

Note: The Italic parts of this grading grid (6EC) can be adjusted by the supervisor using these criteria that are applicable for the thesis. The value of these components may differ between theses.

	Criterion/Grade level	Insufficient	Sufficient	Satisfactory	Good	Very good or excellent
CONTENT (80%)	<b>Research question and originality (optional)</b>	<i>Out of domain (not interesting or irrelevant), unclear or illogical question, or insufficiently related to content of thesis, inadequate scope.</i>	<i>Relevant and functional research question. Question not too simple or too broad. Sufficient or minimum level of ambition.</i>	<i>Adequate and functional research question including one or more elements with the potential to apply existing research in an original way; set at a level of ambition broadly appropriate for program and study load.</i>	<i>Focused, relevant and interesting research question, with the ambition and potential to add to existing literature; this may already involve some degree of innovation.</i>	<i>Accomplished high level of originality, leaving well-charted terrain, yet clearly linked to published work. Well-formulated and original research question.</i>
	<b>Choice and processing of literature</b>	Failure to relate research question to existing literature. Review is unfocused, not functional and/or not mainly based on academic work. Review reveals significant lack of understanding of cited work.	Research question is adequately positioned in existing literature, but is superficial, stays close to textbook levels or relies heavily on existing surveys. Review includes some relevant key references in reputable scientific outlets.	Research question is adequately positioned in existing literature. Functional review guiding own research, showing reasonable understanding and reflection of main issues in existing work. Discusses main key references.	Review well-organized around important research aspects, convincingly embedding own research question. Clear demonstration of critical thinking in assessing previous research. High level publications read and understood.	High level of originality of targeted review, going beyond existing surveys or reviews. Insightful analysis identifying gaps in existing literature.
	<b>Choice and processing of research method (optional)</b>	<i>Design inappropriate for research question, or with evident logical errors/omissions preventing reliable conclusions. Design not well explained, too simple or too limited for program/study load. Insufficient effort towards making use of better methods. Insufficient documentation of data and methods.</i>	<i>Routinely used design chosen for convenience, unconvincingly motivated against possible alternatives. (Marginally) appropriate use of techniques, or methods. Data collection efforts and/or aspects of modeling choice at minimum level for study load. Sufficient, if marginal documentation.</i>	<i>Suitable design for research question, useful to yield persuasive results; avoids inappropriate simplifications or shortcuts; reflects upon/discusses own design choices. Appropriate efforts regarding on data collection and/or modeling tools. Appropriate documentation with replicability in mind.</i>	<i>Reflects on choice of research design, discussing alternative approaches (or argues why alternatives have not been used). Problem-solving data collection efforts and/or modeling tool choice. Replicability-oriented, and concise documentation of all sources.</i>	<i>Convincingly motivated and intelligent choice of research design. Contains methodological aspects that are well beyond the core of the program. Extensive problem-solving data collection efforts and /or modeling tool choice. Replicability-oriented, yet concise documentation of all sources.</i>
	<b>Quality of analysis and interpretation of results (optional)</b>	<i>Poorly organized. Severe errors and important omissions in the analysis. Contains important errors of interpretation or logic; reveals lack of</i>	<i>Some remaining errors or omissions in the analysis. Broadly effective, but inefficient or mechanical presentation of results. May contain (minor) errors of</i>	<i>No obvious errors or critical omissions in the analysis. Fully appropriate use of techniques and methods. Some investigation into reliability/robustness</i>	<i>Convincing analysis, correct application of methods with some degree of complexity. Potential of the data fully utilized. Considered specification tests,</i>	<i>Very convincing and thorough analysis, high standard of complexity. Applies, and discusses specification tests, or model simulations, model testing under</i>

		<i>understanding of own research approach.</i>	<i>interpretation. Minimal critical assessment of robustness of reliability of findings. Considerable unused potential for further analysis.</i>	<i>of results. Generally readable presentation, broadly in line with standard practice. No obvious errors of logic; proper interpretation of results obtained.</i>	<i>model simulations, or model testing under alternative assumptions. Well-organized and thoughtful presentation of results. Substantial care taken in precise interpretation of results obtained and mechanisms uncovered.</i>	<i>alternative assumptions. Interpretation of results shows a deep understanding of research question, design, data and/or model. Conveys clear view on the nature and limitations of data and /or model.</i>
	<b>Quality of conclusions</b>	No clear answer to research question, or an answer that does not follow from the research findings.	Research question is answered by simple summary of findings. Minimal attempt to relate to existing literature. Trivial discussion of limitations and suggestions for further research.	Functional summary of findings, leading to discussion of extent to which research question is or is not answered. Contribution to existing literature articulated. Meaningful reflection on limitations of own research. Discusses policy implications where appropriate.	Well-considered review of findings in light of research question and literature review. Shows clear understanding of limitations of own research. Useful suggestions for further research, clear implications of policy/implementation.	Succeeds in putting findings and research question in a wider context wider than the specific problem under study. Draws out significant implication for policy, theory development or research methodology.
	<b>Presentation, structure and use of language</b>	Unacceptable presentation. Unclear/unhelpful structure and lay-out. Major issues with use of language, spelling, grammar and writing style that make many sentences hard to comprehend or ambiguous	Issues in structuring paragraphs and sections. Some remaining language errors, but some effort taken to adhere to academic writing style, and to consistent bibliographic referencing and citation style.	Meets generally all academic standards, satisfactory care taken on aspects of language, lay-out (incl. tables, figures, references) and sectioning. Focused write-up.	Carefully edited to high academic standards. No language issues. Thoughtfully written and structured texts, convincingly guiding the reader through the document.	A high-quality document: very rigorous editing, excellent command of language. Writing style and structure support a powerfully expressed and persuasive argument.
<b>PROCESS (20%)</b>	<b>Attitude of the students (independence, pace of work and contact with the supervisor)</b>	Student was unwilling or unable to take meaningful initiatives or to advance own ideas, or largely ignored suggestions for improvement. Extensive reliance on assistance from supervisor.	Student required substantial coaching regarding many aspects of the thesis, yet showed general willingness to work, to accept guidance and suggestions, and to learn.	Student required normal level of supervision; was willing to accept advice and suggestions, took own initiatives for paper development, and defended own choices. Problem-owning attitude. Problem-solving capacity to address issues.	Student worked largely independently. Thesis results from student's own thinking and initiative (may still show supervisor's influence). Student kept supervisor well informed of plans and progress, and initiated discussions.	Student can fairly get a large part of the credits for an original and high quality thesis. At the same time, engaged in discussion topic and took the lead in advancing arguments.