

PPE Tutorial and Thesis Manual

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Requirements for access to the PPE tutorial and thesis courses.....	3
3. The PPE tutorial and thesis process	4
4. Role of Supervisor, Second Assessor and Thesis Coordinator.	11
5. Academic misconduct.....	11
6. Late assignments, Extensions, and resit.....	12
7. John Stuart Mill thesis prize and Cum laude	12
APPENDIX A: LITERATURE REVIEW RUBRIC	13
APPENDIX B: THESIS PROPOSAL RUBRIC	15
APPENDIX C: TUTORIAL PARTICIPATION RUBRIC	17
APPENDIX D: PROPOSAL PRESENTATION	18
APPENDIX E: FINAL THESIS ASSESSMENT FORM	19
APPENDIX F: THESIS GRADING RUBRIC.....	20
APPENDIX G: ORGANIZATION, PLANNING, AND COLLABORATION.....	22
APPENDIX H: THESIS PRESENTATION.....	24

1. INTRODUCTION

To complete the PPE program, students are required to write a Bachelor's thesis. This process is supported by a complementary tutorial designed to guide and enhance their work.

The successful completion of both the tutorial and thesis earns students 18 ECTS credits, distributed as follows:

- **6 ECTS** for the tutorial.
- **12 ECTS** for the thesis.

Learning Objectives

Tutorial

During the tutorial, students develop key academic and collaborative skills that prepare them for independent thesis research. By the end of the tutorial, students should be able to:

1. Formulate a clear, original, and feasible PPE thesis proposal based on a focused research question
2. Critically synthesize relevant academic literature in support of their proposed project
3. Demonstrate awareness of the interdisciplinary dimensions of their topic and reflect on how they will integrate perspectives in at least two PPE disciplines
4. Communicate research plan clearly and persuasively in both written and oral formats
5. Engage productively in peer feedback, group discussion, and collaborative planning throughout the tutorial process

Thesis

In completing the thesis, students demonstrate their ability to carry out and communicate independent academic research. By the end of the thesis process, students should be able to:

1. Analyse and critically engage with scholarly sources relevant to their research question
2. Apply appropriate conceptual, normative, or empirical methods drawn from two or more PPE disciplines
3. Develop and present a coherent, well-supported line of argument and discuss its scientific implications
4. Communicate their research effectively in writing and in person via a final presentation
5. Manage a sustained research project independently, including planning, revision, and coordination with supervisors and peers

Important note: the specific content of these learning objectives and the assessment of the thesis as discussed below differ from the current content of the Study Guide on vu.nl. The information contained in this document is controlling and overrides the Study Guide text where it is inconsistent.

2. REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCESS TO THE PPE TUTORIAL AND THESIS COURSES

According to Article 9.1.1 of the PPE Academic and Examination Regulations:

“A student must have obtained 138 EC by the end of period 3 of the year they want to start work on the bachelor thesis. If the grades for the fifth semester have not been processed, the course coordinator of the thesis module can allow a student to start their thesis based on the credits (at least 108 EC) that are registered for the student at that time, with the understanding that these credits must be acquired from year one and two courses.”

3. THE PPE TUTORIAL AND THESIS PROCESS

The following table summarizes the most important dates and **deadlines** of the PPE tutorial and thesis process for the graduating class of 2026. All group meetings are indicated in **light blue** and individual meetings are indicated in **Orange**. (Note the indicated schedule of meetings is a suggestion. It may be modified to fit the schedules of the students and supervisor though the number of meetings is fixed.)

Tutorial

Period	Week	Date and time	Tutorial	
4	1	Mon-Wed, Feb 2-4, time: See Canvas	Supervisor Q&A sessions. Schedule to be posted on Canvas. The sessions are based on the supervisor info sheets posted in Canvas under “Files”.	
		Wed, Feb 4, 16:00	Complete supervisor ranking by Wednesday, 16:00. Thesis groups announced Thursday.	
4	2		Tutorial meetings 1 & 2	
4	3		Tutorial 3	Thesis group meeting 1
4	4		Tutorial 4 & 5	
4	5		Tutorial 6	Thesis group meeting 2
4	6			Individual progress meeting w/ supervisor
4	7	Study week		
4	8	Friday, Mar 27, 23:59	Upload literature review and research proposal on Canvas	

Thesis

Period	Week	Date and time	Thesis
5	1		Student presentation 1: Proposal presentation (thesis group only)
			Individual feedback meeting on Thesis proposal w/supervisor
5	2		Thesis group meeting 3
5	3		Thesis group meeting 4
		Friday Apr 17, 23:59	Upload thesis draft on Canvas Resit tutorial
5	4		Individual feedback on thesis draft w/ supervisor
5	5	Spring break	
5	6		Thesis group meeting 5
5	7		Individual Progress meeting w/supervisor
5	8	Friday, May 22, 23:59	Upload final thesis in Onstage
5	9		Student presentation 2: Thesis Presentations (Schedule to be determined)
		Friday June 26, 23:59	Resit Thesis

The PPE tutorial and thesis process begins in **week 1 of period 4** with mandatory Q&A sessions. During these sessions, supervisors will discuss their research interests, potential thesis topics they are willing to supervise, and the structure and readings for their tutorials. Relevant information, including “Supervisor Info Sheets,” will be available on Canvas under “Files.” The Q&A session schedule will also be posted on Canvas by mid-January.

Supervisor Preferences and Matching Process

By **Wednesday of week 1 of period 4 at 16:00**, students must submit their ranked preferences for thesis supervisors via a Google Form. The link to the form will be shared through an Announcement on the Tutorial Canvas page.

Using these preferences, a **random serial dictatorship algorithm** will assign students to supervisors, with each supervisor supervising a group of four students. The finalized thesis group allocation will be announced the next day (**Thursday of week 1**).

Planning Thesis Group Activities

During the rest of week 1, each thesis group, consisting of up to four students and one supervisor, will organize its activities. This includes:

- **Scheduling Meetings:** Establishing a timeline for the tutorial and thesis group meetings
- **Planning Content:** Outlining the structure and focus of the tutorial meetings.

PPE Tutorial

During **weeks 2–5 of period 4**, students focus on developing their literature reviews and research proposals. A total of **six tutorials**, each lasting 1 hour and 45 minutes, are organized to discuss seminal papers, chapters, and books relevant to their research topics. Simultaneously, students work within their thesis groups to develop their research proposals. Two **thesis group meetings**, each lasting **1 hour and 45 minutes**, are scheduled during this period to discuss progress and provide feedback on each other's work.

The final grade for the tutorial is based on the following components:

1. **Literature Review** – 20%
2. **Thesis Proposal** – 40%
3. **Tutorial Participation** – 20%
4. **Proposal Presentation** – 20%

Each component is assessed individually and contributes to the overall tutorial grade according to the weights above. A condition for passing the tutorial is that the grade for all four components is a pass.

Together, the Literature Review and Research Proposals form the main written product of the tutorial. The assignment assesses students' ability to engage critically with relevant literature and to develop an original, well-motivated, and feasible PPE thesis project. The Research Proposal will be presented to the thesis group and supervisor and will be assessed during the first week of period 5.

By **week 8 of period 4**, students must upload the combined literature review and research proposal to **Canvas**. The combined assignment has a word limit of **3,000 words** (with a 10% margin) structured as follows:

- **Literature Review:** Word limit: 1,500 words (with a 10% margin)
- **Research Proposal:** Word limit: 1,500 words (with a 10% margin)

Word counts should be clearly indicated at the top of the document.

Tutorial Participation

Participation is assessed based on the student's engagement during the tutorial and thesis group meetings in Period 4. Students are expected to attend every session, come prepared, contribute actively to discussions, and provide constructive feedback on the work of their peers.

Literature Review (1,500 words +/- 10%)

The literature review assesses the student's ability to identify, understand, and critically synthesize relevant academic literature that forms the foundation of the thesis project. Rather than aiming for exhaustive coverage, the literature review should demonstrate selective judgment, conceptual clarity, and a clear sense of how existing debates shape the student's research question.

Requirements:

The literature review should

- identify the central academic debates relevant to the thesis topic;
- discuss key contributions and positions within those debates;
- highlight tensions, limitations, or open questions in the literature that will be addressed in the thesis proposal

The review should be written as a **coherent analytical narrative**, not as a series of summaries of individual texts.

Resources:

- Refer to the **PPE Style Guide** (available on Canvas under “Files”) for details on bibliographic citations (Section 8.2, pp. 26–28).
- **Sample literature reviews** from previous years are also available on Canvas under “Files” > “Sample Literature Reviews.”

Thesis Proposal (1,500 words +/- 10%)

Building on the literature review, the thesis proposal sets out the student’s **own thesis project**.

Requirements:

The research proposal should include

1. **Working title**
2. **Research question and motivation**
A clear and precise research question (or set of closely related questions), together with a motivation that explains:
 - why this question is worth addressing;
 - how it relates to the debates discussed in the literature review;
 - the interdisciplinary dimensions of the question
3. **Proposed argument and contribution**
An outline of the main argument, analytical strategy, or contribution the thesis aims to make. Students should indicate how the thesis:
 - builds on, revises, or challenges existing literature;
 - adds something conceptually, normatively, or empirically new.
4. **Approach and methodology**
Students should explain:
 - how the project draws from more than one PPE discipline
 - whether the project is primarily normative, conceptual, empirical, or mixed;
 - what methods, data, or sources will be used;
5. **Provisional structure**
A tentative outline of chapters or sections, with a brief explanation of what each part will address.

Resources:

- For guidance on structuring and sectioning, consult the **PPE Style Guide** (Section 2, pp. 7–8).
- For more on thesis elements (e.g., title, introduction, body, conclusion), refer to Section 4.1 of the style guide (pp. 13–15).

Proposal Presentation

Students present their research proposal to their thesis group and supervisor during a group meeting the week after submitting the proposal. The presentation allows students to articulate their research question, motivation, and proposed approach, and to receive (peer) feedback before finalizing their project for Period 5.

Requirements:

- A clear and concise oral presentation (approx. 12-15 minutes)
- Explanation of the research question, motivation, interdisciplinary dimension, and proposed structure
- Response to feedback and questions from peers and the supervisor

Assessment is based on clarity, coherence, and ability to communicate the significance and structure of the proposed project and respond to feedback and questions.

PPE Thesis

Word Count : The PPE Bachelor's thesis word limit is **7,500 words (+/- 10%)**, including footnotes but excluding the title, abstract, bibliography, and appendices.

The final grade for the thesis is based on the following components:

1. **Final Submitted Thesis** – 60%
2. **Organisation, Planning, and Collaboration** – 20%
3. **Thesis presentation** – 20%

Each component is assessed individually and contributes to the overall thesis grade according to the weights above. A condition for passing the thesis is that the grade for all three components is a pass.

During **weeks 1–3 of period 5**, students focus on writing their thesis drafts. At the start of this period, students will have their an individual meeting with their supervisor to receive feedback on their research proposal.

During these weeks, two Thesis Group Meetings are dedicated to developing the **interdisciplinary dimension of the thesis**:

- **Thesis group meeting 3 (Student-led)**: A student-organized group meeting (without the supervisor) in which each student shares the interdisciplinary dimension of their project and receives peer feedback.
- **Thesis group meeting 4 (with Supervisor)**: A follow-up thesis group meeting, where students present takeaways from the earlier discussion. Each student should be prepared to explain the interdisciplinary relevance of their topic and how they plan to integrate perspectives from more than one PPE discipline.

These meetings are designed to help students refine their interdisciplinary approach and will contribute to the final thesis grade under the criterion: Organization, planning, and collaboration.

Thesis draft

By **Friday of week 3 of period 5**, students must upload their thesis draft to Canvas and email it to their supervisor. The thesis draft should include the following components:

- **Title** (and subtitle, if applicable).
- **Draft version of the thesis** (maximum 3,000 words), including:
 - Introduction.
 - (Some chapters of the) Main body of the thesis.
 - Conclusion.
- **Bibliography.**

All writing and in-text citations must follow the **PPE Style Guide**.

- Refer to Section 3: *Writing* (pp. 8–11) for general writing guidelines.
- Refer to Section 8.1: *In-Text Citations* (pp. 23–26) for citation standards.

Final thesis

During **weeks 4-8 of period 5**, students finalize their thesis. They can incorporate feedback received during the thesis draft and progress meetings with their supervisor, and the thesis group meetings. Students are also allowed to approach external VU staff for additional feedback.

Before **23:59 at the end of week 8**, the student uploads the thesis on **Onstage** and emails it to the supervisor, second assessor, and the thesis coordinator. The final thesis consists of the following components:

- title (and subtitle if applicable),
- name, student number and email address of student,
- names and email addresses of supervisor and second assessor,
- name of programme and university,
- date of completion,
- abstract (max 150 words),
- five keywords,
- word count (including footnotes, excluding title, abstract, bibliography and appendices)
- table of contents,
- introduction,
- main body of the thesis,
- conclusion,
- bibliography,
- appendices (optional),
- acknowledgment (optional).

More information on table of contents, abstract and appendix can be found in the PPE Style Guide, section 4.2 *Optional Elements*, p.15.

Thesis Presentation

During the final week of period 5, students present their final thesis to their supervisor and second assessor. The presentation is part of the thesis assessment and provides an opportunity to demonstrate understanding of the submitted work, communicate the core argument and findings, and respond to questions.

Requirements:

- A clear and concise oral presentation with slides (15-20 minutes)
- Overview of the research question, motivation, main argument, methodology, and key findings, and discussion
- Response to questions from the supervisor and second assessor

Assessment focuses on the ability to clearly communicate the content and structure of the thesis, demonstrate ownership of the work, and engage effectively with questions and feedback.

Organisation, Planning, and Collaboration

This assesses how the student has managed the thesis process over time, including their ability to plan effectively, maintain regular communication with the supervisor, and respond constructively to feedback and challenges. It reflects the student's engagement with the full research process, not just the final product.

Requirements:

- Work independently and with a clear sense of direction throughout the thesis period
- Come to individual meetings prepared to discuss progress and open questions
- Engage actively in supervisory conversations and respond constructively to feedback
- Participate actively and constructively in Thesis group meetings, including those focused on interdisciplinarity

Assessment is based on the student's ability to take ownership of the research process, work in a structured and timely manner, and collaborate effectively with their supervisor and peers.

Alignment of Assessments and Learning Objectives:

Assessment	Targets Learning Objectives
Literature Review (Tutorial)	T2, T3, T4
Research Proposal (Tutorial)	T1, T2, T3, T4
Proposal Presentation (Tutorial)	T1, T3, T4, T5
Tutorial Participation (Tutorial)	T3, T5
Final Written Thesis	TH1, TH2, TH3, TH4, TH5
Final Thesis Presentation	TH3, TH4, TH5
Organization, planning, and collaboration	TH3, TH6

4. ROLE OF SUPERVISOR, SECOND ASSESSOR AND THESIS COORDINATOR.

Supervisor and Second Assessor

Each student is assigned a thesis supervisor who provides academic guidance and monitors progress throughout the thesis process. Four individual meetings are scheduled between the student and supervisor. The foci of these meetings are:

1. Discussion and refinement of the research proposal
2. Feedback on the submitted proposal
3. Feedback on initial thesis draft
4. Feedback on the full thesis draft prior to final submission

These individual meetings are supported by thesis group meetings, including structured sessions focused on interdisciplinarity and peer feedback.

The supervisor is responsible for assigning the tutorial grade. The tutorial assessment forms, rubrics and grading criteria are available on Canvas.

At the end of the thesis period, the supervisor also assesses the final written thesis, the Thesis Presentation, and Organization, Planning and Collaboration. The supervisor is also responsible for checking the submitted thesis for plagiarism using OnStage. Any suspected academic misconduct will be reported to the PPE Examination Committee and the Thesis Coordinator.

The **second assessor** independently evaluates the final written thesis using the same assessment form. They also independently evaluate the Thesis Presentation. In many cases, the second assessor may be from a different disciplinary background than the supervisor. All supervisors also serve as second assessors for a number of theses equivalent to those they supervise. In rare cases, a third assessor may be appointed.

Thesis Coordinator

The role of the thesis coordinator is to monitor the thesis process, which includes updating the thesis manual. If conflicts arise between a student and a supervisor, the thesis coordinator will mediate between them (if the thesis coordinator is also the supervisor, mediation is done by the Dean of PPE). If no solution is found, the matter will be referred to the PPE Examination Board.

5. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

When the completed thesis has been submitted via Onstage, a plagiarism check will be performed by the thesis supervisor. Plagiarism of any kind will not be tolerated. **This includes not only the direct copying of existing texts without proper attribution, but also the use of large language model AI programs like ChatGPT to generate the text of the literature review, thesis proposal, or thesis.** Additionally, plagiarism can occur through improper citation and referencing, as well as self-plagiarism, which is when a student submits the same work to fulfill multiple degree requirements. Electronic detection software will be used to detect plagiarism and by submitting the thesis, the student implies consent for the text to be entered into the

database of the detection program. For more information on plagiarism and its consequences, refer to John Stuart Mill College's regulatory guidelines.

If academic misconduct is suspected, the supervisor reports the case to the Examination Board and notifies the thesis coordinator. The Examination Board will handle the subsequent procedure.

6. LATE ASSIGNMENTS, EXTENSIONS, AND RESIT

Tutorial

For both written assignments in the tutorial (the literature review and the research proposal) the official PPE Assessment Policy regarding written assignments applies. This states that the deadlines are strict and that late submissions are not allowed. Students who submit after the deadline will receive a failing grade for these assignments, and thus the tutorial as a whole.

If the tutorial receives a failing grade, the student can submit (a revised version of) the literature review and research proposal by the indicated deadline (see schedule above). In this case the maximum grade a student can receive for the entire tutorial is a 6. The grades from the tutorial participation and proposal presentation carry over.

Thesis

If a delay in submitting the final thesis is expected due to extenuating circumstances, an extension can be requested to the PPE Study Advisor and Thesis coordinator **at least two weeks before the final thesis submission deadline**. When an extension is granted, the student must coordinate with the supervisor and second assessor when to submit the final version of the thesis and schedule the thesis presentation.

If the grade on the thesis is **a fail**, then there's a possibility of a resit. Make clear agreements about this with your supervisor regarding what changes are needed in order to pass. Beyond these agreements, no additional supervision meetings will be held. June 26th, 23:59 is the deadline for submitting the revised thesis. The maximum grade a student can receive for the thesis is a 6. The resit is integrative—the overall thesis grade will be determined by the written thesis, however, it is at the discretion of the supervisor to have the student give a thesis presentation to validate the thesis grade.

7. JOHN STUART MILL THESIS PRIZE AND CUM LAUDE

A committee installed by the dean of PPE will convene to judge nominations for the PPE thesis prize. The three best theses will receive the John Stuart Mill thesis prize, which will be announced and awarded at the graduation ceremony.

To graduate cum laude, a grade of 8 for the thesis is required.

APPENDIX A: LITERATURE REVIEW RUBRIC

(**Note:** This and all subsequent rubrics are intended to guide assessment and provide an indicative score. The final grade remains the result of the supervisor's overall judgment.)

Five categories:

- ++: Very good / over 8.5
- +: Good / 7 to 8.5
- +/-: Satisfactory / 5.5 to 7
- -: Unsatisfactory / 4 to 5.5
- --: Very unsatisfactory / below 4

1. Source selection

<i>(Very) Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>(Very) Unsatisfactory</i>
Includes an (exceptional) variety of sources from high-quality journals and publications	Includes primary research articles from well-respected journals in the field.	Over-reliance on low quality journals and/or a few sources are not reliable.
All sources selected are clearly relevant to the topic. Relevance is (very) clearly articulated.	Apparent match between all sources and the topic, although perhaps not clearly articulated.	Apparent match between some sources and the topic, though some are mismatched.

2. Synthesis

The literature is presented as a coherent analytical narrative that clearly maps the main positions and debates. The review (very clearly / insightfully) synthesizes different contributions rather than summarizing individual texts.	The review identifies some relevant debates and positions, but synthesis remains less than a fully integrated discussion.	Lacks summary or synthesis of the information, leaving each article as a standalone piece and/or misinterprets the information and/or makes statements unsupported by the literature.
--	---	---

3. Research gap

The review clearly identifies tensions, limitations, or open questions in the literature and (very clearly / insightfully) articulates the research gap that emerges from these discussions.	The review identifies some tensions, limitations, or open questions in the literature, though these are not fully	The review does not clearly identify tensions, limitations, or open questions in the literature, and the
---	---	--

	developed. The research gap is indicated but not clearly articulated.	research gap remains unclear or absent.
--	---	---

APPENDIX B: THESIS PROPOSAL RUBRIC

Five categories:

- ++: Very good / over 8.5
- +: Good / 7 to 8.5
- +/-: Satisfactory / 5.5 to 7
- -: Unsatisfactory / 4 to 5.5
- --: Very unsatisfactory / below 4

1. Research question

<i>(Very) Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>(Very) Unsatisfactory</i>
The proposal formulates a(n exceptionally) clear, precise, and well-focused research question. The scope of the project is (very) appropriate and well calibrated for a bachelor thesis.	A research question is formulated but remains somewhat broad or imprecise. The scope of the project may require further refinement.	The proposal lacks a clear research question or the project is overly broad, vague, or poorly focused.
The proposal clearly explains how the thesis will build on, revise, or challenge existing literature.	The relationship between the proposed project and existing literature is indicated but not fully or clearly explained.	The proposal does not clearly explain how the thesis relates to or contributes to existing literature.

2. Proposed contribution

The proposal presents a clear outline of the proposed analysis, argument, or hypothesis, and explains the intended contribution of the thesis. The central idea of the project is (very) clear and intellectually interesting (and appropriately ambitious)	The proposal suggests a possible analytical direction, argument, or hypothesis, but it remains somewhat vague or underdeveloped.	The proposal does not clearly explain what the thesis aims to show, investigate, or contribute.
---	--	---

3. Approach, Methodology, and Feasibility

The proposal clearly explains the approach or methodology (e.g., conceptual, normative, empirical, or mixed) and how the research question will be investigated.	The proposal outlines an approach or methodology, though some aspects remain unclear or insufficiently specified.	The proposal lacks a clear approach or proposes methods that are inappropriate for the research question.
--	---	---

The proposal provides a (very) clear and coherent provisional structure, and the project appears feasible within the scope of a bachelor thesis.	A provisional structure is provided and the project appears generally feasible, though some elements require further clarification.	The proposal lacks a clear structure or the project appears unrealistic or poorly scoped.
---	---	---

APPENDIX C: TUTORIAL PARTICIPATION RUBRIC

Five categories:

- ++: Very good / over 8.5
- +: Good / 7 to 8.5
- +/-: Satisfactory / 5.5 to 7
- -: Unsatisfactory / 4 to 5.5
- --: Very unsatisfactory / below 4

1. Preparation and attendance

<i>(Very) Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>(Very) Unsatisfactory</i>
Prepares (exceptionally) clear, (insightful) summaries of tutorial readings and leads the group discussion with (excellent) command of the material.	Provides adequate summaries and manages to lead the discussion, though engagement with material may be somewhat surface-level.	Summaries are (largely) inaccurate or missing, and the student fails to guide the group through the material.
Attends every session, is always well-prepared, and consistently contributes (nuanced) questions and comments	Attends every session, is usually well-prepared and participates adequately in discussions led by others.	Missed some sessions, is sometimes unprepared, and/or rarely engages with peers' presentations or makes comments that are (consistently) off topic.

2. Process Management & Ownership

(Proactively) takes ownership of scheduling meetings, planning content, and managing independent research tasks.	Follows the established timeline and completes tasks, though requires (occasional) prompting to maintain momentum.	Fails to engage in group planning or demonstrates a (significant) lack of initiative in the research process.
---	--	--

APPENDIX D: PROPOSAL PRESENTATION

Five categories:

- ++: Very good / over 8.5
- +: Good / 7 to 8.5
- +/-: Satisfactory / 5.5 to 7
- -: Unsatisfactory / 4 to 5.5
- --: Very unsatisfactory / below 4

1. Clarity and Structure

<i>(Very) Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>(Very) Unsatisfactory</i>
The presentation clearly and (very) effectively explains the research question, motivation, and planned approach. The presentation is well structured and easy to follow.	The presentation communicates the main elements of the project, though the structure or clarity of the explanation could be improved.	The presentation is unclear or poorly structured, making it difficult to understand the proposed project.
Visual aids (slides) and time management are used (very) effectively to support the explanation of the project.	Visual aids and time management are generally adequate but not always used effectively.	Visual aids are missing or ineffective, and/or the presentation significantly exceeds or falls short of the allotted time.

2. Engagement with Questions and Feedback

The student responds to questions (very) clearly and thoughtfully, demonstrating a strong understanding of the proposed project.	The student answers questions adequately but responses may lack some clarity or depth.	The student struggles to answer questions or demonstrates limited understanding of the project.
---	--	---

APPENDIX E: FINAL THESIS ASSESSMENT FORM

Student name:

Student number:

Assessor:

Assessment criteria	--	-	-+	+	++	Explanatory notes
1. Methodology (10%)						
2. Argumentation and Analysis (formal, empirical, normative, conceptual) (30%)						
3. Discussion (30%)						
4. Structure (10%)						
5. Language use and style (5%)						
6. Originality (5%)						
7. Interdisciplinarity (10%)						
Final grade:						

A more detailed explanation of each criterion can be found in the Grading Rubric in Appendix F.

In each column, please enter a numerical score that falls within the range indicated in the rubric below. The weights for each category are just an indication.

APPENDIX F: THESIS GRADING RUBRIC

Five categories:

- ++: Very good / over 8.5
- +: Good / 7 to 8.5
- +/-: Satisfactory / 5.5 to 7
- -: Unsatisfactory / 4 to 5.5
- --: Very unsatisfactory / below 4

1. Methodology

<i>(Very) Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>(Very) Unsatisfactory</i>
The methodology is (very) innovative to the research question. .	The methodology is appropriate to the research question.	No clear methodology is used.

2. Argumentation and Analysis (formal, empirical, normative, conceptual)

The argumentation is (very) well thought out	The argumentation is fairly well thought out.	The argumentation is lacking or invalid.
The argumentation is (very) well explained using examples (chosen or devised by the student), the relevance of which is always clear.	The argumentation is explained on the basis of existing examples.	No examples are given, so the argumentation remains abstract.
The analysis is (very) relevant to the research question	The analysis is sufficiently relevant to the research question.	The analysis does not relate to the research question.
The analysis is (fully) developed; the student sets out all stages of the reasoning and guides the reader through them.	The analysis is fairly well developed.	The analysis is incomplete, weak or non-existent.
If applicable, the data collection and data analysis is carried out (extremely) meticulously.	If applicable, the data collection and data analysis is carried out correctly.	If applicable, the data collection and data analysis is carried out incorrectly and with little effort.

3. Discussion

There is a (very) comprehensive description of the implications of the results.	There is a concise description of the implications of the results	There is no description of the implications of the results
The limitations of the analysis are (very) clearly highlighted.	The limitations of the analysis are	No limitations of the analysis are highlighted.

	sufficiently highlighted.	
The student makes (many) explicit connections between the research findings and society.	The student makes some connections between the research findings and society.	The student makes no connections between the research findings and society.

4. Structure

The structure of the text is (always) clear (partly as a result of including a summary, contents, titles, paragraph breakdown, empty lines, key words).	The structure of the text is sufficiently clear.	The text structure is unclear, illogical or not consistently maintained.
---	--	--

5. Language use and style

The style is academic, and yet lively and appealing.	The style is academic.	The style is inappropriate for an academic paper
The formulations are accurate, clear, consistent.	The formulations are fairly accurate, clear and consistent.	The formulations are careless, ambiguous or inconsistent.
The text is easy for the intended audience to follow.	The text is sufficiently easy to follow.	The text is impossible to follow.

6. Originality

The thesis shows an independent line of reasoning, adds to the literature and stimulates thought (and may even contain material for a publication).	The thesis shows an independent line of reasoning but is otherwise unremarkable.	The thesis reproduces the studied sources passively, without critical reflection or addition.
---	--	---

7. Interdisciplinarity

The thesis develops and combines insights from at least two PPE disciplines (in a very well-integrated fashion).	The thesis, though largely monodisciplinary, explains the relevance to research in at least one of the other disciplines.	The thesis is monodisciplinary.
--	---	---------------------------------

APPENDIX G: ORGANIZATION, PLANNING, AND COLLABORATION

Five categories:

- ++: Very good / over 8.5
- +: Good / 7 to 8.5
- +/-: Satisfactory / 5.5 to 7
- -: Unsatisfactory / 4 to 5.5
- --: Very unsatisfactory / below 4

1. Planning and Time Management

<i>(Very) Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>(Very) Unsatisfactory</i>
Develops a (very) clear and realistic project plan and follows it (consistently and effectively) throughout the thesis period. Adjusts the plan (proactively and appropriately) in response to challenges and completes all stages on time.	Develops a project plan and generally follows it, though adjustments may be reactive or only partially effective. Most deadlines are met, with some need for correction or support.	Lacks a clear project plan or fails to follow it. Deadlines are missed or met only with significant delay, and adjustments are (minimal or ineffective).

2. Engagement in Supervision Meetings

Consistently comes to meetings (very well prepared), with clear updates, questions, and topics for discussion. Engages (actively and thoughtfully) in supervisory dialogue.	Comes to meetings prepared, though preparation or engagement may be uneven. Participates in discussions but does not consistently take initiative.	Frequently comes to meetings (poorly prepared or unprepared). Engagement is (minimal or passive), with little contribution to discussion.
---	--	---

3. Responsiveness to Feedback

Responds to feedback (very effectively and constructively), clearly integrating it into subsequent work. Demonstrates (strong and reflective) understanding of how feedback improves the project.	Responds to feedback and incorporates some suggestions, though not always consistently or fully.	Shows (limited or no) engagement with feedback. Revisions are minimal, inappropriate, or absent.
---	--	--

4. Initiative and Independence

Works (very independently and proactively), taking clear ownership of	Works independently in	Demonstrates (little independence or
---	------------------------	--------------------------------------

the research process. Seeks assistance (appropriately and strategically) when needed.	general, though may require occasional prompting or guidance to maintain progress.	initiative), relying heavily on guidance and failing to take ownership of the project.
---	--	--

5. Collaboration and Participation in Group Meetings

Participates (very actively and constructively) in group meetings, including interdisciplinary sessions. Provides (insightful and relevant) feedback to peers and contributes to collective discussion.	Participates in group meetings and provides some feedback, though contributions may be limited in depth or frequency.	Participation is (minimal or absent). Contributions are off-topic, superficial, or not constructive.
---	---	--

APPENDIX H: THESIS PRESENTATION

Five categories:

- ++: Very good / over 8.5
- +: Good / 7 to 8.5
- +/-: Satisfactory / 5.5 to 7
- -: Unsatisfactory / 4 to 5.5
- --: Very unsatisfactory / below 4

1. Clarity and Structure

<i>(Very) Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>(Very) Unsatisfactory</i>
The presentation provides a (very) clear, well-structured, and easy-to-follow account of the thesis. The research question, motivation, and structure are explained (very) effectively and coherently.	The presentation communicates the main elements of the thesis, though structure or clarity could be improved. Some parts may be underdeveloped or not fully connected.	The presentation is unclear, poorly structured, or difficult to follow. Key elements of the thesis are missing or inadequately explained.

2. Content—main argument, methodology and implications

The presentation provides a (very) clear and accurate account of the main argument, methodology, and key findings. Demonstrates (strong and well-articulated) understanding of the thesis and its implications.	The presentation conveys the main argument and findings, though explanation may lack depth, precision, or full clarity. Understanding is adequate but not fully developed.	The presentation misrepresents or omits central aspects of the thesis. Demonstrates (limited or weak) understanding of the project.
---	--	---

3. Use of Slides, Time Management, and Delivery

Slides and visual aids are (very) clear, well-designed, and support understanding effectively. The presentation is delivered (confidently and professionally) and stays (very) well within the allotted time.	Visual aids and delivery are adequate but may be uneven in clarity or effectiveness. Time management is acceptable but not optimal.	Slides are (unclear, cluttered, or missing) and do not support understanding. Delivery is (unclear or unstructured), and the presentation significantly exceeds or falls short of the allotted time.
---	---	--

4. Engagement with Questions and Demonstration of Ownership

The student responds to questions (very clearly, thoughtfully, and confidently), demonstrating (strong and independent) ownership of the thesis. Engages critically with feedback and can clarify, defend, or refine key aspects of the work.	The student answers questions adequately, though responses may lack depth, precision, or confidence. Demonstrates a general but not fully developed grasp of the thesis.	The student struggles to answer questions or provides (unclear or incorrect) responses. Demonstrates (limited or superficial) ownership of the work
---	--	---