

<b>Dissertation writing</b>	<b>Fail</b>	<b>Low pass</b>	<b>Pass</b>	<b>High pass</b>
<b>Structure (10%)</b>	Disorganized and unclear presentation; consistently poor spelling and grammar; disrespectful use of references and quotations.	Slightly disorganized and not clear presentation; poor spelling and grammar; inappropriate use of references and quotations.	Clear writing style. Coherent and logical presentation. Well-structured and focus. Good use of references and quotations.	Excellent structure, focus, presentation and writing style, contributing to a highly compelling argument. Writing is publication quality. Excellent use of references and quotations.
<b>Approach (25%)</b>  <b>MA dissertations will be assessed considering the following aspects:</b>  <b>a) Its quality as an academic work.</b>  <b>b) Originality, significance and creativity.</b>	No clear research question; no clear expected contribution to knowledge.	The research question does not define properly the aim of the dissertation. No coherent relationship to existing literature.	a) Objectives are clear and reflect understanding of subject matter and literature.  b) Originality and high significance in scope.	a) Excellent research question and arguments showing personal insight. Very effective use of evidence to support argument.  b) Exceptional potential for discovery; high critic or artistic value.
<b>Primary and secondary sources for the topic (10%)</b>	Sources and research literature are not cited.	Some sources and research literature are cited. However, the text does not make a distinction between primary and secondary sources.	Primary sources are distinguished from secondary sources. Research literature is integrated into a coherent context framing the research.	Mastery of appropriate cannon is evident; sources cited are rich and diverse; awareness of appropriate mix of primary and secondary sources for the topic.
<b>Argument structure. Integration (35%)</b>	No articulation of the operating assumptions, biases and positions of the researcher.	Generally clear presentation but awkward structure and limited development of argument.	Coherent and logical presentation; compelling argument.	Builds more powerful argument; articulates a sophisticated relationship with the literature supporting, extending or refuting.

<b>Oral presentation</b>	<b>Fail</b>	<b>Low pass</b>	<b>Pass</b>	<b>High pass</b>
--------------------------	-------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------

<p><b>Oral defense of the Dissertation: <i>elocutio</i> (10%)</b></p>	<p>The student exhibits no knowledge of the topic and does not show the ability to present it to the dissertation committee.</p>	<p>The student demonstrates no or little ability to present orally the dissertation research; an incomplete and incoherent oral defense; the student does not keep to time at all.</p>	<p>Clear structure with clearly defined sections so that each section links with and builds on the previous one, producing a coherent and logical discussion of selected material. The student maintains the committee's attention.</p>	<p>The presentation is very interesting and compelling. It demonstrates an excellent ability to present orally the dissertation; high degree of precision; insightful discussion; evidence of independent and critical judgment.</p>
<p><b>Ability to respond to questions: <i>disputatio</i> (10%)</b></p>	<p>Demonstrates no ability to respond to questions posed by the committee.</p>	<p>Demonstrates little ability to respond to questions posed by the committee.</p>	<p>Student demonstrates ability to respond to questions posed by the committee. Demonstrates excellent understanding of topic; clearly focuses on the major concepts of topic and considers wider implications and different viewpoints.</p>	<p>Perceptive and accurate answers to questions demonstrating excellent knowledge and engagement with topic. Shows evidence of wide and often critical Reading.</p>