

ASSESSMENT OF DOCTORAL THESIS / ASSESSMENT BOARD

The assessment board gives a proposal for the grade of the dissertation to the faculty council based on the public examination, the dissertation requirements, and the evaluation criteria for the dissertation. The proposal may be written in Finnish if the doctoral candidate and all members of the evaluation committee are proficient in Finnish.

Doctoral student:

Title of Thesis:

Date of public examination event:

Opponent:

Chair of assessment board:

Member of assessment board (if applicable):

Custos:

Evaluation criteria	Fail	Pass	Pass with distinction
Topic choice and positioning			
Research objectives and research questions			
Theoretical framework and background			
Methodological approach and data selection			
Data analysis and interpretation/implications			
Scientific significance and impact			
Author's independence			
Quality of writing and presentation			
Public defense			

Justifications for the proposed grade

The assessment board is requested to write a statement of the thesis based on the public examination event, the dissertation requirements, and the evaluation criteria for the dissertation and attach it to this document.

Suggested overall grade (see pages 3-5):

Do the members of the assessment board have dissenting views concerning the grade?

In addition to the grade proposal and its justification, the proposal must, if necessary, indicate any disagreement among the members of the assessment board regarding the proposal for the grade.

- No.
 Yes. Please provide a clarification:

Were there any special arrangements or circumstances related to the public examination event?

In addition to the grade proposal and its justification, the proposal must, if necessary, indicate any special arrangements or circumstances related to the public examination that may have affected the conduct of the public examination. Special arrangements may mean, for example, remote participation of the opponent/doctoral candidate, technical arrangements, or other exceptions. Special circumstances may mean, for example, interruption of the public examination event, connection failures, or other unexpected events.

- No.
 Yes. Please provide a clarification:

Any other additional information that the assessment board wishes to mention:

Date and place: _____

Signature of the Chair: _____

Name in block letters: _____

GRADING SCALE FOR DOCTORAL THESIS

All doctoral dissertations and licentiate theses are expected to comply with the responsible conduct of research and ethical principles.

Please note that a doctoral thesis is assessed as a whole, in which the importance of the different components of the assessment may vary. A grade of Pass with distinction will be awarded to dissertations that are considered to be in the top 10% of their discipline.

<i>Evaluation criteria</i>	<i>Fail</i>	<i>Pass</i>	<i>Pass with distinction</i>
<i>Topic choice and positioning</i>	The topic is unclear or poorly defined, or its selection has not been sufficiently justified. The choice of topic is not connected to previous research in the scientific/research field.	The topic is relevant and clearly defined and delineated. The choice of topic is sufficiently connected to previous research in the scientific/research field.	The topic is exceptionally important, innovative, and well-defined. It is clearly connected to the scientific/research field and introduces contemporary perspectives.
<i>Research objectives and Research questions</i>	The research problem is not clearly defined. The research problem may conflict with the theoretical framework. The research questions are vague or not connected to the research problem.	The research problem is clearly defined. The research problem is connected to the theoretical framework. The research questions are precise and linked to the research problem.	The research problem is excellently defined and innovative. The research problem shows a consistent and clear connection to the theoretical framework. The research questions are extremely well-formulated and logically justified. They open new perspectives on the research problem.

<i>Evaluation criteria</i>	<i>Fail</i>	<i>Pass</i>	<i>Pass with distinction</i>
<i>Theoretical framework and Background</i>	The theoretical framework is incomplete, outdated, or irrelevant.	The theoretical framework is up-to-date and relevant, and it supports the research.	The theoretical framework is excellently constructed, diverse, and insightful.
<i>Methodological approach and data selection</i>	<p>The methodological approach is unclear, lacks consistency, or is unsuitable for the research problem or data.</p> <p>Data selection is random, poorly justified, or inadequate for the objectives of the study.</p>	<p>The methodological approach is clearly defined and justified, and it is well-suited for addressing the research problem. The methodological approach is appropriate for the chosen data.</p> <p>Data selection is logically justified and sufficient for the needs of the research.</p>	<p>The methodological approach is excellently designed and supports the solution of the research problem in an innovative and consistent manner.</p> <p>The chosen methodological approach is exceptionally suitable for the data. Data selection is excellently justified, of high quality, and optimal for solving the research problem.</p>
<i>Data analysis and interpretation/implications</i>	The data analysis is incomplete, distorted, or the conclusions are not based on the data.	The data analysis is logical and consistent. The conclusions of the study are based on the data.	The data analysis is profound, multidimensional, and innovative. The data-driven analysis provides insightful perspectives on the research problem.

<i>Evaluation criteria</i>	<i>Fail</i>	<i>Pass</i>	<i>Pass with distinction</i>
<i>Scientific significance and impact</i>	The research does not bring significant new knowledge to the scientific/research field.	The research produces new knowledge and contributes to the ongoing discussion in the scientific/research field.	The research provides a significant and innovative contribution to the scientific/research field.
<i>Author's independence</i>	The author's independent contribution has not been clearly demonstrated or is insufficient. The research does not include the author's own critical reflection.	The author's independent contribution is clearly demonstrated and sufficient. The research reflects the author's own critical thinking.	The author's independent contribution is clearly demonstrated and exceptionally significant. The research consistently reflects the author's critical thinking and research expertise.
<i>Quality of writing and presentation</i>	The dissertation is poorly structured or contains linguistic deficiencies.	The dissertation is clearly structured and linguistically flawless.	The dissertation is of an excellent standard in terms of structure and language.
<i>Public defense</i>	The candidate is unable to defend the dissertation acceptably; the candidate does not demonstrate mastery of the research topic or the content of the work.	The candidate performs acceptably in the defense and is able to demonstrate mastery of the research topic and the content of the work.	The candidate performs excellently in the defense and demonstrates an exceptional mastery of the research area and the content of the work.