Manual for use of the thesis evaluation form and the MSc-thesis assessment rubric (version 1.1) of Wageningen University

User instructions

- Grading the thesis work is generally done by two persons, the daily supervisor and the second reviewer/examiner. For the sake of grading uniformity, it is highly recommended by the Exam Boards that the second reviewer within a chair group is always the same person. Preferably it is the head of the group.

- The thesis evaluation form has four categories. The research competence category can only be filled in by the daily supervisor as this person has worked with the student. The Thesis report category can most objectively be filled in by the second reviewer who was not involved in the thesis process, as grading the thesis report should not be biased by positive or negative experiences with the student. The daily supervisor who has these experiences can take these into account when grading the research competence.

- Use of the comment fields on the thesis evaluation form is highly recommended. It is an extra feedback for the student.

- The assessment rubric has the form of an analytic rubric (see e.g. Andrade (2005), Reynolds et al. (2009), URL1, URL2). Each line discusses one criterion for assessment. Each column gives a level for the grading. Each cell contains the descriptor of the level for that criterion.

- The criteria in the rubric exactly follow the items presented in the Excel worksheet “Thesis evaluation Wageningen University” constructed by the Exam Boards. In a few cases the criteria in the original thesis evaluation document were split into two or more parts because the description of the criteria clearly covered different subjects.

- Since the final mark is composed of so many criteria, the scores on individual criteria should be discriminative. Not all levels are equally broad in marks. Since the final marks of theses usually range between 6 and 9, in the rubric individual levels have been established for the marks of 6, 7 and 8. When performance is at the 9-10 level, decide whether the student is on the low edge (9) or high edge (10) of this level. Descriptions at the 9-10 level tend to describe the ultimate performance (10). Hence, if a student performs well above 8, but below the description at the 9-10 level, a 9 would be the appropriate mark.

- Keep in mind that each line in the rubric should be read independently: it could be that a student scores a 2-3 on one criterion and a 9-10 on another.

- Always start at the lowest mark in the rubric, and test if the student should be awarded the next higher mark. In some cases achievements of a next lower level are not repeated at the higher level (i.e. the lower level achievements are implicit in the higher levels). Furthermore, if a level has a range of marks, choose the most appropriate one (consider the description of the level of performance as a continuum, rather than a discrete description).
• Wherever the student is indicated as ‘he’, one can also read ‘she’.

Remarks

• This rubric has been validated by a number of supervisors by comparing the original grade of a number of theses to the grade resulting from this rubric.

• The main intention of using a rubric is to enhance homogeneity of assessments and the ability to communicate about assessments both with students and with colleagues. Furthermore, it clarifies to students the expectations of the supervisor and helps the supervisor to structure feedback during the process of thesis research. Although the intention is to homogenize the process of assessment, it should be noted that even with the use of a rubric some arbitrariness will remain.

• The two main categories on the thesis evaluation form (research competence and thesis report) should have an assessment of 'sufficient' (i.e. $\geq 5.5$) before the total thesis work can be considered as sufficient. So, no compensation between these main categories is possible to obtain the lowest final mark of 6.0.

• Please report any positive or negative experiences with and suggestions for the rubric to arnold.moene@wur.nl.

• Author of the rubric: Arnold F. Moene (Meteorology and Air Quality Group, Wageningen University), with valuable contributions from Ellis Hofland, Edwin Peeters, Tamar Nieuwenhuizen, Maarten Holtslag, George Bier, Gerard Ros, Lijbert Brussaard, Judith Gulikers and Paul Berentsen.
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