

# First Submission opportunity

[Start Assignment](#)

**Due** 3 Dec by 21:00    **Points** 60    **Submitting** a file upload    **File types** pdf  
**Attempts** 0    **Allowed attempts** 3    **Available** until 24 Dec at 23:59

No additional details were added for this assignment.

## DSS Master Thesis Rubric F2021

Criteria	Ratings				Pts
Introduction + Research Question	<b>10 to &gt;7.5 Pts Excellent (8 or higher)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question is specific and clearly demarcated.</li> <li>• Sub-questions logically proceed from the re-search question and are clearly motivated. Answering the sub-questions leads to a convincing solution of the research question.</li> </ul>	<b>7.5 to &gt;6.5 Pts Good (7 or 7.5)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question is specific enough and clearly demarcated.</li> <li>• Sub-questions logically proceed from the re-search question, are clearly motivated, and contribute to the solution of the problem raised.</li> </ul>	<b>6.5 to &gt;5.5 Pts Sufficient (6 or 6.5)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question is relevant in view of the subject of the thesis and the field of study in which it is written, but it is marginally specific.</li> <li>• Sub-questions are related to the research question, but not all sub-questions are clearly motivated or contribute to the solution of the problem raised.</li> </ul>	<b>5.5 to &gt;0 Pts Insufficient</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research question is lacking or are hardly relevant for the subject of the thesis and/or the field of study in which it is written.</li> <li>• Sub-questions are lacking or are not or hardly related to the research question.</li> </ul>	10 pts
Literature	<b>10 to &gt;7.5 Pts Excellent (8 or higher)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The breadth of the relevant literature is complete with clear connections drawn</li> </ul>	<b>7.5 to &gt;6.5 Pts Good (7 or 7.5)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The breadth of the relevant literature is covered without</li> </ul>	<b>6.5 to &gt;5.5 Pts Sufficient (6 or 6.5)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the relevant literature is</li> </ul>	<b>5.5 to &gt;0 Pts Insufficient</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant literature is insufficiently mentioned.</li> </ul>	

	<p>between sources and topics. • Relevant literature is critically processed with new insights provided. • Relevant literature clearly motivates and connects to the re-search question and/or sub-questions.</p>	<p>irrelevant references or topics included. • Relevant literature is critically processed and clearly contracted against the research question and/or sub- questions.</p>	<p>covered with some less relevant references or topics included. • Relevant literature content is connected to the research question and/or sub-questions.</p>	<p>Relevant literature hardly connected to the research question. • Over reliance on direct quotations instead of summarizing and critical evaluation.</p>	10 pts
Methods	<p><b>10 to &gt;7.5 Pts Excellent (8 or higher)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation of research method(s) is clear, concise, and complete with connections and contrasts drawn with other methods.</li> <li>• Appropriate robustness checks or tests of assumptions are done. • The research has been consistently, transparently, and correctly executed, in a completely independent manner.</li> </ul>	<p><b>7.5 to &gt;6.5 Pts Good (7 or 7.5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation of adequate research method(s) and approaches is explicitly provided and also clearly motivated against one or more other possibilities. • Clearly identifies appropriate data, algorithms, and models. Each component is clearly explained; used in a way that is consistent with its purpose. • Research execution has been done consistently, transparently and correctly.</li> </ul>	<p><b>6.5 to &gt;5.5 Pts Sufficient (6 or 6.5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies appropriate data, algorithms, models and explains how they are used. • A clear explanation of the research method(s) adequate for answering the research question is explicitly provided and the approach is made sufficiently clear. • Robustness checks and tests of analysis assumptions are limited or missing.</li> </ul>	<p><b>5.5 to &gt;0 Pts Insufficient</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The research method(s) chosen is not adequate. • The approach is not made clear, or notation is not defined consistently. • Research execution is weak. Some theories and analytical concepts are identified and explained but insufficiently applied. • Fails to clarify what data/algorithms, theories and models are used or how they are used; uses inappropriate data, algorithms, and models; or exhibits inappropriate use of data, algorithms, and models. • Overreliance on direct quotations.</li> </ul>	10 pts

Results	<b>10 to &gt;7.5 Pts Excellent (8 or higher)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presents the results of the research in a clear, transparent, robust, and original manner. • Visualizations of results are original or unique, clearly interpretable, and completely cover the scope of the results. • Detailed and insightful multi-level evaluation of model performance.</li> </ul>	<b>7.5 to &gt;6.5 Pts Good (7 or 7.5)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presents the results of the research in a clear, transparent, and robust manner. • Visualisations of results are clearly interpretable and completely cover the scope of the results. • Detailed evaluation of model performance clearly presented.</li> </ul>	<b>6.5 to &gt;5.5 Pts Sufficient (6 or 6.5)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presents the results of the research in clear and complete manner. • Visualizations of results are present but do not cover the full scope of the results or could be clearer. • Basic evaluation of model performance clearly presented.</li> </ul>	<b>5.5 to &gt;0 Pts Insufficient</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The results of the re-search execution are not clear and complete. • Visualizations of results are not present, not complete, or deliberately misleading.</li> </ul>	10 pts
Discussion	<b>10 to &gt;7.5 Pts Excellent (8 or higher)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides independent and critical interpretations and draws excellent conclusions with reference to the research question(s), while demonstrating full knowledge of research limitations. • Makes the novel contribution to extant scientific work very clear. • Connection or implications for broader society explained in detail with concrete examples and clear connection to the</li> </ul>	<b>7.5 to &gt;6.5 Pts Good (7 or 7.5)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides independent and critical interpretations and draws good conclusions with reference to the research question(s). • Makes the contribution to extant scientific work clear to a larger extent. • Connection or implications for broader society thought provoking and connected to the wider literature.</li> </ul>	<b>6.5 to &gt;5.5 Pts Sufficient (6 or 6.5)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides independent and critical interpretations and draws reasonable conclusions with reference to the research question(s) and related scientific work. • Hints towards contribution to extant scientific work without being explicit. • Connection or implications for broader society</li> </ul>	<b>5.5 to &gt;0 Pts Insufficient</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides unclear interpretations and conclusions, not sufficiently related to the research question and prior scientific work. • Discussion has the character of a summary or is not present at all. • Connection or implications for broader society not present or</li> </ul>	10 pts

	literature.		present and clearly presented.	clearly presented.	
Form & Presentation	<b>10 to &gt;7.5 Pts Excellent (8 or higher)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well-structured; each section has a clear and unique function.</li> <li>• Hierarchy of sections is correct. Ordering of sections is logical.</li> <li>• All information occurs at the correct place. Level of detail is appropriate throughout.</li> <li>• Thesis makes proper uses of citation, quotation and paraphrasing to avoid plagiarism</li> <li>• Thesis uses an approved reference style in formatting citations and bibliography</li> <li>• Thesis word count falls within set limits (8000±10%)</li> <li>• Images are reprinted with permission or under appropriate licenses</li> <li>• Data/Ethics/Code</li> </ul>	<b>7.5 to &gt;6.5 Pts Good (7 or 7.5)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most sections have a clear and unique function.</li> <li>• Hierarchy of sections is mostly correct. Ordering of sections is mostly logical. All information occurs at the correct place, with few exceptions.</li> <li>• The level of detail is appropriate.</li> <li>• Formulations in text are clear, exact, and concise.</li> <li>• Thesis makes proper uses of citation, quotation and paraphrasing to avoid plagiarism</li> <li>• Thesis uses an approved reference style in formatting citations and bibliography</li> <li>• Thesis word count falls within set limits (8000±10%)</li> <li>• Images are reprinted with permission or under</li> </ul>	<b>6.5 to &gt;5.5 Pts Sufficient (6 or 6.5)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main structure is correct but in places the placement of material in different sections is illogical.</li> <li>• Formulations in text are mostly clear and exact.</li> <li>• Level of detail is inappropriate in a few of places.</li> <li>• The report could have been written more consistently.</li> <li>• Thesis makes proper uses of citation, quotation and paraphrasing to avoid plagiarism</li> <li>• Thesis uses an approved reference style in formatting citations and bibliography</li> <li>• Thesis word count falls within set limits (8000±10%)</li> <li>• Images are reprinted with permission or under appropriate</li> </ul>	<b>5.5 to &gt;0 Pts Insufficient</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thesis contains improperly paraphrased material, improper/incomplete citations or improper attribution of direct quotations</li> <li>• Thesis does not conform to the necessary formatting of a TSHD Master thesis document, including approved citation styles.</li> <li>• Thesis contains repeated spelling or grammar errors.</li> <li>• Vagueness in wording occurs regularly and it affects the interpretation of the text.</li> <li>• Main structure incorrect in some places and placement of material in different sections is illogical in many places.</li> <li>• Level of detail varies widely or information is missing.</li> <li>• Thesis does not conform allowed range of words used.</li> <li>• Images have not been cleared or do not have CC license</li> </ul>	10 pts

	statement clearly states data/code origin and links to a repository related to current thesis with relevant shareable code	appropriate licenses • Data/Ethics/Code statement clearly states data/code origin and links to a repository related to current thesis with relevant shareable code	licenses • Data/Ethics/Code statement clearly states data/code origin and links to a repository related to current thesis with relevant shareable code	specified • Data/Ethics/Code statement is incomplete	
					Total points: 60