



**Amsterdam University College *Excellence
and Diversity in a Global City***

**Capstone Guidelines
2018-2019**

Last updated: January 2019

Contents

1. Introduction	2
1.1 Intended learning outcomes	2
1.2 Capstone Coordinator	2
2. Timeline and deadlines	3
3. Supervisor and Reader Responsibilities	4
3.1 Supervisor	4
3.2 Reader	4
4. Assessed components	5
4.1 Research proposal	5
4.1.1 Overview of proposed research	5
4.1.2 Description of proposed research	5
4.1.3 Bibliography	6
4.1.4 Expected writing update	6
4.2 Writing update	6
4.3 Full Draft of the Capstone	6
4.4 Oral Evaluation/Presentation	6
4.5 The Final Thesis	7
4.5.1 Sciences and Empirical Social Sciences	7
4.5.2 Humanities and Theoretical Social Sciences	7
4.5.3 Conclusion	7
4.5.4 Bibliography	8
4.5.5 Word Count	8
5. Grading procedures	9
5.1 Relative weights of components	9
5.2 Grading procedures	9
5.2.1 Grade discrepancies/single failing Final Thesis grade	9
5.2.2 Submission past the deadline and failed Capstones	9
5.2.3 Extensions	10
5.2.4 Plagiarism and fraud	10
5.3 Capstones of Distinction	10
5.3.1 Procedure for Nomination and Selection	10
5.3.2 Criteria for Thesis of Distinction	10
6. Grading rubrics	11
Final Thesis rubric	11
Oral evaluation rubric	15

1. Introduction

These guidelines provide an overview of the bachelor thesis ('Capstone') process at Amsterdam University College. The document addresses learning outcomes, Supervisor and Reader responsibilities, assessed components, and grading procedures. The guidelines are reviewed and updated periodically, based on (student) evaluations and recommendations of the Capstone Quality Committee and the Board of Studies.

1.1 Intended learning outcomes

The Capstone¹ is the culmination of skills, knowledge and attitudes students have acquired in their curriculum, and must be completed during their final semester at AUC. Within a specified timeframe, and under supervision of a (partner) faculty member, students are expected to carry out research: gather information and sources, formulate a thesis statement or research question, situate their research within the academic field, set objectives for the project, establish a methodology, and communicate their findings clearly and coherently in a polished piece of scholarly work.

Intended learning outcomes:

1. The student can identify a suitable topic for Capstone research, formulate and articulate objectives of a thesis, and situate this within an academic field of study.
2. The student can analyse and evaluate the most relevant scholarly work of the chosen academic field of study and synthesise this within the thesis.
3. The student can articulate a suitable methodology and can effectively and professionally engage with primary or secondary data sources to develop the thesis objectives.
4. The student can interpret and critically evaluate key findings and relate them to an academic field of study.
5. Based on the key findings, the student can discuss limitations, articulate future lines of research, and gesture to/ identify areas of relevance beyond academia.
6. The student can write a comprehensive and coherent thesis that meets the requirements of academic writing in the academic field of study.
7. The student can effectively communicate the results of their research through writing, discussion, and/or presentation.
8. The student works independently, shows initiative and takes ownership of the Capstone process.

1.2 Capstone Coordinator

The Capstone Coordinator is responsible for improving and monitoring the Capstone process, including the guidelines.

The Capstone Coordinator can also supervise Capstone. To ensure that no conflicts of interests or problems arise, the student can consult the relevant Head of Studies if needed.

Whenever questions or problems arise within a Capstone project the Capstone Coordinator is the first point of contact (Capstone@auc.nl), for (partner) faculty as well as students. The interim Capstone Coordinator is Wade Geary, assisted by Bob Kardolus in administration. Please contact the Coordinator as soon as questions or problems become arise so the Coordinator can mediate/intervene in an adequate and timely fashion.

¹ Throughout the document when the word Capstone is used all assessed component are meant, while thesis solely refers to the final written product (Final Thesis)

2. Timeline and deadlines

- Students are advised to contact possible Supervisors early in their fifth semester (see timeline), as they start Advanced Research Writing. Students taking Advanced Research Writing in their fourth semester, before a year abroad, are advised to make earlier contact with a possible Supervisor.
- Students are responsible for finding a thesis Supervisor and are advised to check AUC's faculty members and their expertise on www.auc.nl. In case interdisciplinary cross-major Capstone the student needs to have two Supervisors from the two relevant majors, and the student needs to seek written approval for this supervision with the relevant Heads of Studies.
- Double major students have to write two separate theses in the two majors they want to graduate in.
- It is the Supervisor's responsibility to find and assign a Reader (in consultation with the student).
- Students should have a first meeting with their Supervisor to discuss initial ideas before the semester in which the Capstone will be carried out.
- Overall, the student and Supervisor should meet at least four times; it is left to the discretion of the student and Supervisor to plan additional meetings. It is important that the student and Supervisor agree on the expectations for the writing update and oral evaluation during the meeting in which the research proposal is discussed.
- All students are strongly advised to adhere to the Capstone Timeline. Note that the final deadline is fixed — final theses uploaded after the final deadline will automatically receive an F (see 5.2.2, and 5.2.3). The Supervisor and student can agree on different deadlines, except the final deadline, but the student should inform the Capstone team of this via Capstone@auc.nl.
- *Important notes:* students should be aware that Supervisors and Readers have 10 work days to provide feedback on assessments. Be aware that improper planning on the student's part may not necessarily constitute an emergency on the Supervisor's part. Furthermore, the student should realise that the Capstone is 12 ECP, which amounts to a total work load of 336 hours, or 21 hours per week for 16 weeks,

Student deadlines 2018-2019 semester 1

Date	Task
Fri 17 August, 23:59	Email the name of the Supervisor and their contact information to Capstone Coordinator (Capstone@auc.nl)
Wed 1 October, 23:59	Upload Research Proposal to Canvas and send to Supervisor.
Wed 5 November, 23:59	Send agreed Writing Update to Supervisor.
Wed 28 November 23:59	Upload Draft Final to Canvas and send to Supervisor.
Wed 19 December, 23:59	Upload Final Thesis to Canvas.
Wed 9 January	Oral evaluation/presentation

Student deadlines 2018-2019 semester 2

Date	Task
Fri 7 December, 23:59	Email the name of the Supervisor and their contact information to Capstone Coordinator (Capstone@auc.nl)
Wed 6 March, 23:59	Upload Research Proposal to Canvas and send to Supervisor.
Wed 10 April, 23:59	Send agreed Writing Update to Supervisor.

Wed 8 May, 23:59	Upload Draft Final to Canvas and send to Supervisor.
Mon 3 June, 9:00	Upload Final Thesis to Canvas.
Wed 5 June	Oral evaluation/presentation

Supervisor (and Reader) deadlines 2018-2019

Date	Task
<i>Semester 1:</i> Wed 3 October	Supervisor e-mails Reader details to Capstone@auc.nl (cc-ing student)
<i>Semester 2:</i> Wed 6 March	
10 work days after student hands in their work	Provide feedback. For the Research Proposal , the Final Thesis and the Oral evaluation a grade needs to be given and in addition a rubric grading form has to be filled out. The grade and rubric grading form need to be sent to Capstone@auc.nl .

3. Supervisor and Reader Responsibilities

3.1 Supervisor

The student can only be supervised by AUC faculty (core staff members and other partner members teaching at AUC) or AUC partner faculty (UvA, AMC, VUMC or VU faculty members). The Supervisor should preferably hold a PhD and have a background, either in teaching or in research, in the student's major(s). The role of the Supervisor is to guide the student through the entire Capstone process. Each AUC thesis Supervisor is compensated for 15 hours per Capstone project. If a Capstone has multiple Supervisors, the hours will be shared and only one Supervisor can be the formal examiner. Supervisors are allowed to supervise a maximum of 5 projects per academic year (exceptions can only be made by the Capstone Coordinator after consultation with the Director of Education). Specific Supervisor responsibilities include:

- Providing guidance, suggestions and written critique on all graded and non-graded parts of the Capstone;
- Setting up at least four meetings with the student during the Capstone process;
- Monitoring progress;
- Confirming that all thesis requirements have been met;
- Finding and assigning a Reader (in consultation with the student);
- Reporting any suspicion of plagiarism and/or fraud (see section 5.2.4 of this document);
- Submitting all grades, including written feedback, to the Capstone Coordinator (Capstone@auc.nl) by the determined deadlines;
- Referring the student, if academic writing guidance is needed, to the AUC Writing centre (for more information, see [here](#)).

Finally, a Supervisor can take initiative to contact the Head of Studies to pass on relevant information to the Reader. This could include known or suspected errors and/or information about what role a student played or contributions within a collaborative project.

3.2 Reader

The role of the Reader is to evaluate the Final Thesis. Readers can be AUC Faculty or AUC partner Faculty (see 3.1). If the Supervisor does not teach at AUC, the Reader must be a core faculty member. The Reader should preferably hold a PhD and have a background, either in teaching or in research, in the student's major(s). Readers will be allocated 3 hours for each Readership. Readers are allowed to read a maximum of 5 Capstones per academic year. Note: if the Reader suspects plagiarism, they should follow normal procedures as outlined in AUC's AS&Ps (see section 5.2.4 of this document).

Note that if a Reader feels insufficiently competent to assess a thesis they should contact the Head of Studies to find a solution. The Head of Studies can check with the Supervisor or find an alternative Reader.

4. Assessed components

4.1 Research proposal

A research proposal is the first step in producing a Capstone. It must satisfy the Supervisor that the topic and approach is sufficient and feasible, and in addition, must serve as an assurance that the Supervisor and student share the same expectations in terms of research goals, activity and workload. The research proposal should demonstrate the student's ability to compile research, select, evaluate, and analyse sources, and situate the working research question or thesis within a specific research context. The proposal should include an informed description of the research design and methodology as well as a strong indication of the significance of the question or thesis within the academic field.

The research proposal should contain the following parts:

4.1.1 Overview of proposed research

- Title and a subtitle (if applicable). The title should be brief, descriptive and specific, and should reflect the importance of the proposal, providing a clear statement of the subject of the research.
- Name of author (with affiliation: AUC) and email address.
- Name of Supervisor (with affiliation: AUC, VU, UvA) and email address.
- Name of Reader (with affiliation: AUC, VU, UvA) and email address.
- Name of tutor
- Date of submission
- Name of major
- If applicable, a list of abbreviations
- Summary: a self-contained description of the activity to be undertaken, including: (a) overall project goal(s) and supporting objectives; (b) general plans (activities) to accomplish project goal(s); and (c) larger significance of the study.
- Five keywords

4.1.2 Description of proposed research

- Introduction: A brief description of the project, including the rationale, research objectives and questions to be addressed. The broader relevance of the research question and/or thesis should also be addressed, not only across the academic field, but also beyond it in terms of societal, cultural, environmental, political and/or interdisciplinary implications.
- Research context: In this section, students should situate their working thesis or research question within the scholarly discussion of their selected topic in the academic field. Key studies that have been used to generate the question or thesis should be identified, grouped and synthesized. Secondary questions arising from a survey of the approaches taken to the subject, or from specific studies, should be identified and tested against the thesis or question.
- Methodology: In this section, students should identify and describe the discipline-specific or interdisciplinary methods required to conduct their analysis of the data and/or primary and secondary source materials in developing their research question or thesis. While these methods will vary across disciplines, students must demonstrate an awareness of the range of methods available and provide their rationale for the methods selected.
- Ethics: In cases where the Capstone project requires human participants, the AUC Ethics Committee's [checklist](#) must be completed and added to the proposal. If the Capstone project is part of another, broader project, and as such has already

been approved by an Ethics Committee, then this form does not need to be filled out, but written proof of prior ethical approval from an accredited METC (Medisch Ethische Toesingscommissie) needs to be included, also see <http://www.ccmo.nl/en>. For animal experiments proof of approval (Project License number) from the Central Authority for Scientific Procedures on Animals (Centrale Commissie Dierproeven, CCD) should be provided, see <https://www.centralecommissiedierproeven.nl>.

4.1.3 Bibliography

- All references cited should be complete and the referencing style should conform to one of the standard style guides in the academic field, e.g. MLA (HUM), APA (SSC) or CSE (SCI).

4.1.4 Expected writing update

- Description of the agreed upon writing update product (see below).

4.1.5 The word count range for the proposal (including footnotes, excluding title, abstract, bibliography and appendices) per major is:

- Science majors: between 1.000 and 2.000 words.
- Social Science majors: between 1.500 and 2.500 words
- Humanities majors: between 1.500 and 2.500 words
- Interdisciplinary (across majors): between 2.000 and 2.500 words

Grading

The Supervisor will grade and provide substantive written feedback on the research proposal based on the Final Thesis rubric, focused on learning outcomes 1-3 and 6-8 (see section 6 of this document).

4.2 Writing update

The student is expected to follow the research-writing process carefully, to keep on top of the drafting process, and carefully finish and edit the Capstone. For this reason, the Supervisor and student agree upon a product in the first week of the Capstone process (a significant writing update, such as a first chapter, a description of the experimental set-up or a presentation of preliminary results, etc.) that should be handed in around mid-term as a sign of progress and a moment to receive feedback.

Grading

The Supervisor will perform a formative assessment. It is recommended that the Supervisor gives feedback using the Final Thesis rubric (see section 6 of this document), as a guide to indicate where a student currently stands and where improvements need to be made for the Final Thesis. The Supervisor may choose to give an indicative 'mock' grade.

4.3 Full Draft of the Capstone, Draft Final

Three weeks before the final deadline, at the latest, a full draft of the thesis should be handed in. It is highly recommended that this version is as close to the final product as possible in order to receive complete feedback.

Grading

The Supervisor will perform a formative assessment. This means the Supervisor will give substantive written feedback to the student using the Final Thesis rubric (see section 6) as a guide. The Supervisor may choose to give an indicative 'mock' grade.

4.4 Oral Evaluation/Presentation

In the last weeks of the Capstone process, the Supervisor and the student should arrange an oral evaluation that is meant as a closing of the capstone. The aim of this evaluation is to assess the student's communication skills, specifically: the ability to display subject mastery, generate and manage a discussion, and engage listeners/audience.

The Supervisor and student should agree upon which type of oral evaluation a student will have. One of the following types of oral evaluations should be chosen:

1. a one-on-one discussion about the final thesis between student and supervisor
2. a defense with at least two opponents, of which one could be student
3. a presentation for the supervisor, and:
 - a. academics in a research group or department
 - b. fellow capstone students
 - c. fellow students in a class (i.e. a guest lecture)
 - d. the reader.

Note that it is possible to have an alternative form of presentation, but please consult the Capstone Coordinator about the possibilities.

Grading

The Supervisor will grade and provide substantive written feedback on the oral evaluation, based on the Oral Evaluation Rubric (see section 6).

4.5 The Final Thesis

The Final Thesis (the finished product of the Capstone) should reflect the student's achievement throughout the curriculum: it should demonstrate the acquisition of research, writing and critical thinking skills within and/or across disciplines, the ability of the student to work independently, and their capacity to design and execute a complex research project, as well as their ability to make broader connections to other disciplines and/or society. The Final Thesis should be structured according to disciplinary conventions agreed upon by the student and Supervisor. All Capstones should contain the following information for submission:

- Title and a subtitle (if applicable): The title should be concise and specific, and provide a clear statement of the subject of the research.
- Name of author (with affiliation: AUC) and email address
- Name of Supervisor (with affiliation: AUC, VU, UvA) and email address
- Name of Reader (with affiliation: AUC, VU, UvA) and email address
- Name of tutor
- Date of submission
- Name of major
- Word count of main text (see end of this section)
- Abstract: a self-contained description of the activity undertaken, including: ; (a) thesis statement or research question; (b) methods; and (c) results or findings of the study
- Five keywords
- If applicable, a list of abbreviations
- Introduction (see 4.1.2) .
- Research context (see 4.1.2)
- Methodology (see 4.1.2): even though there are disciplinary differences in how transparently methodology is reported, it is mandatory to include a separate section on this for empirical theses in the (social) sciences. It is highly recommended for literature reviews and theoretical work to include a section on how material was sourced (i.e. databased use, search terms, inclusion and exclusion criteria for sources etc.).

4.5.1 Sciences and Empirical Social Sciences

- Results/Findings: A succinct characterization of the findings is given, if possible and appropriate complemented with visual presentation in tables, charts and/or figures. The writing should be centred on the presentation of the data (qualitative or quantitative). In a literature review thesis, this section succinctly summarizes the findings of the sources in a logical narrative.
- Discussion/Analysis: The results are connected to the literature in the academic field, particularly to theoretical debates. Assumptions and inherent limitations of the study are also discussed, and the section may conclude by considering the broader relevance of the research findings (beyond the discipline), such as

societal, cultural, environmental or managerial implications.

4.5.2 Humanities and Theoretical Social Sciences

- Discussion/Analysis: The discussion comprises the main section of the Capstone. It offers a focused inquiry into a topic with original analysis and argumentation. The contours of the thesis, as well as the methodological approaches employed, will vary according to academic field and discipline, but it develops by drawing from specific texts and/or artefacts, considering these within an established research and/or theoretical framework, and details the analysis or interpretation.

4.5.3 Conclusion

- The conclusion should provide a succinct summary of the argument in light of the findings, the significance of findings within the broader theoretical foundations of the discipline, and the scope for additional future research.

4.5.4 Bibliography

- All references cited should be complete and consistent, and the referencing style should conform to one of the standard style guides in the academic field, e.g. MLA (HUM), APA (SSC) or CSE (SCI).

4.5.5 Word Count

- The word count range for the Final Thesis (including footnotes, excluding title, abstract, bibliography and appendices) per major is:
 - Science majors: between 5.000 and 10.000 words.
 - Social Science majors: between 7.500 and 12.500 words
 - Humanities majors: between 7.500 and 12.500 words
 - Interdisciplinary (across majors): between 5.000 and 12.500 words

If students cannot reach the minimal or exceed the word count, they should ask for written permission from the Reader and Supervisor and inform the Capstone Coordinator no later than 30 May, by submitting a justification and copy of the Reader's and Supervisor's permission. Exceeding the word count without approval could affect the final grade (see Section 6, rubric 7).

Grading

The Supervisor and Reader will grade and provide substantive written feedback on the Final Thesis based on the Final Thesis Rubric (see Section 6 of this document).

5. Grading procedures

5.1 Relative weights of components

The final grade is calculated by applying the specific criteria to the grade components below:

- Research proposal, graded by Supervisor (20%)
- Writing update, assessed by Supervisor (formative)
- Draft thesis, assessed by Supervisor (formative)
- Oral evaluation, graded by Supervisor (10%)
- Final Thesis, graded by Supervisor (35%)
- Final Thesis, graded by Reader (35%)

The grade components are expressed in percentage grades, but the Capstone grade is a letter grade following these conversions:

Letter	Grade Point	Percentage
F	0.0	0 - 44.99
D-	0.7	45.00 - 50.99
D	1.0	51.00 - 52.99
D+	1.3	53.00 - 54.99
C-	1.7	55.00 - 58.49
C	2.0	58.50 - 63.49
C+	2.3	63.50 - 66.49
B-	2.7	66.50 - 68.99
B	3.0	69.00 - 72.49
B+	3.3	72.50 - 77.49
A-	3.7	77.50 - 82.49
A	4.0	82.50 - 89.99
A+	4.0	90.00 - 100.00

Disclaimer: Students should be aware that these grades cannot be as precise – as for instance a test –, because of the encompassing and holistic nature of a thesis. Also note that the grading may not be the same across theses, because of the diversity of academic backgrounds of Supervisors and Readers, and the different weights they may apply in grading. Students are advised to discuss with your Supervisor where the key focus should be and to ask the Supervisor for an explanation of the awarded grades.

5.2 Grading procedures

Once all the Supervisor and Reader grades (per Capstone) have been handed in, the Capstone Coordinator will calculate the Final Capstone Grade (i.e. weighted average of the graded components as described in section 5.1) and inform the student, Supervisor, and Reader via e-mail, including all grading forms. The grading process should be completed 10 work days after the final deadline. Grade discrepancies may cause delays, but students will be informed by the Capstone Coordinator of the estimated delay.

5.2.1 Grade discrepancies/single failing Final Thesis grade

If the Supervisor's and the Reader's Final Thesis grades differ by more than 15% and/or in case either the Reader or Supervisor grades the Final Thesis with a grade below 55%, the Capstone Coordinator will ask the relevant Head of Studies to mediate and make a short report of a discussion between the Reader and Supervisor. The aim of this discussion is to come to a motivated and documented consensus on the grading. If no consensus can be reached, the Head of Studies will appoint a third assessor and will advise the Board of Examiners of the calculation of the final grade on the basis of the three different grades. The BoE decides on the Final Thesis grade (70%).

5.2.2 Submission past the deadline and failed Capstones

Capstones with a failing final grade, a failing 70% Final Thesis grade, or submissions past the deadline, will receive an F. In case of an F, the student is allowed two weeks – after notification by the Capstone Coordinator – to remedy the Capstone failure by reworking the Final Thesis. The F *will*, however, appear on the student's transcript, along with any

subsequent passing grade. Capstone failures can be remedied only once per semester. After that students will need to write a new Capstone in a next semester.

5.2.3 Extensions

If delay is reasonably expected, extensions should be requested from the Board of Examiners two weeks before the final deadline, except in cases of force majeure.

5.2.4 Plagiarism and fraud

The Capstone Coordinator performs plagiarism checks of the submitted files. Plagiarism and fraud will be handled according to the regulations governing fraud and plagiarism (Appendix 2 AS&P). Note that drawing from/elaborating on materials from a student's own work in Advanced Research Writing does not count as self-plagiarism if clear references and/or citations are made.

5.3 Capstones of Distinction

The top 15% of Capstones in each major will be considered for AUC's *Thesis of Distinction*. The number of awards per year is not limited, and Capstones are judged by a committee comprised of lecturers from each major.

5.3.1 Procedure for Nomination and Selection

- A thesis is eligible if both Supervisor and Reader send the Final Thesis grade (total 70%) to the Capstone Coordinator no later than 10 working days after the final deadline (Capstone@auc.nl).
- The top 15% of Capstones in each major, based on the *average* grade of the Final Thesis, will be submitted to the Capstone Distinction Committee.
- A committee installed by the Director of Education will convene to judge the Capstones.
- A selection of nominees will be invited to present their Capstone project in the college-wide Capstone seminar.

5.3.2 Criteria for Thesis of Distinction

Capstones will be evaluated based on the degree to which high standards were met in all grading criteria judged by the Supervisor and the Reader *and* according to the following categories as judged by the awards committee:

- *Advanced level*: Does this Capstone go beyond expectations according to these guidelines and rubrics? Could it be prepared for possible publication? Could it be considered to be a master's thesis?
- *Originality and Innovation*: Does the Capstone manifest originality and/or innovation in its approach, content, and/or writing style? Does it significantly contribute to the body of knowledge in the field?
- *Contextual thinking*: Is the subject of the Capstone viewed from a broad perspective? Does it, for instance, demonstrate cross-disciplinary literacy and make connections across different fields of knowledge, *and/or* does it make explicit connections between the research findings and society?

6. Grading rubrics

Final Thesis rubric

While some rubrics can be strictly applied (i.e. a weighted sum of scores per category), the following rubric is meant to support the assessor not only in determining the grade for the Capstone, but also in providing the written motivation for that grade. The motivation (at least 300 words) should be included in the corresponding section of the Final Thesis form supplied by the Capstone Coordinator. The motivation should also make clear how different categories are weighted (in general words, not per se % weights), especially when some categories weigh in heavily (e.g. academic competencies weigh heavily when a Capstone involves advanced or extensive empirical research, whether it be qualitative/observational methods or physical experiments

The Supervisor is strongly encouraged to work with these rubrics and the corresponding grading forms from the start of the Capstone process (see 4.2).

Intended learning outcome¹	0-55% - insufficient (I)	55-72.5% - sufficient (S)	72.5-85% - good (G)	>85% very good/excellent (E)
1. Quality of the research question and/or thesis	Does not meet the minimal requirements described under (S). The research question is poorly articulated and not supported enough by academic sources.	Research topic is suitable; the research question and/or thesis is simple but sufficiently informed and supported by academic sources.	Goes beyond the criteria under (S), the research question/thesis is well articulated and sufficiently complex. It is clearly situated in a specific academic field.	Meets the criteria under (G). The research question/thesis is focused and complex. It addresses a viable research gap and could potentially make an original contribution to the academic field.
2. Review/synthesis of literature/research context	Does not meet the minimal requirements described under (S). Research literature is sporadically sampled; peer-reviewed articles, chapters and/or book-length studies are insufficiently used; online sources are misused.	Sufficient coverage of academic sources relevant to the research question/thesis, with method of review apparent if not always systematically applied.	Goes beyond the criteria under (S), comprehensive and critical coverage of academic sources relevant to the research question/thesis, with a systematic method of review.	In addition to the criteria under (G), the relevant literature is effectively synthesized and used to situate the research question/ thesis.

¹ See Section 1 of this document

3. Methodology	Does not meet the minimal requirements described under (S). No clear methodology is articulated or used in the collection, synthesis and/or engagement with primary and/or secondary data sources. No clear relationship exists between the methodology and research question/thesis. Ethical requirements not met.	Methodology is appropriate to the research question and is clearly articulated; the collection, synthesis and/or engagement with primary or secondary data sources is of sufficient quality and meets ethics requirements (where applicable).	In addition to (S), methodological selection demonstrates an awareness of a range of methodological approaches; the collection, synthesis, and/or engagement with primary or secondary data sources is of high quality.	In addition to the criteria under (G), the methodology used represents an innovative approach to the research question.
4. Analysis and Argument	Does not meet the minimal requirements described under (S). The argument is non-existent or weak; the analysis of data and/or primary and secondary texts is absent or flawed and does not reflect what is required by the research question/thesis. The findings do not relate to the research question. The description of the problem and/or findings is incomplete or unclear.	The argument/analysis is present and sufficiently developed. The analysis of data and/or primary and secondary texts is sufficient and reflects a concerted attempt to implement the methodology. The claims/findings are supported by tables and figures, and/or evidence from the text.	Goes beyond the criteria under (S), the argument/analysis is consistent and well-developed. The analysis of data and/or primary and secondary texts is rigorous. The claims/findings are solid Findings are closely related to the research question, and there is coherence between these elements.	In addition to the criteria under (G), the student demonstrates awareness of the process of analysis, either implicitly or explicitly. The student clearly guides the reader to the main findings by effectively using arguments, tables and graphs where appropriate.
5. Discussion and implications	Does not meet the minimal requirements described under (S). The societal relevance (if applicable) lacks or is not connected to the results;	There is a concise description of the implications of the results; Some notions are included about the social relevance and opportunities for further	Goes beyond the criteria under (S), there is a near-comprehensive description of the implications of the results; The social	In addition to the criteria under (G), the student presents a compelling argument for the broader significance or academic value of the student's

	Opportunities for further studies are not specific or not based on the study outcomes; no limitations are mentioned.	studies; Limitations are sufficiently highlighted.	relevance and implications for further studies are discussed in relation to the outcomes of the study; A comprehensive set of limitations are brought forward.	Research, demonstrating, for instance, cross-disciplinary literacy <i>and/or</i> making implicit or explicit connections between the research findings and society.
6. Organization and structure	Does not meet the minimal requirements described under (S). Disjointed, incomplete or incoherent; required sections are missing or inadequately developed; Does not adhere to AUC's expectations in terms of formatting and style, with missing citations or bibliography; Notable presence of grammar and spelling errors.	Document is complete and structure is generally coherent, if disjointed or limited in places; Adheres to correct spelling and grammar, formatting and style, but with errors.	Goes beyond the criteria under (S). Document proceeds coherently through all required sections; Adheres to disciplinary conventions in terms of format and style, with a few errors; Limited grammar and spelling errors.	Goes beyond the criteria under (G). Cogently structured, with chapters and/or sections contributing to cohesive and compelling narrative; Fully adheres to disciplinary conventions in terms of format and style: Very few, if any, grammar and spelling errors.
7. Effective written communication	Does not meet the minimal requirements described under (S). Writing is not sufficiently clear, concise or engaged; sentences limited in complexity and variety. Word count is exceeded without necessity or approval.	Writing and flow of information is generally clear and understandable.	Meets the criteria under (S); Evidence of a (developing) scholarly voice and conveys the academic content in a convincing way.	In addition to the criteria under (G), compellingly engages scholarly audience, while being clear and accessible to various communities of practice.
8. Academic competencies (only graded by Supervisor)	Does not meet the minimal requirements described	The student works independently; Takes	In addition to (S), recognizes the need for	In addition to the criteria under (G), demonstrates full

	<p>under (S). The student relied too much on the Supervisor, did not keep to agreements and deadlines, and in general showed a lack of independence and initiative.</p> <p><i>For empirical research, the data collection/experiments are carried out with little effort or skill and/or they are carelessly documented. In collaborative work, the student did not engage effectively with collaborators.</i></p>	<p>feedback seriously and processes it appropriately; Is usually able to manage their work and to keep to agreements and meet deadlines.</p> <p><i>For empirical research, the data collection/experiments are carried out with effort and the work is organized and documented. In collaborative work, the student was a cooperative and engaged team player.</i></p>	<p>assistance or feedback and takes initiative to improve.</p> <p><i>For empirical research, the data collection/experiments are carried out with effort and skill and the work is well-organized and carefully documented. In collaborative work, the student was a cooperative and engaged team player who contributed good independent ideas.</i></p>	<p>ownership and responsibility for the project.</p> <p><i>For empirical research, in addition to (G) the data collection/experiments are carried out meticulously and efficiently with foresight and/or creative initiative. The work is documented carefully and clearly enough for another researcher to repeat the study. In collaborative work, the student contributed consequential and valuable independent ideas within their team.</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--

Oral evaluation rubric

Criteria	0-55% - insufficient (I)	55-72.5% - sufficient (S)	72.5-85% - good (G)	>85% very good/excellent (E)
Subject mastery	Claims are typically unsupported assertions that lack sufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities). The student fails to develop arguments because of a lack of independent analysis. The student's subject mastery is insufficient.	Claims are clearly stated, while supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make periodic reference to information or analysis that partially supports the oral evaluation. Some claims do not have sufficient support. The student's subject mastery on the topic is sufficient.	Claims are stated with relative clarity, and supported with a variety of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities). The student periodically integrates their own analysis into the speech. The student generally masters the subject well.	Claims are clearly stated, and thoroughly explained with a combination of evidence and the speaker's own analysis. A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) are used to develop ideas. The student shows exceptional subject mastery.
Communication skills	Student cannot sufficiently answer questions about subject or can only answer rudimentary questions; The central message is not understandable or memorable.	Student is able to answer questions adequately. Answers do not always display original or very deep thinking; Central message is generally clear, but sometimes drift to the background.	Student can answer all questions with explanation. Some answers or comments display deep understanding and/or originality; Central message is clear and consistent.	Student can answer all questions with explanation and elaboration. Most answers or comments display deep understanding (or even profound thought) and/or originality; Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)