university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences / rema

Assessment plan of the Research Master's programme Behavioural and Social Sciences

Academic year 2026-2027

Graduate School of Behavioural and Social Sciences - University of Groningen
rema.bss@rug.nl

Contents

0. Preface

This document contains the assessment plan of the programme of the Research Master Behavioural and Social Sciences. The assessment programme and assessment plan comply with the assessment policy of the Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences (2011; as summarized in 18 prerequisites (see Appendix 1)), the general assessment policy of the University of Groningen (2021-2026) and the protocol setting out the duties and powers of the Board of Examiners of the University of Groningen (Manual for Board of Examiners; 2025).

The assessment programme and assessment plan are published separately, so there is a legal distinction between the assessment programme and assessment plan. The assessment programme is an appendix to the Teaching and Examination Regulations (TER) and also part of the assessment plan.

The assessment plan comprises the following topics:

1. Stimulation of the learning process
2. Study programme
3. Responsibilities for the implementation of the various components of the assessment policy;
4. The method of regular evaluation

The assessment programme comprises the following topics:

1. Learning goals and learning outcomes of the programme
2. Descriptions of constructive alignment, and overview of the learning outcomes of the individual courses related to the learning outcomes of the programme and the assessment modes
3. Course assessments: procedures and assessment criteria used

Detailed descriptions of the content of each individual course can be found in Ocasys, the online course catalogue (http://www.rug.nl/ocasys/). This includes the learning outcomes, description of content, mode(s) of instruction and assessment mode(s) and assessment content. The first and last aspects can be found in the assessment programme as well, whereas the description of content and mode(s) of instruction can be read in Ocasys only.

Groningen,

Prof. dr. R.J.C. Huntjens, director Graduate School of Behavioural and Social Sciences
Drs. I.P.J. Veenstra, coordinator Graduate School of Behavioural and Social Sciences

1 Stimulation of the learning process

Self-responsibility is an important guiding principle in the programme's testing policy. This means that we encourage students to take their own responsibility in acquiring academic knowledge and skills. In order to take responsibility for their learning process, students must be enabled to do so. Therefore, during the course, students should be able to regularly evaluate to what extent they are on track to achieve the learning objectives. Below we describe how we use testing to create the preconditions for promoting the learning process in our programme. This is based on the principle that we want students to take responsibility for their own learning process.

1.1 Formative and summative assessment

The program uses a combination of formative and summative testing to encourage students to actively work on achieving the learning objectives early in the course.

Summative assessment is to assess whether the student achieved the learning goals of the course. For each course, the summative assessment is aligned with the learning goals of the course involved. That is, the content, its level and the assessment method(s) are chosen such that all learning goals are assessed in a proper way.
Summative assessment is essential to determine whether the student meets the learning goals sufficiently to complete the course. The Board of Examiners can therefore confidently sign the diploma of the student who has passed all exams belonging to their curriculum. All exams of their curriculum program together cover the final qualifications of the programme – as explained in the Assessment programme, Section 1 (Learning goals and learning outcomes of the programme).

Formative assessment has an informative purpose. It informs both teachers and students about the progress of the learning process. For students, formative assessment provides the necessary feedback and starting points for improving learning performance, so that students can take control of their own learning process. Students get an impression of the topics that the teacher considers important and at what level these topics should be mastered at a certain point in the course. For teachers, formative assessment provides the necessary feedback on which subjects require additional attention or explanation.

Detailed information on the summative and formative assessments per course in the programma is provided in the Assessment programme, Section 3 (Course assessments).

1.2 Programming of testing

Due to the combination of formative and summative testing in each course and the combination of several summative testing formats, the students' progress is regularly assessed throughout the duration of the course. This ensures that students are encouraged to actively work with the subject matter from the start of the course and the learning behavior of students is directed in such a way that they have mastered the subject matter at the end of the course.
A resit or correction (i.e. correction of an unsatisfactory version of, for example, a paper, report or thesis) is organized for each summative assessment component of each course. This is to ensure that students can reasonably complete courses within the academic year. The resits are scheduled after the examination period of the next block. This ensures that the resit is not an attractive option. After all, the resit takes place weeks later, which means that time must be invested to keep the knowledge active in the memory. Moreover, the second resit week is in a period when other students are free from education and exams.

2 Study programme

2.1 Characterization of the degree programme

The research master's programme is designed for talented, ambitious students with interest in behavioural and social phenomena who would like to pursue a career in an academic or applied (clinical, industry, or governmental) research environment. The curriculum is focused on theory-guided analysis of empirical data and generalizable explanations of human behavioural and social phenomena. Increasingly, research into these complex phenomena is of a multidisciplinary nature. Because we view a disciplinary base to be essential for successful contributions to multidisciplinary research, both specialization and multidisciplinarity play key roles throughout the whole programme. The students are trained to function as specialists in a multidisciplinary context

After completion of this programme the student meets the entry requirements of national and international PhD programmes within the behavioural and social sciences and of research institutions outside academia at the junior researcher level.

2.2 Programme outline: specialization combined with multidisciplinarity

The programme is centred around three themes, where each theme is associated with a few disciplines. When entering the programme, each student selects a theme according to his/ her interest. During the programme, the student has the opportunity to select a specialization into a discipline associated within the student's theme. The programme provides for all students a firm basis in science theory, methodology and statistics. The science theoretical part includes theory building, reflecting on science and science integrity. In the methodology and statistics part, the connection between statistics and content-related theories receives much attention.

For each theme, the associated theme courses introduce the theme from both disciplinary and multidisciplinary perspectives. That is, the similarities and essential differences in theories, concepts and perspectives between the disciplines associated with the theme are carefully highlighted and discussed. Students develop their abilities to work in a multidisciplinary setting in the project-based course for all second-year students 'Multidisciplinary research in action'.

Other courses in the programme with multidisciplinary elements are:

- Reflecting on Science and integrity (obligatory for all students)
- Development, learning and instruction (elective course)
- Economy and Society: Critical Transitions in Advanced Industrialised Societies (elective course)
- Environmental psychology (elective course)

Disciplinary specialisation takes further place via the elective courses, and via the individual research projects (traineeship and Master's thesis). The individual research projects can be multidisciplinary research.

The setting with the theme courses, specialization courses and individual research projects provides the students with a proper degree of disciplinary specialization and use different perspectives on societal problems, to function well in both monodisciplinary and multidisciplinary contexts.

The final and all-inclusive assessment of the programme is the Master's thesis. This thesis should be at the level of a first draft of a research paper that may be submitted to an international, peer-reviewed journal, and may form the basis of a proposal for a PhD thesis or for an application for research funding. Thus, graduates are well prepared for PhD positions and careers as research scientists, primarily in academia, but also for research positions in public or private organizations.

2.3 Learning environment

The vision on the learning environment of the programme is inspired by the notion that knowledge and understanding result from activities conducted by students themselves. The learning environment is arranged in such a way that students are invited to function as self-directed learners who achieve the learning outcomes in a manner that fits their individual learning needs. Students are stimulated to develop understanding in fields of their own interest, always linking new information to already acquired competence and experiences.

Students are stimulated and required to work on different research questions and to practice using different quantitative methodologies. From the start of the programme, it is expected and stimulated that students take part in the research groups associated with their theme via active engagements in seminars and lab meetings.

Further, it is stimulated to take and use broader perspectives on societal research questions, by offering theme courses, and thought provoking seminars.

3 Procedures and responsibilities

3.1 Assessment procedures and criteria

The learning outcomes and the assessment of the courses (see assessment programme) are determined by the programme director, upon proposal of the examiners involved. Per course, the programme director considers whether the learning outcomes and the assessment proposed fit each other. Further, the programme director considers the resulting variety in assessment methods for the programme as a whole, in relation to the learning goals of the programme. In case this would not fit, and/or an unbalanced assessment landscape would arise, the programme director guides the process to arrive at a proper landscape, in mutual agreement with the examiners involved.

For each exam, the form, content and level are aligned with the learning objectives of the course. The examiner is responsible for designing the exam. For each exam except for the traineeship and the Master's thesis, the examiner is responsible for the scoring model. The scoring model includes the model answers, the scoring system (i.e., the points that should be included in the answer and how they are scored) and the method of computing the grades, including the cutting score. The scoring model has to be determined before the exam is given.

Each exam must be checked by at least one colleague examiner from the Research master before administration. The colleague considers, in view of the learning objectives of the course: the content of the questions, their clarity, level of difficulty, coverage of content, and the scoring model.

The grading of traineeships and Master's theses is done on the basis of the Assessment forms for writing a traineeship report (see Appendix 2a and 2b) and a MSc thesis (see Appendix 3), so that the criteria for evaluation are clear. During both the traineeship and RMSc thesis project, students and their supervisors have regular meetings in which their progress relative to the criteria, among other things, is monitored and discussed. Students taking a clinical traineeship are evaluated on their scientific traineeship report as well as their clinical report and their performance during their clinical traineeship (see appendix 2b).

All procedures for staff involved in the programme are summarized in the Faculty handbook[1] for the Research Master's programme.

3.2 Responsibilities in assessment

The assessment plan is determined by the Faculty Board. The Graduate School director is responsible for the day-to-day management of the Graduate School, for the development, maintenance, execution, and evaluation of the RMSc programme, the monitoring of students' progress, and the internal quality assurance of the RMSc programme. The director shapes the scientific and educational policy of the Graduate School in consultation with the Faculty Board, the Research and Teaching directors of the three departments within the faculty (i.e., Psychology, Sociology, and Pedagogical and Educational Sciences), the coordinator of the Graduate School, and the relevant committees that operate within the school, including the Board of Examiners.

The RMSc Board of Examiners is appointed by the Faculty Board. The Board of Examiners acts according to the protocol setting out the duties and powers of the Board of Examiners of the University of Groningen (Manual for Board of Examiners). With respect to the assessment, they carry out the following tasks:

- Appointing the responsible examiners for implementing the different parts of the assessment of courses.
- Evaluation of the assessment plan in relation to the realization of the learning outcomes of the programme.
- Supervising the utilized assessment methods in relation to the Assessment Plan as decreed by the Faculty Board.
- Carrying out periodically and general evaluations of the assessments.

The periodic evaluation of each course assessment takes place via detailed evaluation of the course documents. The Board provides comments and suggestions for improvement which the Graduate School sends to the instructor. Instructors are asked to make adjustments and resubmit the documents

—

[1]Students may contact rema.bss@rug.nl for access to the relevant text in the Faculty Handbook.

as soon as possible. If needed the Board of Examiners discusses the assessment with an examiner in person. Further, each course receives a detailed evaluation by the Board of Examiners once every 5 years.

Annually, the Board of Examiners reports their evaluation of the quality of the implementation of the assessment plan to the Graduate School director and the Faculty Board. The director of the Graduate School takes proper notice of the evaluation and takes action if necessary.

3.3 Generative AI and assessment

Assessment is used to determine whether students have achieved the learning objectives of courses and ultimately, whether students meet the programme's final qualifications. The development and widespread availability of generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) potentially impacts the validity of assessment.

Guidelines for responsible use of GenAI have been drawn up at university and faculty level. These have been communicated to students in the online learning environment. Moreover, the BSS Teaching and Examination Regulations (TER) have been amended by adding the possibility to further investigate the student's knowledge, insight and skills when fraud (e.g. through GenAI) is suspected.

At programme level, efforts were made to make assessment programmes more robust against the unpermitted use of GenAI. Vulnerabilities in assessment programmes have been identified and discussed in staff meetings. Teachers have been made aware of the risks of GenAI for certain modes of assessment such as essays, the importance of clear instructions for the use of GenAI at course level, and alternative modes of assessment that are less vulnerable to the use of GenAI. The Board of Examiners uses a checklist to verify whether instructions regarding the use of GenAI in assessments have been included.

As a consequence, the number of (writing) assignments has been reduced and more testing takes place at exam venues. In case of (writing) assignments that students work on outside contact hours, the writing process is included in the assessment. This can be both formatively and summatively, for instance by organising interim reflection moments, having interim versions submitted, adding a logbook assignment, or adding an oral presentation, that may be followed by a discussion.

The programme also works on improving AI literacy. In the faculty undergraduate programme, students are taught how to use GenAI responsibly. This includes discussion of the risk of fraud, the ethical aspects of the use of GenAI, and teaching students how to generate high-quality input and output. In the RMSc programme, students are educated about AI literacy in the student introduction sessions.

Teachers may use AI in teaching. There are pilots to use GenAI to support teachers in assessing tests and giving feedback under the conditions that 1) teachers use a Chatbot that is approved by the UG, such as Mistral's Le Chat; 2) when using such tools, the teacher remains responsible for the content of what is taught and for student assessment. It is not permissible to make decisions/grading solely on the basis of a GenAI model. The assessment process and the tone and content of the feedback that is generated by AI should always be checked by the teacher.

4 Regular evaluation

The Board of Examiners assures the quality of assessment by supervising the execution of the Assessment Plan, including Assessment Programme, as decreed by the Faculty Board, including 18 prerequisites to ensure the quality of assessment and grading within the educational programmes (see Appendix 1). Characteristics of the Assessment Plan that are evaluated by the Board of Examiners annually are, for example:

- The links between the aims of the RMSc programme and the content of the curriculum.
- The links between the aims of each course and assessment procedure, content and method.
- The variety in assessment methods within each year.

The task of the RMSc Programme Committee is to evaluate the RMSc programme and to evaluate to what extent the teaching and examination regulations are followed. Further, the Committee has to judge the agreement with the program part of the teaching and examination regulations. The Programme Committee meets after each block (two in each semester), that is, four times per year. The Graduate School coordinator manages the course evaluations and provides administrative support to the committee.

Each course is evaluated once every three years. Students are provided with course evaluation forms for the selected courses that they were enrolled in. The results are summarized and sent to the lecturers and the Programme Committee members; lecturers are asked to provide a written response to this evaluation report. Based on both the evaluation report and the lecturer's response, the Programme Committee may decide to invite the lecturer(s) to the committee meeting in which the evaluation report and the lecturer's response will be discussed. After each Programme Committee meeting, the evaluations and the lecturer's response are published in the online course environment Brightspace, so that students receive feedback on their comments and suggestions. In addition to the course evaluations, the committee's focus lies on the coherence and overall quality of the programme.

Once a year, a separate Programme Committee meeting is organized in which the entire RMSc programme (including the individual courses) and the current state of affairs is evaluated and discussed.

Appendix 1 – Prerequisites Assessment Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences

Onderwerp van Toetsing

1a. Er zijn duidelijke eindtermen voor de opleiding geformuleerd die zijn vertaald naar leerdoelen voor de verschillende curriculumonderdelen.

1b. Om de eindtermen van de opleiding adequaat te kunnen toetsen zorgt de opleiding voor een goede aansluiting tussen de eindtermen van de opleiding, de leerdoelen van de curriculumonderdelen en de toetsing van de leerdoelen.

1c. Toetsvormen zijn afgeleid van de leerdoelen en sluiten daar goed bij aan.

1d. De onderwijsvorm van een curriculumonderdeel is consistent met de geselecteerde toetsvorm en de leerdoelen.

2. De Dublin descriptoren zijn uitgangspunt voor het vaststellen van de eindtermen van de opleiding en de leerdoelen van de curriculumonderdelen (inclusief veranderingen in de loop van de studie).

Programmering van Toetsing

3. Het 'toetsprogramma' is, vooral in de beginfase van de studie, dusdanig van opzet dat de student geregeld wordt getoetst en dat er geen ongewenste concurrentie tussen de toetsen en de andere programmaonderdelen bestaat. De toetsing van een curriculumonderdeel wordt dus bij voorkeur gespreid over de tijdsduur van het onderdeel.

4. Ieder curriculumonderdeel kent maximaal één tweede kans tentamen per collegejaar, georganiseerd op een moment dat het hertentamen zo min mogelijk concurreert met het reguliere onderwijs en de reguliere tentamens.

Toetsvormen en eisen aan toetsing

5. Het totale pakket aan toetsvormen moet goed aansluiten bij het beoogde leergedrag van de studenten in de opeenvolgende fasen van het curriculum. De toetsvorm van ieder curriculumonderdeel is een afgeleide van de leerdoelen van het desbetreffende onderdeel.

6. Iedere toets kent een zo groot mogelijke transparantie, validiteit en betrouwbaarheid.

7. De betrouwbaarheid wordt gewaarborgd door toetsen te maken van voldoende lengte (ook in tijd) en door duidelijke, van tevoren vastgestelde, beoordelingsprocedures te hanteren.

8. De (inhouds-)validiteit van de toetsen wordt gewaarborgd door de toetsinhouden aan te laten sluiten bij de leerdoelen.

Examinatoren

9. De examinatoren zijn de eindverantwoordelijken voor de beoordelingen van studenten op curriculumonderdelen, de Examencommissie is eindverantwoordelijk voor de beoordeling van studenten op opleidingsniveau.

10. Iedere docent is geschoold en/of bekwaam verklaard voor zijn/haar specifieke rol in het examenprogramma.

11. De Examencommissie is formeel verantwoordelijk voor de bekwaamheidsverklaring van de betrokkenen bij de toetsing van de studenten.

Regelgeving

12. De Onderwijs & Examenregeling en de Regels & Richtlijnen zijn transparant.

13. De wijze van cesuurbepaling is vooraf duidelijk gemotiveerd en vastgelegd.

Kwaliteitszorg voor toetsbeleid en toetsing

14. Elke opleiding kent een toetsbeleid waaruit de aandacht voor toetsing als instrument tot sturing blijkt en waarin de verantwoordelijkheden voor de uitvoering ervan zijn vastgesteld, evenals de wijze van periodieke evaluatie.

15. Per opleiding zijn er protocollen voor samenstelling, afname, beoordeling en analyse van toetsen.

16. Docenten passen peer review toe bij het construeren van een beoordelende toets.

17. De Bachelor- en Master's scriptie kennen twee (van elkaar onafhankelijke) beoordelaars.

18. Er is een archiveringssysteem voor al het relevante toetsmateriaal. De vereiste documentatie, de wijze van archivering en de verantwoordelijken voor de archivering zijn vastgelegd in een protocol dan wel het toetsplan.

university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences

Appendix 2a – RMSc Traineeship Report Assessment Form

Name and initials:
Student number:
Module: GMTRAIN10
Title Traineeship report:

Name supervisor:
Name 2nd assessor:
Grade:
ECTS: 10
Date:

Signature first supervisor:

Please ensure to carefully review and check the following points to confirm compliance:
☐ The grade has been agreed upon by the supervisor and the 2nd assessor
☐ Word count is within the limits (each part max. 1000 words)
☐ Explanation is included about if and how AI tools have been used in the process of completing the literature study report.

Procedure

1. In case of more than a single supervisor, the four-eyes principle is respected in the process evaluation, in the sense that the supervisors each give feedback. These can be the first supervisor, second supervisor and an external supervisor. A final grade is approved after discussion between the supervisors if their initial assessments disagree. The first supervisor fills out this form.

2. The student will be assessed on process, skills, their academic attitude, and their traineeship report, consisting of A. Self-evaluation; B. Output.
   In the case of an internal traineeship, the first and second supervisor independently assess the traineeship report; the first supervisor also assesses the process, skills and academic attitude. Both supervisors subsequently jointly decide on a grade for the traineeship.
   In the case of an external traineeship, the same procedure is followed by the internal supervisor and the external supervisor, with the difference that the internal supervisor has the final say in the grading.

   The various dimensions within each category are evaluated on a scale from unsatisfactory to excellent. You may tick two adjacent boxes.
   A student cannot pass when one of the parts is marked 'unsatisfactory'. If a part is marked as 'unsatisfactory', the student gets one opportunity to revise and submit, within a period of 2 weeks. Each of the categories needs to have been evaluated at least satisfactory (grade 6) overall by both evaluators to pass. Please use the 'guidelines for grading' table below to decide on a grade.

3. The student and supervisors organize a 'project evaluation conversation' to reflect on the student's past performance in conducting the research by discussing self-reflection and the grading. The student hands in a reflection report prior to this evaluation conversation. After the evaluation conversation, the first supervisor fills out this assessment form.

4. The first supervisor submits this form to the Graduate School rema.bss@rug.nl and gives a copy to the student. The Graduate School will send the grade to the Student Service Desk.

Guidelines for grading	**Corresponding overall grade for the traineeship**
Indicating unsatisfactory at least once	5 or lower
Predominantly indicating satisfactory	6
Predominantly indicating between satisfactory and good	7
Predominantly indicating good and very good	8
Predominantly indicating between very good and excellent	9
Predominantly indicating excellent	10

A. Self-evaluation: Student specific learning goals (assessed by the first supervisor)

Learning goals (as described in A. Self-evaluation and traineeship plan) Please indicate and evaluate the learning goals as formulated in the traineeship plan	**Unsatisfactory**	**Satisfactory**	**Good**	**Very good**	**Excellent**
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Explanation:					

Process and Skills (as far as described in the Traineeship report, and as assessed by the first supervisor)	**Unsatisfactory**	**Satisfactory**	**Good**	**Very good**	**Excellent**	**Not applicable**
Planning and time management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Experimental set-up (e.g. designing, developing, programming)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Data collection	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Data analysis	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Writing process	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Explanation:						

Academic attitude (as assessed by the first supervisor)

	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very good	Excellent	Not applicable
Independence in conducting research	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proactive behaviour	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Inventiveness and creativity	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Motivation and eagerness	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Critical attitude	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Dealing with feedback and advice	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Perseverance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Participation in lab group/ research meetings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other aspects of academic attitude, such as [to be filled in by the supervisor if desired]:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Explanation:						

B. Output (as described in B. Output)

A specification of the activities conducted during the traineeship is clearly and completely described	☐ Yes	☐ No

	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very good	Excellent	Not applicable
The problem is clearly described and linked to the activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
A discussion of the ethical aspects is clearly described	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The results and contributions are clearly described	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Explanation:						

Appendix 2b – Clinical Traineeship Assessment Form

Student name:	
Student number:	
Master track:	
Examiner:	
Date:	
ECTS:	
Course code	REMA: GMTRAIN20.2023-2024.1
Type of internship:	Integrated internship / Clinical internship
Internship organization:	
Place of the internship organization	
Internship period:	from … / … / 202… until … / … /202…
200 hours diagnostics	Yes/no
BAPD:	Yes/no
Clinical internship (according to LOGO criteria)	Yes/no
E-learning module Organisatie in de GGZ	Yes/no
CAT presentation	pass/fail
CAT interviewer	pass/fail
Grade daily functioning	
Grade internship report	
Final grade (grade internship report + or – 0.5 when grade daily functioning is higher or lower, respectively)	
Signature examiner	

CAT presentation

1. Introduction
1.1 Case description
1.2 Formulation of clinical question
Insufficient/ sufficient

2. Methods
2.1 Reformulation in terms of PICO
2.2 Well-identified search terms (explicitly including MESH / Thesaurus terms, use synonyms) + comprehensive scientific literature search (consulting at least Cochrane library, PsycInfo, Medline)
2.3 Consultation of relevant guideline (may be national or international)
2.4 Description of the selection process of relevant literature (transparency; at least 4 publications in total; including at least 1 systematic review / meta-analysis, 1 more specific RCT/cohort, 1 guideline, 1 other)
Insufficient/ sufficient

3. CAT/ conclusion/ advice
3.1 Summary and critical appraisal of each publication (good consideration of general issues as well as issues related to the generalizability of the findings for the specific patient; consider the effect size or the meaning of the potential effect for the patient. For the guideline: also consider how systematically it was developed and by whom)
3.2 General conclusion (based on literature search for this patient)
3.3 Advice to the patient (taking the patient characteristics into account as well as institutional aspects in the context of the internship including consideration of shared decision making)
Insufficient/ sufficient

4. Presentation skills
4.1 Structure (clear structure)
4.2 Design (readability of text, images, function of figures/tables, attractiveness/ polished lay-out)
4.3 Content (argumentation, content-related answering of questions)
4.4 Verbal elements (appropriate usage, volume, pace, liveliness)
4.5 Communication (makes eye contact with the audience, responds to the audience, liveliness, non-verbal communication)
4.6 Tools (relation between text and speech, timing of image alternation, position in relation to the screen)
4.7 Time (has obliged to the agreed duration)
Insufficient/ sufficient

Comments: **Final assessment: Fail/ pass**

Internship Report

1 = insufficient, 2 = sufficient, 3 = more than sufficient, 4 = good, 5 = excellent

1. Description of institution	**INSUF 1**	**SUF 2**	**MORE SUF 3**	**GOOD 4**	**EXC 5**
1.1 Description of organization *A clear, concise and exhaustive description of the organization and its target population, scope, objectives/procedures and position to other organizations.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.2 Description of tasks of psychologist within the institution *A clear, concise and exhaustive description of the position of the psychologist/behavioral scientist/ supervisor within the organization, their tasks/ daily work and tasks of the intern.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.3 Scientific/ theoretical framework *Good description of embedment of working methods of organization/ psychologist (e.g. diagnostics/ treatment) in scientific/ theoretical framework .*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments:					

2. Case	**INSUF 1**	**SUF 2**	**MORE SUF 3**	**GOOD 4**	**EXC 5**
2.1 Context description *A clear, concise and exhaustive description of personal information, question of referrer, case history, description of complaints (nature/type, duration, course, intensity), client request and other relevant information*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.2 Model *The problems of the case are summarized in a model (e.g. a cognitive case conceptualization). The relevant variables are part of the model. The model logically follow from anamnesis information.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.3 Clarity of question/ aim of treatment/ project *The research question/ hypotheses/ aim of treatment is clearly formulated and testable/ viable and logically follow from background/ anamnesis information.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.4 Research design single case methodology *The chosen design of research is in line with the research questions.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.5 Method *The action plan, procedure and tools fit with the question/ aim. The method is appropriate, is executed correctly, and is clearly described.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.6 Statistical analyses single case methodology	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

The planned statistical analyses are appropriate and described clearly.					
2.7 Results *a) assessment case: observations and results (including rating, label, peer group) are clearly described without interpretation according to APA guidelines;* *b) treatment case: clear description of sessions and description of results from point of view of client and (if available) objective pretest and posttest measurement*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.8 Visual analysis *Results using single case methodology are visually presented, as part of the statistical analyses, and as a way of providing feedback to a patient (could be the same format). Note that the type of graphs need to be shown (even with limited data). Report on handling of missing data. The visual analysis has to be functional, clear and complete.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.9 Conclusion/Advice *A clear, concise and exhaustive summary of the most important findings in relation to the aim and/or hypotheses/research questions including concrete-action orientated recommendations. Client's request (case) is referred to in advice.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.10 Scientific/ theoretical framework *Good underpinning of all elements in scientific/ theoretical framework (e.g. underpinning of research questions/ hypothesis testing by literature including peer-reviewed journal articles, clinical hypothesis testing as scientific n=1 study, link to evidence-based methodologies).*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments:					

3. Reflection	**INSUF** **1**	**SUF** **2**	**MORE SUF** **3**	**GOOD** **4**	**EXC** **5**
3.1 Reflection on learning goals/ personal functioning *A clear and concise summary of personal functioning during the internship based on the most important (personal) learning goals with attention to the learning process.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.2 Strength-Weakness analysis *A clear strength-weakness analysis including suggestions for future training that logically follows from personal functioning during the internship.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.3 Reflection on case	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

The approach and results are critically and transparently discussed including good underpinning of choices, learning moments and suggestions for improvement.					
3.4 Reflection on single case methodology *Adequate level of critical reflection on the single case design used, the usefulness and practical possibilities of such designs in clinical practice including ethical considerations*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.5 Reflection on organization *The working approach is critically discussed including suggestions for improvement.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.6 Reflection on ethical aspects *Professional ethical aspects of approach of case/project and ethical aspects of working approach of the institution are clearly discussed including suggestions for improvements.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments:					

4. Format and coherence	**INSUF 1**	**SUF 2**	**MORE SUF 3**	**GOOD 4**	**EXC 5**
4.1 Lay-out and use of language *Lay-out and references are according APA standards. Correct use of punctuation, spelling and grammar. Appropriate style and vocabulary.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.2 Readability *Writing is clear, fluent and concise. Adequate structure of arguments.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments:					

5. Process	**INSUF 1**	**SUF 2**	**MORE SUF 3**	**GOOD 4**	**EXC 5**
5.1 Commitment and deadlines have been observed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.2 Independence	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.3 Use of feedback	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments:					

Final Grade Report	Grade (1–10)

Guidelines for grading: give grades in multiples of 0.5

Predominantly indicating 1s	5 or lower
Predominantly indicating 2s	6
Predominantly indicating 3s	7
Predominantly indicating 4s	8
Predominantly indicating 5s	9
Exclusively indicating 5s	10

Comments:

university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences

Appendix 3 – RMSc Thesis Assessment Form

Research Master's Thesis Assessment Form

Procedure: Each thesis is evaluated by two assessors. Each assessor fills out an individual assessment form. The assessors jointly determine the grade which is reflected in the joint grading box on the first assessor's form, including a clear motivation of the grade. The first assessor will discuss this joint grading form with the student in order to provide feedback about the student's performance. Both assessors submit their assessment forms to rema.bss@rug.nl. Please pay attention to the information in the appendix and the rubrics before filling out this form.

Assessment Research Master's Thesis
GMREMA03

Student's name:
Student's number:
Title of the Master's Thesis:

First assessor's name:
Second assessor's name:
Date: Click or tap to enter a date.
ECTS: 30

To be filled by the Graduate School
Final grade:

This form is an:
☐ Individual form filled out by the first assessor, together with a joint motivation for the grade by the first and second assessor
☐ Individual form filled out by the second assessor

How to fill in your assessment?

In the case of "unsatisfactory" check the check-box. Otherwise, move the slider anywhere on the scale between "satisfactory" and "excellent". Please refer to the Rubrics for assessing the different aspects of the thesis (see Brightspace). If aspects of the Rubrics are not applicable or missing you can indicate your comments on these aspects – and how they are relevant for the grade – in the text box for your final assessment of the thesis. The Rubrics are based on the intended learning outcomes of the Research Master's thesis that are described in Ocasys.

To be checked by the first assessor before the assessment of the thesis takes place

☐ word count is within the limits (6,000-10,000 words for core text (i.e. introduction, methods, results, discussion including abstract, keywords and excluding references, tables, figures and max. 5 appendices)
If the word count of the thesis is not met, assessment of the thesis may not take place. The student needs to revise the thesis such that it meets the word limit.
☐ deviations of the Master's thesis from the proposed plan are indicated on the title page
On the title page, a short reflection should be included on the deviations of the actual Master's thesis research from the proposed research as originally presented in the Master's thesis plan.
☐ protocol for data storage has been followed

Link to rubrics	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory / Good / Excellent
Title	☐	
Topic	☐	
Introduction		
Research problem		
A. Topic	☐	
B. Research problem	☐	
C. Research questions	☐	
D. Concepts	☐	
Theoretical framework		
A. Theory	☐	
B. Sources	☐	
C. Hypotheses	☐	
Method		
Respondents, design and procedure		
A. Research design	☐	
B. Data-collection	☐	
C. Sample and sampling procedure	☐	
Research instruments and variables		
A. Research instruments	☐	
B. Variables	☐	
Analyses	☐	
Clarity with respect to replication	☐	

[Link to rubrics]	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory / Good / Excellent
Results		
Data inspection (as appendix in the Research Master's thesis)		
A. Description of data quality	☐	
B. Assumptions and interventions/ manipulations	☐	
Description of the results		
A. Textual description and coherence	☐	
B. Interpretation	☐	
Use of tables and figures		
A. Clarity	☐	
B. Necessity	☐	
Discussion		
Answering the research question(s)		
C. Summary and connection to research question(s) and hypotheses	☐	
D. Interpretation of results in light of theory	☐	
Discussion of theoretical and methodological limitations of the research	☐	
Implications		
A. Value and/ or implications for practice and/ or theory	☐	
B. Implications and recommendations for future research	☐	
Structure and compliance with APA 6 guidelines		
Structure	☐	
References	☐	

Thesis assessment by first/ second assessor

The thesis assessment has been divided into two parts:

- First, the first and second assessor grade the thesis as a scientific end product without taking the process into account. Thus, they grade the thesis similar to how a scientific journal, Board of Examiners, or visitation committee would assess the thesis independent of the qualities of the student who wrote the thesis.
- Next, the first assessor takes the process into account and evaluates the performance of the student with regard to aspects that pertain to the process (independence, creativity, etc.).

It is important that the grading process is transparent and that these two aspects of the thesis (the scientific end product and the process) are assessed separately.

Assessment first/second assessor independently
Please indicate your assessment of the thesis (grade between 1-10, see page 7) Grade:
Motivation and argumentation:

This box should only be filled out on the first assessor's form. *Assessment of the thesis as scientific end product (without taking into account the process)*
Assessment after deliberation between first and second assessor (grade between 1-10):
Motivation and argumentation for the final thesis assessment:

This box should only be filled out on the first assessor's form. Process assessment
The process leading to the thesis is evaluated by the first assessor, informed by the daily supervisor (in case these are different persons). The process is to be evaluated on the basis of the student's performance in terms of… - Collaboration with the individuals (researchers, participants, …) involved in the research project - Proactively working, showing self-efficacy: taking initiative, asking for guidance in good time - Progress: Commitments and deadlines have been observed, and the student has executed the thesis project within an appropriate time frame - Creativity: processing of original and refreshing ideas of high-quality - Reflection: active, high-quality reflections carrying out the project, profiting from feedback The performance with regard to the process has to be evaluated with a number within the range minus 0.5 up to plus 0.5, which expresses the performance on the process, as expressed by the thesis assessment. The meaning of the values -0.5, 0 and +0.5 are thus as follows: -0.5: The student performed much worse on 'Process' than would be expected based on the Final thesis assessment;

0: The student performed equal on 'Process' as would be expected based on the Final thesis assessment; +0.5: The student performed much better on 'Process' than would be expected based on the Final thesis assessment.
Process assessment (value in the range -0.5 and +0.5):
Motivation and argumentation:

Final grade = Final thesis assessment (grade between 1-10) + Process assessment (value in the range -0.5 and +0.5)	
Final grade:	
Signature first assessor:	Signature second assessor:
To be checked by the first assessor, via Brightspace, before the grade is communicated to the student: ☐ A plagiarism scan has been performed. There is no suspicion of plagiarism.	

Important: Submit the assessment forms to rema.bss@rug.nl. Only assessment forms with signatures will be accepted.

university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences

Appendix to the Research Master's Thesis Assessment Form

Please pay attention to the following when grading a thesis:
The final assessment of the Research Master's programme is the RMSc thesis. This thesis should be at the level of a first draft of a research paper that may be submitted to an international, peer-reviewed journal, and may form the basis of a proposal for a PhD thesis or for an application for research funding.

Guidelines for assigning a grade for the thesis after assessing the thesis aspects are presented in the table below. Grades must be expressed as a multiple of .5 (with the exception of 5.5).

Assessment of aspects of the RMSc thesis	Corresponding overall grade for the thesis
Indicating unsatisfactory at least once (only applies to the main components Introduction, Method, Results, Discussion)	5 or lower
Predominantly indicating satisfactory	6
Predominantly indicating between satisfactory and good	7
Predominantly indicating good	8
Predominantly indicating between good and excellent	9
Predominantly indicating excellent	10

Procedure RMSc thesis assessment

1. Each thesis is evaluated by two assessors.
2. The student writes the thesis and submits it to the first assessor, i.e. the internal supervisor. The second assessor will receive the manuscript of the thesis after approval by the first assessor and will judge the thesis within 10 working days. The second assessor will also receive a reflection on the deviations of the actual Master's thesis research from the proposed research as originally presented in the Master's thesis plan. This reflection is included on the title page of the thesis.
3. The first and second assessor fill out an individual assessment form.
4. The first and second assessor jointly determine the grade, on the basis of the version delivered to the second assessor. Modifications can be made upon the second assessor's approval, but will not change the grade.
5. The first and second assessor jointly determine the grade which is reflected in the joint grading box on the first assessor's form, including a clear motivation of the grade.
6. If the Master's thesis is considered adequate, a plagiarism scan takes place via Brightspace.
7. The first assessor informs the student about the final grade of the Master's thesis and discusses the joint grading form with the student in order to provide feedback about the student's performance.
8. The first assessor submits the grade to rema.bss@rug.nl.
9. The first and second assessor submit their assessment forms to rema.bss@rug.nl.
10. A complete overview of the RMSc thesis regulations and procedures (e.g., the graduation guide) can be found on Brightspace.