UNIVERSITEIT GENT

FACULTEIT ECONOMIE EN BEDRIJFSKUNDE

ASSESSMENT FORM FOR THE MASTER'S DISSERTATION 2018-2019

NAME OF THE STUDENT:	
NAME OF THE PARTNER (IN CASE OF DUO DISSERTATION):	
MASTER'S DISSERTATION TITLE:	
PROGRAMME & MAIN SUBJECT:	
DATE:	

Duo master's dissertation: for each student a separate assessment form needs to be filled in.

FINAL ASSESSMENT (P.T.O.)

1/ WRITTEN REPORT (PROCESS EVALUATION INCLUDED)	:……../20 → : ………/15	**(75%)**
2/ PRESENTATION AND DEFENCE	:……../20 → : ………/5	**(25%)**
ASSESSMENT MARK	: ……... /20	

!!! THE STUDENT MUST ACHIEVE AT LEAST 50% ON THE WRITTEN REPORT IN ORDER TO PASS !!!

Duo master's dissertations: if the examination panel identify significant differences between the students during the defence, they may distinguish their final marks. This is substantiated in the open remarks in the section process and/or presentation and defence.

Chair
(name and signature)

Supervisor
(name and signature)

Co-supervisor
(name and signature)

Commissioner
(name and signature)

1/ ASSESSMENT WRITTEN REPORT:

The matrix below is used to evaluate the written report on several dimensions, in the context of the programme. See assessment framework in attachment.

	Excellent 17-20	Very good 14-16	Good 12-13	Satisfactory 10-11	Unsatisfactory <10
Insight into the topic & problem statement					
Research					
Analysis					
Conclusions					
Aspects of style					

Remarks on the written report (clarifications are mandatory in case of extreme scores 'unsatisfactory' or 'excellent' + if one or more dimensions play a bigger role in the evaluation)

The **process elements** 'independence' and 'effort' can be a reason to adjust the score of the written report in a positive or negative way.

Reasons for a positive adjustment	Positive adjustment	No adjustment	Negative adjustment	Reasons for a negative adjustment
Demonstrates a certain independence, big personal input, strong problem solving and critical skills.	☐	☐	☐	Needs a lot of guidance, low personal input, low problem solving and critical skills.
Very motivated, includes remarks of the supervisor, works hard.	☐	☐	☐	Little motivation, lack of effort.

Remarks on the process:

2/ ASSESSMENT PRESENTATION AND DEFENCE:

	Excellent 17-20	Very good 14-16	Good 12-13	Satisfactory 10-11	Unsatisfactory <10
Presentation					.
Defence					

Remarks on presentation and defence:

Written report: assessment by the supervisor (and co-supervisor – if applicable)

Name of the student(s):………………………………………...

The matrix below is used to evaluate the written report on several dimensions, in the context of the programme. See assessment framework in attachment.

	Excellent 17-20	Very good 14-16	Good 12-13	Satisfactory 10-11	Unsatisfactory <10
Insight into the topic & problem statement					
Research					
Analysis					
Conclusions					
Aspects of style					

Remarks on the written report (clarifications are mandatory in case of extreme scores 'unsatisfactory' or 'excellent' + if one or more dimensions play a bigger role in the evaluation)

The **process elements** 'independence' and 'effort' can be a reason to adjust the score of the written report in a positive or negative way.

Reasons for a positive adjustment	Positive adjustment	No adjustment	Negative adjustment	Reasons for a negative adjustment
Demonstrates a certain independence, big personal input, strong problem solving and critical skills.	☐	☐	☐	Needs a lot of guidance, low personal input, low problem solving and critical skills.
Very motivated, includes remarks of the supervisor, works hard.	☐	☐	☐	Little motivation, lack of effort.

Remarks on the process:

Written report: assessment by the commissioner

Name of the student(s):……………………………………...

The matrix below is used to evaluate the written report on several dimensions, in the context of the programme. See assessment framework in attachment.

	Excellent 17-20	Very good 14-16	Good 12-13	Satisfactory 10-11	Unsatisfactory <10
Insight into the topic & problem statement					
Research					
Analysis					
Conclusions					
Aspects of style					

Remarks on the written report (clarifications are mandatory in case of extreme scores 'unsatisfactory' or 'excellent' + if one or more dimensions play a bigger role in the evaluation)

Assessment framework written report

This assessment scale contains criteria in order to help the assessors to situate and evaluate the master's dissertation within the different aspects/dimensions, taking into account the programme's context. How the dimensions are weighed is the jury's authority.

	Excellent 17-20	Very good 14-16	Good 12-13	Satisfactory (light shortcomings) 10-11	Unsatisfactory (big shortcomings) <10 *
Insight into the topic, contextualization and quality of the problem statement	• in-depth understanding of the topic's current scientific debate. • critical processing of relevant and prominent scientific and original publications. • the problem statement is motivated from gaps in the literature (consistent and logic structure). • the problem statement is innovative, specific, adding great value; a result of 'out of the box' thinking. Commonly used interpretations are questioned in a responsible manner.	• in-depth understanding of the topic's current scientific debate. • The sources are scientific, relevant and are synthesized correctly and critically. Some, less important, publications are missing. • The problem statement is scientifically grounded, is clear and justified (added value).	• good understanding of the topic's scientific debate. • the sources used are relevant for the problem statement, of sufficient volume and mostly scientific. • the report lists (relevant) concepts /theoretical models but contains little critical reflection. • The problem statement is scientifically grounded; but could be motivated more comprehensively.	• sufficient understanding of the topic's scientific debate. • the sources used are relevant but incomplete (crucial sources are missing) • the report is descriptive. There are some mistakes, loose ends, inconsistencies, that do not, however, significantly affect the report's essence. • the problem statement is poorly contextualized and has limited added value.	• insufficient understanding of the topic's scientific debate. • the sources used are little scientific and partly irrelevant, crucial authors are missing. • the report lacks synthesis, analysis and critical reflection. The reader gets an incomplete and superficial understanding of the academic debate. • the problem statement is vague and has little or no added value.
Research: design and execution	• the research design is logic, original and bold (advanced techniques, combination of methods…). • the choice of research units and methods is thoroughly motivated (critical considerations and/or original arguments) and derives logically from the research questions. • the research is conducted with great attention to detail.	• the research design is detailed (logic and well-considered). • the choice of research units and methods is well motivated (well-considered) and derives logically from the research questions. • the research is conducted correctly.	• the research design is developed correctly in general but could have been more detailed. • the choice of research units and methods is correct and derives from the research question(s). Some other elements could have been taken into account. • the research is conducted correctly.	• the research design is inaccurate (some choices are not motivated, some considerations are missing). • the choice of research units and methods does not derive entirely from the research questions • there are small mistakes in the research's conduct.	• the research design is little motivated and is not the best (viable) option for answering the research questions. • the data collection is very poor and/or the research includes fallacies or incorrect applications of research techniques.
Analysis	• the collected data are analysed thoroughly and originally (based on scientific criteria, several analyses are conducted, less obvious connections are made) • the results are discussed clearly and in detail providing an answer to the research question(s).	• the collected data are analysed in-depth (based on scientific criteria). • the results are discussed in relation to the research questions. They are presented clearly.	• the collected data are analysed correctly but are missing some depth. Additional tests or other analysis techniques could have been conducted. • the conducted research provides (an) answer(s) to the research question(s).	• the analysis of the collected data includes small defects of reasoning and misses some depth and critical reflection. Additional tests or other analysis techniques could have been conducted. • the conducted research provides (a) answer(s) to the	• the analysis is superficial, contains serious mistakes and/or is subjective (assumptions). The link to the research questions is limited. • the answers to the research questions are general, incomplete and/or not to the point.

				research question(s) but the discussion of the results is rather general.	
Conclusions	• the discussion and conclusions are well-developed and well-structured; the most important results are presented clearly and critically. • the strengths and weaknesses of the research are identified in depth; several alternatives for follow-up research are proposed. • the student's own input contributes to innovative or new insights in the research domain and business practice/ society (different stakeholders). Specific suggestions are proposed.	• the discussion and conclusions are linked to the most important results. • the research is evaluated critically: strengths and weaknesses are identified. Some alternatives for follow-up research are proposed but are rather general. • the research's relevance for business practice/society is explained. Specific suggestions are rather limited.	• the discussion and conclusions are linked to the results. The discussion includes repetitions with the analysis while there should have been more focus on the most important findings and explanations. • reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the research, the possibilities for follow-up research are limited. • the research's relevance for business practice/ society is explained minimally (one-sided, little depth, …)	• the discussion and conclusions contain gaps, are not completely logical and/or are poorly linked to the research's results. Some details are missing. • The research's evaluation lacks critical reflection. No useful suggestions for follow-up research are made. • the research's relevance for business practice/society is explained minimally (one-sided, little depth, …)	• the discussion and conclusions are superficial and the link to the results is illogically presented. • the research's evaluation and the relevance for business practice/society is lacking and/ or is based on poor arguments (no scientific criteria).
Aspects of style	• consistent academic language use, • logic and consistent structure, • the text, tables and figures are straightforward and easy to read • coherent and concise report, a good basis for a journal paper.	• consistent academic language use • logic and consistent structure, • easy to read, • coherent report. Only small details are missing.	• mainly academic language is used (less consistent). • the structure is logical but some subtitles or linking sentences could make the report stronger.	• the structure is not logical in some parts of the report. • It is not easy to read because of insufficient explanation and/or too little attention to language and structure. • the report includes some loose ends (lay-out, linguistic errors, incorrect references,..).	• inconsistent language use • illogical structure • irrelevant information and a lot of loose ends (lay-out, linguistic errors, incorrect references,..).

* If the master's dissertation shows a lot of similarities with the descriptions in the section 'Unstatisfactory' and/or remediation in the short term is not possible, the advice is to give a score lower than 8/20.