

Sub-evaluations for individual assessment items must always be justified verbally on the assessment form. A verbal justification is particularly important in cases where the rating falls into the categories "Excellent" or "Satisfactory". An individual assessment item may be disregarded only for a justified reason, which should also be recorded on the evaluation form. Assessment items 'Independence of the Student' and 'Staying on schedule' are based solely on the instructor's assessment. The total grade of the thesis is not an arithmetic mean of the assessment items; depending on the nature of the thesis, the evaluation may emphasize different aspects of the work. The student must know the emphasis at the start of the work and, if necessary, the emphasis must be justified in the summary of the assessment.

| | Excellent, 5 | Very good, 4 | Good, 3 | Satisfactory, 2 | Sufficient, 1 |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| Mastery of methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Background ▪ Choice of methods ▪ Description of working methods | The methods used are understood and described clearly. Choice of methods is justified in detail and with knowledge of the limitations and consequences of the choice. The working methods are described in detail, so that replication of the study is easy. | Partly better than good, but not excellent in all parts. | The methods used are mainly understood and their main features described. The choice of methods is justified, but the justification is partly general. The description of the working methods is deficient in places, but the main elements of the study are easy to reproduce. | Partly better than sufficient, but not good in all parts. | Not all the methods used are fully understood and/or described in a comprehensible way. The choice of methods is sometimes not justified. The description of the working methods is sometimes poor, which can make it difficult to reproduce parts of the study. |
| Use of literature <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Range of literature sources and their diversity ▪ Relevance of literature sources and their use | The literature used is comprehensive and justifiably defined, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Literature includes the main original sources and the most significant recent publications relevant to the study. The use of literature is broad, and it provides an excellent overview of the study's background. | | The literature used is mainly comprehensive, but there are some flaws in source selection. References include both the most relevant original sources and the most recent publications relevant to the study. The use of literature is good, and it provides a clear overview of the study's background. | | The literature used is partly incomplete and/or unjustifiably defined. Some of the relevant critical original sources or recent publications have not been cited. The use of literature is one-sided and unbalanced, and the overall picture of the study's background is limited. |

| | Excellent, 5 | Very good, 4 | Good, 3 | Satisfactory, 2 | Sufficient, 1 |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| <p>Results and their analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presentation of results ▪ Evaluation of the reliability of the results | <p>The results have been examined systematically and thoroughly. Results are presented in an illustrative manner. The imitations and the reliability of the results are critically assessed in relation to existing scientific information.</p> | <p>Partly better than good, but not excellent in all parts.</p> | <p>The results have been examined systematically, but the examination is in some places limited. Results are presented in a clear manner. The limitations and the reliability of the results have been assessed, partly also in relation to existing scientific information.</p> | <p>Partly better than sufficient, but not good in all parts.</p> | <p>The results are mostly catalogued, and not systematically discussed or reviewed. Visual presentation of results is partly incomplete and/or difficult to understand. The limitations and the reliability of the results is poorly analysed.</p> |
| <p>Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Importance of the results ▪ Answering research questions ▪ Discussion and conclusions | <p>The importance and the relation of the results to the objectives of the research is understood and presented clearly. The results are consistent with the research question, and are comprehensively related to the existing scientific information. The conclusions are critical and logical, and thoroughly justified. The study has considered the applicability of the results and poses new research questions.</p> | | <p>The importance of the key results and the main aim of the study are well understood. Results are broadly in line with the research question, and have been reviewed in relation to the existing existing scientific knowledge. The conclusions summarise the main findings, which are clear and well-founded. The study has discussed the applicability of the results.</p> | | <p>The importance of the results and/or the aim of the study is not fully understood. The results and the research question are partially unclear, and the evaluation of the results in relation to the existing scientific information is limited. Conclusions are few and/or poorly justified. The applicability of the results has not been discussed.</p> |

| | Excellent, 5 | Very good, 4 | Good, 3 | Satisfactory, 2 | Sufficient, 1 |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| <p>Independence of the student</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adoption of working methods ▪ Self-initiation ▪ Use of guidance ▪ Role of the supervisor | <p>The student has adopted the used working methods and been active in solving research problems and presenting own views and ideas. The student has made effective use of the supervisor's advice and guidance, keeping the supervisors informed on the progress of the work. The contribution of the supervisor in moving the project forward has been minor.</p> | <p>Partly better than good, but not excellent in all parts.</p> | <p>The student has adopted the most important working methods, and participated in problem solving and presenting own views and ideas, at least when asked to do so. The student has made use of the supervisor's advice and guidance, and regularly reviewed the progress with the supervisor. The supervisor has partly assisted in moving the project forward.</p> | <p>Partly better than sufficient, but not good in all parts.</p> | <p>The student has not fully adopted the working methods., and has hardly expressed own views or participated in problem solving. The student has not made effective use of the supervisor's advice and guidance, and the progress of the work has not been communicated forward. Supervisor's contribution has been significant in some parts.</p> |
| <p>Staying on schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planning ▪ Handling delays | <p>The student has worked systematically. The work has been completed within the agreed timeframe. Possible delays have been justified and agreed with the supervisor.</p> | | <p>The student has worked mainly systematically. The work has been partly delayed from the agreed timetable, but the delays have been mostly justified.</p> | | <p>The student has had difficulties in working systematically. Staying on schedule has been challenging and the delays have not always been justified.</p> |

| | Excellent, 5 | Very good, 4 | Good, 3 | Satisfactory, 2 | Sufficient, 1 |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Style and language of the text</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scientific style ▪ Clarity and structure of the text ▪ Fluency of the text ▪ Grammar and spelling | <p>The text is written in an academic style from start to finish. The text is very coherent, well-structured, and easy to read as well as expressive and illustrative. A work of high linguistic quality with almost flawless use of language.</p> | <p>Partly better than good, but not excellent in all parts.</p> | <p>The work is stylistically coherent and mainly of academic style. The text is understandable and coherent in structure, but linguistically one-sided. There are a few grammatical errors, which do not, however, impede comprehension.</p> | <p>Partly better than sufficient, but not good in all parts.</p> | <p>The work is stylistically incoherent and partly colloquial. The text is unbalanced and illogical in places, with problems in fluency. There are several repeated grammatical errors, which make it difficult to understand the text.</p> |
| <p>The layout and finishing of the thesis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Layout ▪ Visual expression ▪ Bibliography and references ▪ Finishing details | <p>The layout is fully in line with the guidelines. Tables, pictures, graphs, etc. are informative and well-chosen, and their captions are clear and concise. References and citations are clear, concise, and easy to understand. The layout of the work is polished and almost flawless.</p> | | <p>The layout is broadly in line with the guidelines. Tables, figures, graphs, etc. are understandable, and their captions are clear. References and citations are largely accurate. The layout of the work is good with only minor errors that are not distracting.</p> | | <p>The layout differs from the guidelines. Tables, figures, graphs, etc. are partly difficult to understand or irrelevant to the subject, and/or their captions have deficiencies. References and citations are not accurate. Layout of the work is unattractive in part and errors are clearly visible.</p> |