



rijksuniversiteit
groningen

faculteit der letteren

Academic year 2024/2025

Assessment Plan

Research Master: Archaeology



1 / Vision of teaching and assessment

The Faculty of Arts Vision of Teaching and Assessment can be found through the following link:

<https://myuniversity.rug.nl/infonet/medewerkers/let/onderwijs/vision-for-education>

2 / How to follow the assessment cycle (from design to evaluation and optimization)

3 / Assessment dossier

a. The assessment dossier

The requirements of the assessment dossier are set out in §4 of the 'Protocol for Quality Assurance in the Assessment of Course Units' drawn up by the Board of Examiners.

All the examiners of a degree programme must provide the Board of Examiners with an 'assessment dossier' containing the following:

- a. the syllabus
- b. the list of marks, comprising all marks that count towards the final mark
- c. the following additional documents:
 - for assessments in the narrower sense of the word (i.e. tests): the test that was set, incl. model answers/key
 - for written assignments: the formulation of the assignment, information about the assessment method (assessment criteria and standards) if this is not listed in the syllabus, and the completed assessment forms
 - for final assignments: the completed assessment forms and the work submitted (with or without the lecturer's comments)
- d. the assessment blueprint, minutes of peer-support meetings, evaluations and self-evaluations of course units, etc., if available
- e. an evaluation form completed by the examiner with information about how the assessment proceeded.

b. Parties involved

The following parties are involved in fulfilling duties related to the assessment dossier:

- Lecturers: Providing completed assessment dossiers



- Secretariat: Ensuring completion of assessment dossiers
- Board of Examiners: Oversight of assessment dossiers

4 / Assessment timetable

Overview of learning outcomes of the degree programme + matrix	Appendix 1
Schematic overview of time periods intended for assessment and modes of assessment used	Appendix 2

The objectives of the degree programme, set out in the learning outcomes of the degree programme (Appendix 1), form the guiding principles. All course units together fulfil a role in working towards these learning outcomes. This is reflected in a coherent curriculum with a transparent structure. The matrix of learning outcomes (Appendix 1) defines the course units that include summative assessments and distinguishes between a) course units with assessments that *lead up to* the attainment level set out in the programme-level learning outcomes and b) course units with assessments *at this attainment level* (in the latter case the learning outcomes of the course unit are thus identical to the programme-level learning outcomes of the degree programme). This distinction is expressed as follows:

<u>'x'</u>	i.e. underlined, is used for summative ¹ assessments at the level specified in the programme-level learning outcomes
'x'	for summative assessments at lower performance levels
'fx'	for formative ² evaluations at lower performance levels

In parallel with the curriculum, the assessment programme (Appendix 2) offers a balanced, well-structured overview of modes of assessment and exam periods.

5 / Safeguarding of assessment quality by the Board of Examiners

The Board of Examiners is responsible for safeguarding the quality of assessment at both the degree programme level and the level of individual course units.

a. Safeguarding of assessment quality at degree programme level

¹ Summative assessment aims to assess a student's knowledge and skills. Such assessments are usually awarded a mark, accompanied by a justification of the mark (adapted from *Toetsen in het hoger onderwijs* (2017)).

² Formative evaluation relates to the process of searching, aggregating and interpreting information, which students and lecturers can then use to determine how students are doing in their learning process, what they should work towards and how this can be most effectively done (adapted from *Toetsen in het hoger onderwijs* (2017)).



The Board of Examiners annually issues advice on each degree programme's draft assessment plan for the coming academic year.

b. Safeguarding of assessment quality at course unit level

The Board of Examiners aims to evaluate the assessments for all course units in a degree programme in a three-year cycle – in other words, to examine each course unit's assessment at least once every three years, bearing in mind the position of the course unit in the curriculum and in a specific learning pathway. In addition, a substantiated selection of these is also evaluated.

6 / Archiving

Assessment dossiers are held in the Brightspace environment for the course in question.

7 / List of documents relevant to assessment

Faculty vision of teaching and assessment – see:

<https://myuniversity.rug.nl/infonet/medewerkers/let/onderwijs/vision-for-education>.

Rules and Regulations – the internal regulations of the Board of Examiners.

Teaching and Examination Regulations (TER = OER; *Onderwijs- en examenregeling*) – a legally binding document that applies to the entire cohort of students who start a degree programme in a certain academic year. The TER may also contain transitional arrangements for previous cohorts.

Matrix of learning outcomes – an appendix to the Assessment Plan that specifies the course units with *summative* assessment leading up to or at the level specified in the programme-level learning outcomes and the course units with formative assessment.

Placement manual – a manual for the placement course unit.

Syllabus – a document that sets out the details of the TER and the Assessment Plan at course unit level in accordance with the information in Ocasys.

Assessment programme – the implementation of the TER, Part A, Article 4.16

Appendix 1. Learning outcomes of the degree programme + Matrix of learning outcomes

Assessment Plan ReMA Archaeology 2024-25

Canan Çakırlar, Program Coordinator

<p><i>Description of Master's level according to the descriptors of the Qualifications Framework for the European Higher Education Area (Dublin descriptors)</i></p>	<p><i>Intended learning outcomes of the Research Master's Programme in Archaeology</i></p> <p>In order to successfully complete the Research Master's programme in Archaeology, students:</p>
<p>1. Knowledge and Understanding Students have demonstrable knowledge and understanding that is founded upon and extends and/or enhances that typically associated with Bachelor's level, and that provides a basis or opportunity for originality in developing and/or applying ideas, often within a research context</p>	<p>1.1 have understanding of the development and structure of the discipline and the relationship between its various branches.</p> <p>1.2 have a thorough and up-to-date knowledge of at least one branch of the discipline.</p> <p>1.3 have knowledge and understanding of research methods and theories in archaeology.</p> <p>1.4 show awareness of the interpretive potential of archaeological artefacts, the built environment, organic remains, ecosystems, and landscapes in their historical context.</p> <p>1.5 have understanding of archaeology's relationship with other scientific disciplines.</p> <p>1.6 have knowledge and understanding of the role and relevance of archaeology in present-day society.</p>
<p>2. Applying knowledge and understanding Students can apply their knowledge, understanding and problem-solving abilities in new or unfamiliar environments within broader (or multidisciplinary) contexts related to their field of study</p>	<p>2.1 have the skills to apply appropriate methods of analysis and theoretical frameworks when conducting archaeological research</p> <p>2.2 have the skills to, independently and in collaboration with others, perform a responsible task relating to the organization of an academic event (e.g. workshop or seminar).</p> <p>2.3 be able to connect one's specialist knowledge to wider debates and current societal issues</p>

<p>3. Making judgements</p> <p>Students have the ability to integrate knowledge and handle complexity, and formulate judgements with incomplete or limited information, but that include reflecting on social and ethical responsibilities linked to the application of their knowledge and judgements</p>	<p>3.1 are able to critically evaluate past and current archaeological research and propose methodological and theoretical improvements.</p> <p>3.2 are able to critically evaluate archaeological research and its impact in terms of ethics and social responsibility</p> <p>3.3 be able to design, conduct, disseminate research in line with the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Research Integrity</p>
<p>4. Communication</p> <p>Students can communicate their conclusions, and the knowledge and rationale underpinning these, to specialist and non-specialist audiences clearly and unambiguously</p>	<p>4.1 be able to participate actively in a group working on a research project</p> <p>4.2 be able to participate in academic debate and to present an academic problem convincingly, both orally and in writing.</p> <p>4.3 be able to present the results of academic research to academic and non-academic, both orally and in writing, while making appropriate use of (digital) visual material.</p> <p>4.4 be able to formulate a research (grand) proposal.</p> <p>4.5 be able to write a publishable article in accordance with current academic norms.</p>
<p>5. Learning skills</p> <p>Students have the learning skills to allow them to continue to study in a manner that may be largely self-directed or autonomous</p>	<p>5.1 be able to develop and conduct informed, original, relevant research independently and in collaboration with others.</p> <p>5.2 be able to communicate about their field of expertise effectively and to engage in debate in a sphere of mutual respect and constructive criticism.</p> <p>5.3 be able to reflect critically on one's own research design, results, and communication in response to feedback from experienced researchers and peers, and make improvements accordingly.</p>

Semester 1		Block 1		Block 2	
		Weeks 1-7 lectures	Weeks 8-10 exams/resits	Weeks 11-17 lectures	Weeks 18-20 exams/resits
Mortuary Archaeology	LPR008M10	Seminars with discussion on literature. Summaries and questions	Work on essay and oral presentation	Same as weeks 1-7 Essay and oral presentation	Workshop
Mortuary Archaeology ADVANCED	LPR017M10	Seminars with discussion on literature. Summaries and questions	Work on essay and oral presentation	Same as weeks 1-7 Essay and oral presentation	Workshop
Anthropocene	LPR002M10	Seminars with debates and oral assignments based on literature Oral presentation	Work on position paper	Discussion on position paper Seminars with debates and oral assignments based on literature Oral presentation 2	Research essay on method and theory
Anthropocene ADVANCED	LPR014M10	Seminars with debates and oral assignments based on literature Oral presentation	Work on position paper	Discussion on position paper Seminars with debates and oral assignments based on literature Oral presentation 2	Research essay on method and theory
Archaeological Theory	LPR001M10	Seminars with reading assignments, weekly summaries. Short presentations on paper topic	Work on research paper	First draft of paper. Peer-review reports of two papers. Work on research paper.	Final version of paper, presentation.
Archaeological Theory ADVANCED	LPR015M10	Seminars with reading assignments,	Work on research paper	First draft of paper. Peer-review reports of two papers.	Final version of paper, presentation.

		weekly summaries. Short presentations on paper topic		Work on research paper.	
Semester 1 Even years					
Archaeometry	TBA	Seminars with discussion on literature	Work on assignment: Writing publishable article	Seminars with discussion on literature	Submission of assignment: Publishable article
Archaeometry ADVANCED	TBA	Seminars with discussion on literature	Work on assignment: Writing publishable article	Seminars with discussion on literature	Submission of assignment: Publishable article
Landscape Archaeology	TBA	Taught classes and student progress presentations	Essay	Grand reading and classes on grant writing	Peer-review of grant and full (mock) grant proposal
Landscape Archaeology ADVANCED	TBA	Taught classes and student progress presentations	Essay	Grand reading and classes on grant writing	Peer-review of grant and full (mock) grant proposal
Skills	TBA	Interviews with archaeologists, policy makers, seminars on reflexive skills, scientific integrity	Dossier of assignments completed (active learning, peer feedback, self-reflection)	Analysis of non-academic archaeology organization. Discussion on design, conduct, timely completion of research projects (tutorials)	Complete PESTLE assignment
Skills ADVANCED	TBA	Interviews with archaeologists, policy makers, seminars on reflexive skills, scientific integrity	Dossier of assignments completed (active learning, peer feedback, self-reflection)	Analysis of non-academic archaeology organization. Discussion on design, conduct, timely completion of research projects (theses)	Complete PESTLE assignment

Flexible component 1	various	Choice between Archaeology Master modules, REMA elective courses, and courses at other RUG programmes, MA courses at other universities, tutorials, and internships. These comprise seminars, lectures and individual meetings. This course unit will always include the writing of a paper, article, or poster, and may include a written exam, an oral presentation, debating assignments, assessment of participation, etc. Participation in the tutorial cohort meetings is mandatory.			
Semester 2					
Flexible component 2	various	Choice between Archaeology Master modules, REMA elective courses, and courses at other RUG programmes, MA courses at other universities, tutorials, and internships. These comprise seminars, lectures and individual meetings. This course unit will always include the writing of a paper, article, or poster, and may include a written exam, an oral presentation, debating assignments, assessment of participation, etc. Participation in the tutorial cohort meetings is mandatory.			
Flexible component 3	various	Choice between Archaeology Master modules, REMA elective courses, and courses at other RUG programmes, MA courses at other universities, tutorials, and internships. These comprise seminars, lectures and individual meetings. This course unit will always include the writing of a paper, article, or poster, and may include a written exam, an oral presentation, debating assignments, assessment of participation, etc. Participation in the tutorial cohort meetings is mandatory.			
Archon courses	various	This module comprises courses offered by the National Research schools. Courses typically consist of workshops, seminars or conferences of one or more days. Students prepare for the workshop by reading relevant literature and will report on its outcomes.			
Semester 4					
Thesis	LKR998M30	Thesis preparation, submission, thesis cohort meetings (also known as the thesis class), presentation in GIA research seminar			

Appendix 2. Schematic overview of time periods intended and modes of assessment

Appendix 1

Matrix learning outcomes – course units Research Master Archaeology

‘x’, i.e. underlined, is used for summative³ assessments at the level specified in the programme-level learning outcomes
 ‘x’ for formative⁴ evaluations at lower performance levels

Achieved Learning Outcomes	1 knowledge & understanding						2 applying			3 making judgements			4 communication					5. learning skills		
	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	2.1	2.2	2.3	3.1	3.2	3.3	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	5.1	5.2	5.3
Course unit																				
Semester 1 Odd Years																				
Mortuary Archaeology	+	±	+		+	+		±				±		±			±		+	
Mortuary Archaeology ADVANCED	+	±	+		+	+		±				±		±			±		+	
Anthropocene	+		+	±	±	+		±		+	±	±		+	±				+	
Anthropocene ADVANCED	+		+	±	±	+		±		+	±	±		+	±				+	
Archaeological Theory	+	±	+		+	+				±		±		±	±		±		+	
Archaeological Theory ADVANCED	+	±	+		+	+				±		±		±	±		±		+	

³ Summative assessment aims to assess a student's knowledge and skills. Such assessments are usually awarded a mark, accompanied by a justification of the mark (adapted from *Toetsen in het hoger onderwijs* (2017)).

⁴ Formative evaluation relates to the process of searching, aggregating and interpreting information, which students and lecturers can then use to determine how students are doing in their learning process, what they should work towards and how this can be most effectively done (adapted from *Toetsen in het hoger onderwijs* (2017)).

Semester 1 Even years																				
Archaeometry	+	±	±	±	+		±					±		+			±		+	+
Archaeometry ADVANCED	+	±	±	±	+		±					±		+			±		+	+
Landscape Archaeology	+	±	±	±	+		±					±		+		±				
Landscape Archaeology ADVANCED	+	±	±	±	+		±					±		+		±				
Skills					+				±		±	±		±					±	±
Skills ADVANCED					+				±		±	±		±					±	±
Flexible component 1		±		±			±					±	±					±		
Semester 2																				
Flexible component 2		±		±			±					±	±					±		
Flexible component 3		±		±			±					±	±					±		
Archon courses	+	±	+	+		+	+			+	+	±		+					+	+
Semester 4																				
Thesis		±	±	+			±			±		±					±	±		



**university of
groningen**

Thesis Regulations

Research Master

Archaeology



Contents

1.	Definition and learning outcomes	3
a.	Definition.....	3
b.	Learning outcomes Research Master thesis as defined in the TER (Teaching and Examination Regulations)	3
2.	Instructions	4
a.	Language of the thesis	4
b.	Length of the thesis	4
c.	Format of the thesis	4
	See also Appendix c. Planning Schedule Graduation.....	5
3.	Procedure	5
a.	Admission.....	5
b.	Supervision.....	5
c.	Thesis contract.....	5
e.	Research Master Thesis Class.....	6
4.	Assessment and assessment criteria.....	6
5.	Archiving and free access	7
6.	Rights and obligations of students.....	7
7.	Final provisions	7

1. Definition and learning outcomes

a. Definition

The Research Master's thesis (thesis) is one of the most important instruments for determining whether a student has achieved the learning outcomes for the Research Master's programme. The students put what they have learned (knowledge, understanding and skills in their subject area) into practice by setting up and carrying out a substantial and academically sound research project. For this purpose, an unambiguous problem definition is formulated (also known as the research question or central question), which can be split into subquestions if necessary. **A well-formulated problem definition is essential to the success** of a research project. It gives direction to the research and **determines which material needs to be studied**. The subquestions give structure to the research and determine how the thesis is subdivided.

The most **relevant secondary and primary literature, sources and/or research data are identified and analysed** in order to answer the research question as well as the subquestions. The answers are then presented in the form of an analytical argument, substantiated with sources or data that support the argument. The academic research is carried out in accordance with the conventions for the subject area. **Students conduct the research independently**. Their work constitutes **an original contribution** to the development of the subject and/or to the application of ideas within it.

The thesis should **demonstrate knowledge of current research on the chosen subject**. It should contain a **critical reflection on the theoretical perspectives and methods** used. The relevant sources, arguments, views and conclusions must be assessed in terms of their value and validity, and where necessary compared.

The thesis thus demonstrates the student's ability, based on subject knowledge, to analyse and critically appraise their own research results and what others have written on the subject. The thesis **describes how the research makes a new contribution to the discipline**. The thesis may conclude with describing perspectives for future research.

The thesis forms the proof that a student can actually carry out independent research on a level that demonstrates their capacities to participate in the international debate on their topic. The level of the argumentation and the mastery of the relevant literature should be such that the thesis could be **re-worked into an article that could be submitted to an academic journal**.

To download a sample of recent theses, visit: <https://arts.studenttheses.ub.rug.nl/>.

b. **Learning outcomes Research Master thesis** as defined in the TER (Teaching and Examination Regulations)

<i>Description of Master's level according to the descriptors of the Qualifications Framework for the European Higher Education Area (Dublin descriptors)</i>	<i>Intended learning outcomes of the Research Master's Programme in Archaeology</i> Graduates are expected to have achieved the following:
<p>1. Knowledge and Understanding Students have demonstrable knowledge and understanding that is founded upon and extends and/or enhances that typically associated with Bachelor's level, and that provides a basis or opportunity for originality in developing and/or applying ideas, often within a research context</p>	<p>1.2 have a thorough and up-to-date knowledge of at least one branch of the discipline. 1.3 have knowledge and understanding of research methods and theories in archaeology. 1.4 show awareness of the interpretive potential of archaeological artefacts, the built environment, organic remains, ecosystems, and landscapes in their historical context.</p>

<p>2. Applying knowledge and understanding Students can apply their knowledge, understanding and problem-solving abilities in new or unfamiliar environments within broader (or multidisciplinary) contexts related to their field of study</p>	<p>2.1 have the skills to apply appropriate methods of analysis and theoretical frameworks when conducting archaeological research.</p>
<p>3. Making judgements Students have the ability to integrate knowledge and handle complexity, and formulate judgements with incomplete or limited information, but that include reflecting on social and ethical responsibilities linked to the application of their knowledge and judgements</p>	<p>3.1 are able to critically evaluate past and current archaeological research and propose methodological and theoretical improvements. 3.3 be able to design, conduct, disseminate research in line with the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Research Integrity</p>
<p>4. Communication Students can communicate their conclusions, and the knowledge and rationale underpinning these, to specialist and non-specialist audiences clearly and unambiguously</p>	<p>4.5 be able to write a publishable article in accordance with current academic norms.</p>
<p>5. Learning skills Students have the learning skills to allow them to continue to study in a manner that may be largely self-directed or autonomous</p>	<p>5.1 be able to develop and conduct informed, original, relevant research independently and in collaboration with others.</p>

2. Instructions

a. *Language of the thesis*

The thesis must be written in English. Another language may only be used with the explicit authorization of the Director of Studies (DoS) and the supervisors. If a thesis is written in another language than English, the supervisor and the DoS have to make sure that there is a second supervisor available, who is sufficiently fluent in that language to assess the quality of the work.

The style of writing should be of an acceptable academic level.

b. *Length of the thesis*

The thesis must be between 20,000 and 30,000, excluding appendices, footnotes, tables and figures and bibliography. A different word length may be agreed between student and supervisor, if the type of research demands this. Assuming there are approximately 450-500 words on a page, this is 30-60 pages. These figures are based on the following calculation: the thesis is worth 30 ECTS credit points = 840 hours that is an effort of 21 full-time weeks.

c. *Format of the thesis*

Each thesis should have a title page, stating name, study programme and degree programme and student number, submission date, name of the supervisor(s) and, of course, the title. The thesis should be formatted with a line distance of 1 ½, in a standard 12 point font. The thesis must be uploaded in PDF format in the following link: https://forms.ub.rug.nl/theses_arts/

See also Appendix c. *Planning Schedule Graduation*.

3. Procedure

The student is advised to **start** during the third semester (i.e., the **first semester of the second year**) with their orientation on a suitable topic and the available literature. They are also advised to **approach potential supervisors** in an early stage.

a. Admission

The thesis is the final and all-inclusive assessment of the programme. Consequently, **students are allowed to start with the thesis in semester IV after they have taken all (55 ECTS) compulsory courses and completed at least 45 ECTS of them.** If they do not fulfil this condition, students must apply to the Board of Examiners in order to receive permission to start their thesis, submitting also a clear schedule for the completion of any missing assignments and a report by the supervisor on their progress therein. Students can start with the thesis after a supervisor has been appointed, and after the **thesis contract is submitted by 15 February** and has been approved by the supervisor and the Director of Studies.

b. Supervision

An individual supervisor will be appointed to each student by the DoS. Students will have the opportunity to suggest the choice of supervisor with the DoS, who will have to approve their choice. The supervisor will normally be chosen from the degree programme. A **second supervisor may be appointed if this is appropriate** for the subject of the thesis. External supervisors need to be informed about the thesis regulations, and sent the assessment form (see below) in advance.

Students should be aware that the supervisor has only a limited number of hours available for thesis supervision, but have the right to at least four supervision meetings:

1. an exploratory discussion to choose a subject;
2. discussion of the research setup and planning;
3. discussion of the first version of the thesis;
4. discussion of the final version of the thesis.

c. Thesis contract

Two weeks after the beginning of the semester the student hands in a thesis contract of at least two pages signed by the student, the supervisor and the DoS.

A thesis contract (see Appendix b. *Thesis Contract*) should contain the following information:

- Working title
- Provisional table of contents
- Research question
- Provisional list of literature and sources
- Discussion of used methods
- Detailed time schedule, including appointments with supervisor
- If applicable, state if work for thesis requires stays abroad or away from Groningen in connection with field, museum or laboratory work during the teaching semester, and give approximate duration
- If applicable, state if work for thesis requires access to archaeological material, and if access to this material has been granted
- If applicable, provide explicit agreement with respect to the availability of necessary research facilities such as computer software or hardware, lab time, etc.

d. Thesis schedule, deadlines and resits

There are set deadlines for the beginning (submission of thesis contract: 15 February) and the completion and submission of final assignments (1 July, with the assessment completed by 15 July).

Resit possibilities are regulated following the TER (Part A, p. 13):

- i. If the final draft is not submitted on time, the student will receive a Fail mark and have a resit by submitting by the end of the next semester block. If a student submits on time, but receives a grade below 5.5 (hence a Fail), the same procedure will be followed.
- ii. If the resubmitted thesis is not awarded a Pass, the student will be given one opportunity to remedy the work by one more semester block. If the revised work cannot be awarded a Pass mark, the student will have to complete a new thesis/final assignment with a new topic and a different supervisor at a time agreed with the DoS.

Delay in completing the thesis is penalized, as punctuality is included among the criteria of the thesis assessment forms (see Appendix a. *Assessment Forms*). If students take a resit a semester block later, their grade will be lowered by 0.25; if they submit the tutorial a semester later, the grade will be lowered by 0.5, and if a year later, by 1.0. Moreover, students are not eligible for a *cum laude* award if they resit their thesis.

In highly exceptional circumstances (such as serious health or personal problems, equipment failure, etc.), delay will not be penalised. In such cases, the student must contact the Study Advisor in good time, i.e. at the moment the problem arises, and put in an application to the Board of Examiners in order to be exempted from becoming penalised for delay.

e. *Research Master Thesis Class*

The Research Master thesis has been redesigned especially for Research Master students. The class is held in year 2, semester IV, as the students have to start and complete the thesis in this semester (i.e. after they have completed their compulsory courses, see above).

The Thesis class has an attendance requirement of 80%, which may be adjusted for reasons directly connected with the work undertaken for a tutorial (e.g. the need to do field, museum or laboratory work, or to attend a conference, in the Netherlands or abroad). In this case, the student must apply for such an adjustment to the Board of Examiners by including this information in the thesis contract after having received an initial approval by their supervisor and Director of Studies.

Each student:

- Attends, participates and presents research progress in the monthly sessions of the Research Master thesis class.
- Gives an oral presentation based on his/her thesis research in the presence of staff and students during a special Research Seminar in June.

4. **Assessment and assessment criteria**

The thesis is assessed by two examiners: the **main assessor** is the thesis supervisor (who has to take into account the advice of any co-supervisors). The **second, independent, examiner** is appointed by the Research Master Thesis Class coordinator. The examiners first make their own individual assessment, which they then discuss together in order to decide on a final grade, justified explicitly on the assessment form. The mark for a thesis is based on the quality of the research setup, the quality of the research itself, and the quality of the reporting on the research. The following criteria are used (see Appendix a. *Assessment Forms*):

Topic:

1. Difficulty
2. Originality

Process:

3. Independence and creativity Originality of the research
4. Planning, punctuality, communication

Quality of content:

5. Knowledge of literature
6. Critical reflection on state of question skills
7. Theoretical approach

8. Methodological approach
9. Quality of analysis
10. Use of sources
11. Structure and strength of argument
12. Awareness of social / ethical issues

Presentation:

13. Length
14. Structure, clarity
15. Annotation
16. Language, style
17. Illustrations and data presentation

The final mark is awarded by means of the thesis assessment form.

If the **two grades differ more than 1.0, a third examiner** (member of the Archaeology teaching staff) has to be appointed by the Board of Examiners, Expertise Team REMA.

If the student does not agree with the assessment, it is possible to seek the opinion of a third expert. This is done via the Board of Examiners, Expertise Team REMA.

5. Archiving and free access

Students must provide a digital version (in PDF format) of the thesis for the degree programme's archive. This should be submitted via the delivery portal of the Office for Student Affairs. The thesis is stored in the University of Groningen repository, the digital archive of University publications.

Theses in the repository can be freely accessed (from within and outside the University) if the student and supervisor give permission. Students can indicate **'freely accessible – yes/no' on the form**. 'Yes' means that the student states that the supervisor has also given permission, in accordance with the Rules and Regulations of the Boards of Examiners that apply within the Faculty of Arts. Before answering 'yes' on the form, the student must check that the lecturer also agrees to the thesis being freely accessible.

6. Rights and obligations of students

Students have the right to thesis supervision as described in Section 3. In addition, the student is required to gather material in the correct way – i.e. independently – and use it to write a thesis in accordance with the regulations and conventions of the degree programme. See also the section relating to cheating and plagiarism in the relevant Teaching and Examination Regulations.

Cheating and plagiarism carry severe penalties, because it must be clear at all times that the student is the actual author of the thesis in all respects. Partial or inaccurate source references and deliberate false references will count against the student. The thesis must be the result of independent academic research. Copying or too closely paraphrasing consulted works does not comply with this. The lecturer has the right to examine the consulted sources and literature, and students must provide the lecturer with this material if required.

The copyright on a thesis is shared: both the lecturer and student have copyright on the thesis. This means that neither the supervisor nor the student can publish on the results reported in the thesis unless they have the permission of the other.

7. Final provisions

In cases not covered by these regulations, the Director of Studies shall have the final say.

Disputes concerning the provisions of these thesis regulations will first be brought before the Board of Examiners of the degree programme, who will take a decision that can in turn be appealed against.

RESEARCH MASTER ARCHAEOLOGY

THESIS ASSESSMENT - 1st Reader

to be handed to student and archived by Secretariat

Submission date	
If later than July 1st, BoEX exemption date	Please attach the BoEX decision letter.
Assessment date	
Name of student	
Student number	
Title of thesis	
1st Reader / Supervisor	Name Signature

Assessment Criteria		Assessment						
		Insufficient (≤5.5)	Weak (≤6.0)	Sufficient (≤7.0)	Good (≤8.0)	Very Good (≤9.0)	Excellent (≤10.0)	
30%	Topic	Difficulty	ProgCo & PC advice: 1 st , 2 nd readers + mentor (if not involved) should discuss this criterion on an individual basis. To answer the question: <i>“How difficult is the topic for a REMA student, taking into account their study as a whole?”</i>					
		Originality	Research lacks originality	Adequate research that demonstrates an understanding of the field but may lack in depth or originality.	Competent research that demonstrates an understanding of the field but may lack in depth or originality.	Strong research that demonstrates a deep understanding of the field and makes a significant contribution to knowledge.	Very strong research with a clear understanding of the field and a valuable contribution to knowledge.	Outstanding research with a clear understanding of the field and a valuable contribution to knowledge.
	Comments	<i>How original is the question and the approach?</i>						
	Process	Independence and creativity	<i>How independently has the student worked? How creative have they been in seeking solutions for problems?</i>					
		Planning, punctuality, communication	<i>Have they adhered to planning? Have they submitted on time? Have they communicated any problems on time?</i>					
		Comments	<i>Have they adhered to planning? Have they submitted on time? Have they communicated any problems on time?</i>					
50%	Quality of content	Knowledge of literature	* Literature review is superficial or missing.	* Literature review is limited or lacks critical engagement. * Gaps in the literature are not addressed.	* Reviews relevant literature, but may lack depth or critical analysis. * Gap identification may be present, but not well-developed.	* Comprehensively reviews relevant literature, demonstrating critical analysis and synthesis.	* Comprehensively reviews relevant literature, demonstrating critical analysis and synthesis. * Acknowledges potential gaps in the existing literature.	* Comprehensively reviews relevant literature, demonstrating critical analysis and synthesis. * Acknowledges and addresses potential gaps in the existing literature.
		Critical reflection	No critical reflection on state of question	Poor reflection on state of question	Adequate reflection of the state of question	Good reflection on state of question	Very good reflection of the state of question	Excellent analysis of the state of question

		on state of question						
		Theoretical approach	Theoretical frameworks are absent.	Theoretical frameworks are not clearly identified or integrated.	Identifies some of the theoretical frameworks but may not fully integrate them.	Identifies most of the theoretical frameworks but may not fully integrate them.	Identifies key theoretical frameworks and positions them within the research context.	Identifies all key theoretical frameworks comprehensively and positions them within the research context.
		Methodological approach	Research design and methods are missing or poorly conceived.	Research design is unclear or poorly justified.	Research design is outlined, but justification may be weak.	Research design is outlined, but justification is appropriate.	Research design is outlined, but justification is strong.	Clearly outlines the research design and justifies its appropriateness for the research questions.
		Use of sources	Available appropriate datasets remain unexplored	Poor integration of available datasets	Adequate integration of novel and available datasets	Good integration of novel and available datasets	Very good and appropriate integration of novel and available datasets	Creative and appropriate integration of novel and available datasets
		Quality of analysis	Research design and methods are missing or poorly conceived.	Data collection and analysis methods are poorly described or inadequate.	Data collection and analysis methods are described, but they lack detail and clarity.	Data collection and analysis methods are clearly described, but may lack detail.	Provides a clear and detailed description of the data collection and analysis methods.	Provides a very clear and detailed description of the data collection and analysis methods.
		Structure and strength of argument	Discussion and conclusion sections are missing or irrelevant.	* Interpretation of findings is limited. * Conclusions are poorly supported. * No discussion of future implications.	* Interprets the findings somewhat, but connections may be weak. * Draws conclusions, but their support or contribution may be unclear.	* Interprets the findings, connections are strong. * Draws conclusions, but they may be clearer. * Discusses some implications for future work.	* Interprets the findings well in light of the research questions, literature, and broader field. * Draws well-supported conclusions and identifies the research's contribution to knowledge. * Discusses the implications of the research for future study or practice.	* Interprets the findings very well in light of the research questions, literature, and broader field. * Draws well-supported conclusions and identifies the research's contribution to knowledge. * Discusses the implications of the research for future study or practice.
		Awareness of social/ethical issues	<i>Are they aware of any social and ethical issues arising from their research? Do they engage with these issues?</i>					
		Comments						
20%	Presentation	Length	Much longer or shorter (more than 20%) than agreed in the thesis contract	As agreed (less than 20% for articles, less than 10% for normal length thesis)	As agreed (less than 20% for articles, less than 10% for normal length thesis)	As agreed (less than 20% for articles, less than 10% for normal length thesis)	As agreed (less than 20% for articles, less than 10% for normal length thesis)	As agreed (less than 20% for articles, less than 10% for normal length thesis)
		Structure, clarity	Thesis is poorly written, disorganized,	Thesis contains a lot of organizational issues or	Thesis may contain organizational issues or	Thesis is generally well-written and organized,	Thesis is generally well-written and organized, and	Thesis is well-written, organized, and free of grammatical errors.

			or riddled with errors.	grammatical errors.	grammatical errors.	with minor grammatical errors.	almost free of grammatical errors.	
	Annotation	Missing references, no consistent reference style	All references cited, but no consistent reference style	Referencing may not be entirely consistent.	Referencing almost entirely consistent.	Referencing almost entirely consistent.	Referencing perfectly consistent	
	Language, style	Use of academic language is inadequate.	Use of academic language needs improvement.	Uses academic language adequately.	Uses academic language effectively.	Uses academic language very effectively.	Uses academic language in an excellent way.	
	Illustrations and data presentation	Presentation is unclear or unprofessional.	Presentation may be unclear or unprofessional.	Presentation is clear, but may lack polish.	Presentation is clear, but may use some polish.	Presents the research in a clear and professional manner.	Presents the research in a clear and professional, creative and exemplary manner.	
	Comments							
Grade								
Justification								
Penalties apply		Yes/No						
Final grade								
Justification								

Final Assessment Form Thesis

(to be completed jointly by first and second assessors, and if applicable third assessor)

Student name:		Date started:	
Student number:		Date completed:	
Thesis title:			
First assessor			
Second assessor			
Third assessor (if applicable)			

Final grade	
Date and place:	Signature first assessor:
Date and place:	Signature second assessor:
Date and place:	Signature third assessor (if applicable):
Explanation of agreed grade <i>(please include an explanation of the weighing of overall assessments as well as of any assessment point where assessments significantly diverge)</i>	

RESEARCH MASTER ARCHAEOLOGY THESIS ASSESSMENT - 2nd Reader

to be handed to student and archived by Secretariat

Submission date	
If later than July 1st, BoEX exemption date	Please attach the BoEX decision letter.
Assessment date	
Name of student	
Student number	
Title of thesis	
1st Reader / Supervisor	Name Signature

Assessment Criteria			Assessment					
			Insufficient (≤5.5)	Weak (≤6.0)	Sufficient (≤7.0)	Good (≤8.0)	Very Good (≤9.0)	Excellent (≤10.0)
10%	Topic	Difficulty	ProgCo & PC advice: 1 st , 2 nd readers + mentor (if not involved) should discuss this criterion on an individual basis. To answer the question: <i>“How difficult is the topic for a REMA student, taking into account their study as a whole?”</i>					
		Originality	Research lacks originality	Adequate research that demonstrates an understanding of the field but may lack in depth or originality.	Competent research that demonstrates an understanding of the field but may lack in depth or originality.	Strong research that demonstrates a deep understanding of the field and makes a significant contribution to knowledge.	Very strong research with a clear understanding of the field and a valuable contribution to knowledge.	Outstanding research with a clear understanding of the field and a valuable contribution to knowledge.
		Comments	<i>How original is the question and the approach?</i>					
	Process	Independence and creativity	<i>How independently has the student worked? How creative have they been in seeking solutions for problems?</i>					
		Planning, punctuality, communication	<i>Have they adhered to planning? Have they submitted on time? Have they communicated any problems on time?</i>					
		Comments						
60%	Quality of content	Knowledge of literature	* Literature review is superficial or missing.	* Literature review is limited or lacks critical engagement. * Gaps in the literature are not addressed.	* Reviews relevant literature, but may lack depth or critical analysis. * Gap identification may be present, but not well-developed.	* Comprehensively reviews relevant literature, demonstrating critical analysis and synthesis.	* Comprehensively reviews relevant literature, demonstrating critical analysis and synthesis. * Acknowledges potential gaps in the existing literature.	* Comprehensively reviews relevant literature, demonstrating critical analysis and synthesis. * Acknowledges and addresses potential gaps in the existing literature.
		Critical reflection on state of question	No critical reflection on state of question	Poor reflection on state of question	Adequate reflection of the state of question	Good reflection on state of question	Very good reflection of the state of question	Excellent analysis of the state of question

		Theoretical approach	Theoretical frameworks are absent.	Theoretical frameworks are not clearly identified or integrated.	Identifies some of the theoretical frameworks but may not fully integrate them.	Identifies most of the theoretical frameworks but may not fully integrate them.	Identifies key theoretical frameworks and positions them within the research context.	Identifies all key theoretical frameworks comprehensively and positions them within the research context.
		Methodological approach	Research design and methods are missing or poorly conceived.	Research design is unclear or poorly justified.	Research design is outlined, but justification may be weak.	Research design is outlined, but justification is appropriate.	Research design is outlined, but justification is strong.	Clearly outlines the research design and justifies its appropriateness for the research questions.
		Use of sources	Available appropriate datasets remain unexplored	Poor integration of available datasets	Adequate integration of novel and available datasets	Good integration of novel and available datasets	Very good and appropriate integration of novel and available datasets	Creative and appropriate integration of novel and available datasets
		Quality of analysis	Research design and methods are missing or poorly conceived.	Data collection and analysis methods are poorly described or inadequate.	Data collection and analysis methods are described, but they lack detail and clarity.	Data collection and analysis methods are clearly described, but may lack detail.	Provides a clear and detailed description of the data collection and analysis methods.	Provides a very clear and detailed description of the data collection and analysis methods.
		Structure and strength of argument	Discussion and conclusion sections are missing or irrelevant.	* Interpretation of findings is limited. * Conclusions are poorly supported. * No discussion of future implications.	* Interprets the findings somewhat, but connections may be weak. * Draws conclusions, but their support or contribution may be unclear.	* Interprets the findings, connections are strong. * Draws conclusions, but they may be clearer. * Discusses some implications for future work.	* Interprets the findings well in light of the research questions, literature, and broader field. * Draws well-supported conclusions and identifies the research's contribution to knowledge. * Discusses the implications of the research for future study or practice.	* Interprets the findings very well in light of the research questions, literature, and broader field. * Draws well-supported conclusions and identifies the research's contribution to knowledge. * Discusses the implications of the research for future study or practice.
		Awareness of social/ethical issues	<i>Are they aware of any social and ethical issues arising from their research? Do they engage with these issues?</i>					
		Comments						
30%	Presentation	Length	Much longer or shorter (more than 20%) than agreed in the thesis contract	As agreed (less than 20% for articles, less than 10% for normal length thesis)	As agreed (less than 20% for articles, less than 10% for normal length thesis)	As agreed (less than 20% for articles, less than 10% for normal length thesis)	As agreed (less than 20% for articles, less than 10% for normal length thesis)	As agreed (less than 20% for articles, less than 10% for normal length thesis)
		Structure, clarity	Thesis is poorly written, disorganized, or riddled with errors.	Thesis contains a lot of organizational issues or	Thesis may contain organizational issues or	Thesis is generally well-written and organized, with minor	Thesis is generally well-written and organized, and almost free of	Thesis is well-written, organized, and free of

				grammatical errors.	grammatical errors.	grammatical errors.	grammatical errors.	grammatical errors.
		Annotation	Missing references, no consistent reference style	All references cited, but no consistent reference style	Referencing may not be entirely consistent.	Referencing almost entirely consistent.	Referencing almost entirely consistent.	Referencing perfectly consistent
		Language, style	Use of academic language is inadequate.	Use of academic language needs improvement.	Uses academic language adequately.	Uses academic language effectively.	Uses academic language very effectively.	Uses academic language in an excellent way.
		Illustrations and data presentation	Presentation is unclear or unprofessional.	Presentation may be unclear or unprofessional.	Presentation is clear, but may lack polish.	Presentation is clear, but may use some polish.	Presents the research in a clear and professional manner.	Presents the research in a clear and professional, creative and exemplary manner.
		Comments						

Grade	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 to 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 to 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 to 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 to 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 9 tot 10
Justification	