

## Thesis review form

Title of the thesis:

Author of the thesis:

### Thesis Advisor and Reviewer

Thesis Advisor:	
Reviewer:	

### Type of thesis

Underline the type of thesis to be reviewed.

Bachelor's thesis (Major), Bachelor's thesis (Minor), Master's thesis (Major), Master's thesis (Minor), Dissertation (Doctoral thesis)

### Assessment criteria, allocated points and overall evaluation

Assessment criteria are divided into three groups: 1) fulfilment of the assignment, 2) formal requirements and language, and 3) content. Please allocate a number of points according to the allocation criteria for each of the groups and write them in the table. The number of points allocated by the assessor for a given criterion roughly corresponds to the ECTS rating scale as follows: **40 point criterion:** 40-38 = A, 37-33 = B, 32-28 = C, 27-23 = D, 22-20 = E, 19-0 = F; **30 point criterion:** 30-29 = A, 28-25 = B, 24-21 = C, 20-17 = D, 16-15 = E, 14-0 = F; **20 point criterion:** 20-19 = A, 18-17 = B, 16-14 = C, 13-12 = D, 11-10 = E, 9-0 = F; **10 point criterion:** 10 = A, 9 = B, 8-7 = C, 6 = D, 5 = E, 4-0 = F.

Please justify the score under the table, especially if you are assigning a low score according to any criterion. Specifically, please offer a detailed justification if the thesis scores less than 50 % of the maximum number of points in a given assessment-criteria group.

Finally, add up the points from all three assessment-criteria groups and convert the sum to your proposal for the overall evaluation of the thesis following the table in the section "Overall evaluation proposal". **It should be noted that if the thesis receives less than 50 % of the maximum number of points in any of the three assessment-criteria groups, the proposed overall evaluation must be F, regardless of the final score.**

Please note that the Czech evaluation system does not allow the option to "revise and resubmit". Instead, it applies a rating scale ranging from A to F, where A to E suggests that the thesis be accepted (with the corresponding grade from A-Excellent to E-Sufficient), while F suggests that the thesis is graded Fail and that the student is asked to revise and resubmit it if this is the first defence (the student can only defend the thesis twice).

### 1) Assignment fulfilment

First, evaluate the degree to which the thesis fulfilled the official project. **Deviations from the initial proposal should be judged according to how they are justified.** Thesis assignments can be found at this address: <https://is.muni.cz/auth/rozpis/?lang=en> or requested by email from the thesis supervisor.

Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts, Department for the Study of Religions

Arna Nováka 1/1, 602 00 Brno, Czech republic

T: +420 549 49 7954, E: religionistika@phil.muni.cz, <http://religionistika.phil.muni.cz/>

<i>Criterion</i>	<i>Evaluation</i>	
	<i>maximum</i>	<i>assigned</i>
<b>Assignment fulfilment.</b> Does the thesis focus precisely on the topic specified in the official assignment? To what degree is it based on the theoretical background specified in the assignment? Does it use the methods specified in the assignment? Does it achieve the objectives specified in the assignment and does it answer the research questions that the assignment specifies? Does it make use of literature specified in the assignment?	<b>40</b>	

**Justification of the evaluation:**

## 2) Formal requirements and language

<i>Criterion</i>	<i>Evaluation</i>	
	<i>maximum</i>	<i>assigned</i>
<b>Language.</b> Academic writing and style.	<b>30</b>	
<b>Clarity and consistency of argument.</b>	<b>30</b>	
<b>Structure,</b> proportionality of the individual parts.	<b>10</b>	
<b>Bibliographic references.</b> The accuracy, completeness and consistency of bibliographic data in the text and in the final bibliography.	<b>10</b>	
<b>Formal precision when dealing with sources of information.</b> The accuracy of distinctions between the author's text and citations and paraphrases. The accuracy of quotations and paraphrases.	<b>10</b>	
<b>Typography and visuals.</b> Typographical quality, quality of image attachments, charts, graphs, etc.	<b>10</b>	
<b>Overall score</b>	<b>100</b>	

**Justification of the evaluation:**

Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts, Department for the Study of Religions

Arna Nováka 1/1, 602 00 Brno, Czech republic

T: +420 549 49 7954, E: religionistika@phil.muni.cz, <http://religionistika.phil.muni.cz/>

### 3) Content

Criterion	Evaluation	
	maximum	assigned
<b>Level of the thesis as an academic text.</b> The clarity and accuracy of the expression of the research objectives. The clarity with which research questions are addressed and the level of unnecessary digression. The persuasiveness, originality and contribution of the results. The achievement of the objectives of the thesis.	40	
<b>Theoretical level.</b> The clarity of the theoretical foundations offered. The degree to which they are directly and competently employed in solving the research problem. Definition of the used terminology.	20	
<b>Methodological level.</b> Methodological clarity. The appropriateness of the methods used to resolve the research questions according to the relevant data. The degree of consistency with which methods are used. The quality of their usage. The depth of the analysis.	20	
<b>The quality of sources of information and the quality of their use.</b> The relevance and adequacy of the resources used, and the use of the most significant resources (please specify below). The degree to which work with resources is critical, nuanced and accurate. The quality of their use in the solution of the research problem.	20	
<b>Overall score</b>	<b>100</b>	

**Justification of the evaluation:**

### Overall evaluation proposal

The overall evaluation of the thesis shall be determined according to the following table, based on the sum of scores of all three assessment-criteria groups. If the thesis receives less than 50 % of the maximum number of points in any of the three assessment-criteria groups, the proposed overall evaluation shall be F (Fail), regardless of the final score. In this case, do not add up the scores. Instead complete the table “Sum of scores of sections 1-3” with “failed to satisfy”. Although the evaluation follows from the sum of points, please type it explicitly in the appropriate box.

Sum of scores	Overall evaluation	In Words
240-229	A	Excellent
228-199	B	Very good

Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts, Department for the Study of Religions

Arna Nováka 1/1, 602 00 Brno, Czech republic

T: +420 549 49 7954, E: religionistika@phil.muni.cz, <http://religionistika.phil.muni.cz/>

198-162	C	Good
161-132	D	Satisfactory
131-120	E	Sufficient/Acceptable (passed)
119-0	F	Fail

Sum of scores of sections 1-3:	????
Overall evaluation proposal:	?????

## Free commentary

Reviewers' comments (overall impression of the thesis, strengths and weaknesses, suggestions for further development, etc.). In the case of **doctoral theses**, please state explicitly (1) **whether (or not) the thesis demonstrated the student's "research and creative capacities in the field"**, and (2) **whether (or not) "you recommend the thesis for defence"**. These two statements are necessary for the reviews of doctoral theses to be valid.

## Suggestions for discussion

Please provide at least two areas for discussion regarding the thesis.

(1)

(2)

## Date, reviewer, signature

Place, date:	
Name (including titles) and the department of the reviewer:	
Signature:	

Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts, Department for the Study of Religions

Arna Nováka 1/1, 602 00 Brno, Czech republic

T: +420 549 49 7954, E: religionistika@phil.muni.cz, <http://religionistika.phil.muni.cz/>