UNIQUE EUROPEAN MASTER'S PROGRAMME
4 European cities. 4 top universities. 1 joint Masters degree.

eu —hem
EUROPEAN MASTER IN HEALTH ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT

| BOLOGNA | INNSBRUCK | OSLO | ROTTERDAM |

The European Master in Health Economics & Management coordinated by:

Erasmus University Rotterdam
Burgemeester Oudlaan 50
3062 PA Rotterdam
The Netherlands

tel: +3110 - 408 8555
e-mail: euhem@bmg.eur.nl

www.eu-hem.eu

Evaluation form Eu-HEM thesis
To be filled in by supervisor, *prior* to the defence

Date:	July 11th, 2017
Student name:	Katrin SPÖGLER
student ID:	1510360027
Title thesis:	Two-tier healthcare
Date of final exam/defence:	
Supervisor:	Nils Mevenkamp
Location:	MCI Management Center Innsbruck

Criteria*	Bad	Borderline	Competent	Good	Excellent
Introduction/objective				x	
Theory and literature			x		
Methods and results			x		
Conclusion and discussion			x		
Writing skills			x		
Process			x		

External assessor within country:

External assessor partner institute:

* Please see 'Matrix assessment criteria' for more information

Proposal final grade*: Satisfactory (77%)

* Please use grading system of the supervisor's university

Short explanation of final grade:

Objective: p1-4 clear problem definition and clear objective without any suggestive connotation - Content: p5 examples / do countries with one-tier health system exist? - P6 If a one-tier system is a theoretical construct, how can the Austrian discussion be explained (if there is a one- vs- two tear system in Austria)? - P8/32/35/47 touches the main question: Is the Austrian health care system two-tier with regard to comfort ("hotel character") or in terms of: medical quality ("treatment quality")? This is discussed briefly in the conclusion (p50f) but not "nailed" explicitly - Literature/Sources of knowledge: P18ff discussion of Austrian/Tyrolean health system slightly outdated (Leopold et al. 2008; ÖBIG 2008); Look up more recent data? E.g. p22: check-ups still increased since 2008? - Structure/Style: Easy to read, easy to follow although expressiveness is partly limited; Why separate ch2 from ch3? - Methodology: well documented process - p25/26 operationalization/ creation of interview guideline? role of borderline interviewees unclear: why were they interviewed, how do they contribute to patients & doctors, how do they relate to theory? - p26/27 selection of interviewees? - p31ff results from interviews taken as if they were universally valid / generally accepted? Generalization? – Discussion/ Conclusion: p46f/ p49f discussion is summary of results while conclusion is summary of literature review > linkage between these parts? (> a real discussion is lacking)

ALMA MATER STUDIORUM UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

MCI MANAGEMENT CENTER INNSBRUCK

UNIVERSITAS OSLOENSIS

Erasmus University Rotterdam

UNIQUE EUROPEAN MASTER'S PROGRAMME

4 European cities. 4 top universities. 1 joint Masters degree.

eu
–hem
EUROPEAN MASTER IN
HEALTH ECONOMICS
AND MANAGEMENT

| BOLOGNA | INNSBRUCK | OSLO | ROTTERDAM |

**The European Master in
Health Economics & Management**
coordinated by:

Erasmus University Rotterdam
Burgemeester Oudlaan 50
3062 PA Rotterdam
The Netherlands

tel: +3110 - 408 8555
e-mail: euhem@bmg.eur.nl

www.eu-hem.eu

Evaluation form Eu-HEM Oral examination (defence)
To be filled in by the Oral examination committee, *after* the defence

Members of the examining committee:	Name supervisor Name co-reader Name 3rd committee member
Location:	EUR, MCI, UiO, or UniBO
Date:	………………..
Time (from - until):	……………….

Comments:

Grades oral examination			
Part I: Presentation of Master Thesis			
Part II: Defense of Master Thesis			
Part III: Interdisciplinary Oral Examination			
Grade of Oral Master's Examination			….

Overall Grade			
Part A: Master Thesis			
Part B: Oral Master Examination			
Overall Grade*:			…..

* consisting of the grade of the Master's Thesis and the overall grade of the oral Master's Examination

Chair of the Examining Committee: name 3rd committee member

Member of the Examining Committee: name supervisor

Member of the Examining Committee: name co-reader

Criteria	Bad	Borderline	Competent	Good	Excellent
Introduction and objective	Background information on the topic is not clearly expressed.	The introduction includes relevant background information, but is too wide or narrow in scope. Some of the information bears only partial relevance to the topic.	Includes relevant background information on the subject matter. The relevance of the research and the research objective is well justified. Shows a general understanding of the research area.	Includes relevant background information on the subject matter. The relevance of the research and the research objective is well justified. Displays a good understanding of the research area.	Includes relevant background information and a skilful explanation of the relevance of the research and the research objective. Shows an excellent understanding of the research area. The scope of the thesis is appropriate.
	No objective is indicated, or it is indicated ambiguously.	The research objective is indicated, but is ambiguous or poorly structured.	Although the objective is sufficient, its formulation is somewhat awkward, confusing or complex.	The objective is clear and concise.	The objective is clear, well structured and justified.
Criteria	Bad	Borderline	Competent	Good	Excellent
Theory and literature	No conceptual or theoretical discussion of any value. There is little documented about the current state of knowledge.	Definition and use of theoretical concepts are confusing and no attempt has been made to provide a theoretical synthesis or evaluation.	Concepts are sufficiently defined and appropriate, set in the context of literature.	Conceptual framework is developed, or existing one adapted, in the context of evaluated literature	A good or excellent attempt has been made to theorise beyond the current state of literature.
	There is no clear relationship between any theory (and the current state of knowledge) and the research objective.	There is only a tenuous connection between theory (and the current state of knowledge) and the research objective.	There is a sufficient connection between theory (and the current state of knowledge) and the research objective.	There is a clear connection between theory (and the current state of knowledge) and the research objective.	Theory (and the current state of knowledge) and the research objective are skillfully and innovatively linked. These form a coherent whole.

Criteria	Bad	Borderline	Competent	Good	Excellent
Methods and results	Description of methodology is severely lacking or inappropriate for the thesis objective.	Methodology is defined, but it remains unclear why they were chosen for the thesis.	Methodology has been described well and the use is sufficiently justified. ⦿	Methodology has been described according to **good** academic practice, and the use is sufficiently justified.	Methodology has been described according to **excellent** academic practice, and the use is sufficiently justified.
	Methods have been applied inconsistently, wrongly or extremely weakly.	Methods have been applied rather inconsistently, partly wrongly or weakly.	Methods have been applied correctly and appropriately according to accepted practice within the discipline.	Methods have been applied flawlessly. Shows an understanding of methodological issues. ⦿	**M**ethods have been applied at an **excellent** level or **advanced** methods have been used flawlessly. Contribution to development and methods for collecting and analysing research material and/or methodological debate.
	Presentation of research results is severely flawed.	Presentation of results is superficial, confusing or inconsistent.	Presentation of results is logical and clear. ⦿	Presentation of results is unambiguously and flawlessly. If applicable: the images, tables and text support each other, but do not overlap. Use of quotes, information of document analysis or observations is well done.	Same as for 'good'.

Criteria	Bad	Borderline	Competent	Good	Excellent
Conclusion and discussion	The empirical research is not based on the stated theories.	The connection between theory and empirical research is tenuous.	Connection to underlying theory has been established. Theory and empirical research are in dialogue.	Connection to underlying theory has been **well** established. Theory and empirical research are in an **interesting** dialogue.	Theory and empirical research are skilfully and innovatively linked.
	Analysis of the results is superficial and lacking.	There are occasional comments that show some insight but a sufficient interpretation of the results is lacking.	The analysis evaluates the wider relevance of the results. Findings are treated as straightforward and unproblematic. Interpretation is done in a mechanical way.	Results are analysed critically and in a versatile manner. The wider relevance of the results is evaluated with the future in mind.	Sophisticated interpretation of findings.
	Conclusions are either missing or unconnected to the content or objectives of the thesis.	Conclusions are not sufficiently in line with the objectives of the thesis.	Conclusions are somewhat in line with the objectives of the thesis.	Conclusions are entirely in line with the objectives of the thesis.	Conclusions are entirely in line with the objectives of the thesis. Conclusions are firmly based on the findings, but show a creative spark and/or transcend them

Criteria	Bad	Borderline	Competent	Good	Excellent
Writing skills	Structure: The thesis lacks a logical structure; headings are lacking or non-specific	All chapters in the thesis are logically connected to each other, but within chapters the structure of some sections and/or paragraphs is illogical; most headings do not express the content of the chapter or paragraph	All chapters and sections are logically connected with each other (one issue automatically leads to the next); most headings are clearly describing the central content of the chapters and paragraphs	All chapters and sections are logically connected with each other (one issue automatically leads to the next); all headings are clearly describing the central content of the chapters and paragraphs	Same as for "Good"
	Writing style: the thesis lacks an academic writing style, and is not easy to read	The writing style is not consistent throughout the text (academic and non-academic);	The thesis is easy to read, but academic writing style is not yet consistent through the whole thesis	The thesis is written in academic language and is easy to read	The thesis is fluently written in academic language; the writing style is distinctive and persuasive
	Technical: The thesis consists of many grammatical and typological errors causing difficulties in understanding the meaning of many sentences	The thesis consists of several grammatical and typological errors, but the meaning of most sentences is understandable	The thesis consist of some grammatical and typological errors	The thesis consist of only a few grammatical or typological errors	The thesis does not contain any grammatical or textual errors.
	List of references is incomplete or incorrect	List of references is inconsistent and not according to standards	The list of references is according to standards but may contain a few errors References to literature in the text are correct and consistent, using an approved reference style, but may contain a few errors	The list of references is according to standards and without errors; References to literature in the text are correct and consistent, using an approved reference style, without any errors	Same as for "Good"

Criteria for process

	Reduction of credits	Normal	Extra credits
Attitude	Student was not motivated to work on the thesis; wanted to go for the easiest solution	Student was motivated to work on the thesis and did what (s)he was asked to do	Student clearly enjoyed doing research, and was internally motivated; student takes initiative is creative (comes with own ideas) and willing to walk the extra mile
Dependence	The student was too dependent on the supervisor; student needed relatively more feedback than other students, and had much difficulty processing the feedback	Student-supervisor dependency was normal. Student understood (most of) the feedback received, and could process it independently, most of the time.	Student worked very independently on the thesis; hardly any feedback was needed; could process feedback very well
Control	Student did not make deadlines; in case of problems, student had the supervisor solve them	Student sticks to (almost) all deadlines	Student sticks to deadlines; was in control of own thesis process. In case of problems, student developed workarounds
Group process	Student was not an active member of the group	Student was an active member of the group	Student was an active member of the group; was willing to give feedback to and receive feedback from other students in the group

Criteria for the defence

	Reduction of credits	Normal	Extra credits
Quality of the presentation	Student had a weak presentation, either too superficial or too much emphasis on details; had difficulty with time management	Student had a good presentation; the main message was clearly put forward in 5 minutes	Student had a very strong presentation; the main message was clearly put forward in 5 minutes
Quality of the discussion	Student had, overall, less satisfactory answers to the questions from the supervisor and co-reader. Students' answers were not consistent with the thesis; there is doubt that the student understood the topic, theory, and/or method of the thesis.	Student had, overall, a satisfactory answer to the questions from the supervisor and co-reader, but stayed close to what was already written down in the thesis.	Student had, overall, a very good answer to the questions from the supervisor and co-reader, and could even argue beyond the thesis