

Assessment form for MA Philosophy

Add cover page assessment thesis (see 'Thesis Regulations'):

<https://vu.nl/en/student/graduation-and-diploma/thesis-information-school-of-humanities>

Thesis title:

Date:

Name of Student:

Student number:

Supervisor:

Second assessor:

Assessment criteria	++	+	+-	-	--	Comments
1. Research question and structure (10%)						
2. Literature (25%)						
3. Argumentation (25%)						
4. Interdisciplinarity (10%)						
5. Language use and style (10%)						
6. Process (5%)						
7. Originality (15%)						
Final grade (1-10)						

Theses are assessed on all these criteria, and the student will only pass the thesis if for all criteria a pass mark is scored. A more detailed explanation of each criterion can be found in the rubric in the appendix. The numerical score on a criterion falls within the range indicated in the rubric. So in the table, a number is entered for each criterion. The

weights of the criteria are a guideline. It is recommended that reference be made to the rubric so that it is clear how the grade was arrived at.

The thesis will only be assessed according to the above procedure if a number of (formal) conditions are met:

- Within the word count: 15-25k.
- Submitted within the agreed deadline.
- Title page with all data according to the Thesis Regulation (title of thesis; name of university, faculty and programme; name of student; student number; name of supervisor(s); name of second assessor; date and year of completion; word count.
- Correct spelling and grammar.
- Appropriate and consistent font and layout.
- Clear and insightful structure (including title, summary, table of contents, chapter and paragraph division, blank lines, signal words).
- Correct, complete and consistent source reference (according to one system, see appendix A of the thesis manual).
- No plagiarism.

When the completed thesis has been submitted, the supervisor performs a plagiarism check.

Appendix: Rubric

Five categories:

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

1. Research question and structure

<i>(very) Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>(Very) Unsatisfactory</i>
The research question is clearly stated (together with any sub-questions) and any ambiguities have been clarified.	The research question is clearly stated.	The research question is absent, unclear or ambiguous.
The research question is well demarcated, and the limitations of the project (and any follow-up questions) are explicitly stated.	The research question is demarcated.	The research question is too ambitious and therefore cannot be answered in a thesis.
The research question is interesting and philosophical, i.e. it falls within the scope of the discipline (see appendix F).	The research question is philosophical.	The research question is not interesting or not philosophical.
The thesis is well structured, and the chapter structure shows clearly how the research question is answered.	The thesis is structured.	The thesis is not well structured.
The main question and any sub-questions have been answered fully in the conclusion.	The research question is answered in the conclusion.	The conclusion does not sufficiently answer the research question.

2. Literature

The argumentation is thoroughly embedded in relevant and current debates (such as influential books or publications in journals).	The argumentation is embedded in existing debates.	The argumentation is insufficiently embedded in existing debates.
The literature considered is of a high level (degree of difficulty).	The sources are of average level.	The sources are of insufficient level.
The literature is conveyed correctly, in the student's own words, and in an original or attractive way.	The literature is conveyed correctly.	The literature is conveyed carelessly or incorrectly, or in a way that is too close to the original source.
It is always clear who is speaking and from which source ideas have been drawn.	It is generally clear who is speaking and from which source ideas have been drawn.	It is unclear when the student is conveying his/her own ideas and those of others.

3. Argumentation

The argumentation is well thought out (and always has a valid form: modus ponens, dilemma, reductio ad absurdum, etc.).	The argumentation is fairly well thought out.	The argumentation is lacking or invalid.
The argumentation is fully developed; the student sets out all stages of the reasoning and guides the reader through them.	The argumentation is fairly well developed.	The argumentation is incomplete; the reader has to complete the reasoning himself, so it remains superficial.
The argumentation is 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 or own) examples.	No examples are given, so the argumentation remains abstract.
The argumentation is relevant in the light of the research question and balanced (e.g. no unnecessary repetitions or digressions and most attention is focused on the main arguments).	The argumentation is relevant in the light of the research question.	The arguments are less relevant to the research question, or unbalanced.
The discourse is convincing and relates critically to the work of others and to one's own position.	The discourse is convincing to some extent.	The discourse is unconvincing.

4. Interdisciplinarity

The thesis develops a critical, philosophical perspective on scientific knowledge, academic insights or social phenomena and convincingly integrates this perspective with the problems and context of the research question.	The thesis reflects on scientific knowledge, academic insights or social phenomena.	The thesis reflects hardly or not at all on scientific knowledge, academic insights or social phenomena.
The philosophical content of this developed critical perspective is of a high level.	The philosophical content of this developed critical perspective is of a sufficient level.	The philosophical content of this developed critical perspective is of insufficient level.

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 (e.g. too populist).
The formulations are accurate, clear, consistent.	The formulations are fairly accurate,	The formulations are careless, ambiguous or inconsistent.

	clear and consistent.	
The text is easy for your intended audience to follow (specialist or broadly academic).	The text is sufficiently easy to follow.	The text is impossible to follow.
All relevant philosophical terms are defined (and the main terms at the beginning of the thesis).	Most philosophical terms are defined.	Many philosophical terms are not defined.
The text is supported by illustrations, helpful diagrams, tables and argumentation reconstructions (if applicable).		

6. Process

The student demonstrated a lot of independence in formulating the research question, finding and studying sources and drawing up the argumentation.	The student was able to continue working independently on the basis of instructions.	The student had to be continuously supervised during the process.
The student works to an agreed schedule and meets his/her own deadlines.	The student meets the deadlines set for him/her.	The student exceeds deadlines.
The student has an open attitude, is able to incorporate feedback (including deleting, supplementing or restructuring text).	The student tries to incorporate feedback.	The student finds it difficult to deal with feedback.

7. Originality

The thesis contains innovative elements, demonstrates an individual perspective on the relevant literature, shows an independent line of reasoning, is a sample of competence in conducting independent research and stimulates thought.	The thesis contains innovative elements, but does not stand out in terms of an individual perspective or an independent line of reasoning.	The thesis reproduces the studied sources passively, without developing an individual perspective or independent line of reasoning.
--	--	---