Student's name
Thesis title

THESIS STATEMENT

In Oulu _ . _. 20

Reviewer and   Second reviewer and
Academic degree   Academic degree

Appendices: Evaluation form
             Scoring instructions

UNIVERSITY OF OULU

FACULTY OF TECHNOLOGY

EVALUATION FORM

Basic information

Student:	
Supervisor(s):	
Employer:	
Thesis title:	*in Finnish:*
	in English:

Evaluation[1]

Gategory	Points

	0	0,5	
Scope of the topic — Sufficient			Very good
Language of the thesis (text structure, spelling) — Sufficient			Excellent
Layout and appearance (following instructions) — Sufficient			Excellent

	0	1	2	
Degree of difficulty (theory, abstraction) — Low				High
Thesis structure (logical structure of the work) — Functional				Excellent
Amount of supervision required — Need a lot or ignored				Self-guiding or receptive

	1	2	3	4	5	
Introduction of the research problem and previous research — Poor						Excellent
Completion of goals — Poor						Excellent
Author's evaluation of results — Poor						Excellent
Significance of results — Minor						Major

Total points   ☐ / 27,5

Suggested grade and signatures

Date:	Suggested grade[2]: _____ / 5
Reviewers:	
Clarification of	
Reviewer and academic degree	Second reviewer and academic degree

[1]Read the scoring instructions on the following page.
[2]Evaluation table: 4–6 pts. sufficient (1); 7–11 pts. satisfactory (2); 12–16 pts. good (3); 17–23 p. very good (4); 24–27,5 pts. excellent (5). The grade is informed of as a whole number.

UNIVERSITY OF OULU

FACULTY OF TECHNOLOGY

SCORING INSTRUCTIONS

Evaluation is based on the final thesis uploaded in the Laturi submission system. Approval requires that the work achieves a sufficient level for all evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria provided in these scoring instructions are only provided as guidance and should be applied with individual consideration.

Areas of evaluation and scoring	Evaluation criteria	

The following have only a minor impact on the final grade.

Scope of thesis 0–0.5 pts.	0 pts.	The scope is sufficient, but the topic is relatively limited and only requires knowledge of a few themes.
	0.5 pts.	The thesis comprises several themes and shows the author's ability to compare and prioritise these themes.
Language (structure, spelling) 0–0.5 pts.	0 pts.	Clear and fluent language. Only a few grammatical errors but some structural weaknesses.
	0.5 pts.	Clear and fluent language. No grammatical errors; structurally logical and linguistically impeccable.
Layout (conformity to writing instructions) 0–0.5 pts.	0 pts.	Conforms with the master's thesis writing instructions; no serious layout weaknesses.
	0.5 pts.	Conforms exactly with the master's thesis writing instructions. The work gives a good overall impression to the reader and is easy to follow.

The following have a moderate impact on the final grade:

Level of difficulty (theoretical knowledge, use of concepts) 0–2 pts.	0 pts.	The level of difficulty is low.
	1 pts.	The level of difficulty is moderate.
	2 pts.	The level of difficulty is high.
Thematic structure (logical structure of the work) 0–2 pts.	0 pts.	Consistent structure.
	1 pts.	Clear and consistent structure.
	2 pts.	Excellent structure.
Need for guidance 0–2 pts.	0 pts.	The student needed extra guidance.
	1 pts.	The student needed some guidance but mostly worked independently.
	2 pts.	The student needed some guidance but mostly attempted to solve problems independently.

The following have a major impact on the final grade:

Presentation of the research problem and previous research 1-5 pts	1 pt	Insufficient presentation of previous research; weaknesses in the theoretical background.
	2 pts	…
	3 pts	Good presentation of previous research; well-founded theoretical background.
	4 pts	…
	5 pts	Comprehensive introduction to previous research on the basis of scientific articles; excellent presentation of the theoretical background.
Achievement of aims 1-5 pts	1 pt	The aims have not been fully achieved.
	2 pts	…
	3 pts	The aims have been fully achieved.
	4 pts	…
	5 pts	The aims have been achieved better than expected.
Author's evaluation of the results 1-5 pts	1 pt	Weaknesses in the assessment of results.
	2 pts	…
	3 pts	Appropriate assessment of results, but the supervisor can easily find room for improvement.
	4 pts	…
	5 pts	Thorough assessment of results; the student's contribution is clearly established.
Significance of the results 1-5 pts	1 pt	The results may have great significance, but the student has failed to demonstrate/establish their potential impacts.
	2 pts	…
	3 pts	The results are useful and may even be of great significance.
	4 pts	…
	5 pts	The results and how they were handled have scientific significance or are otherwise important for the development of the field.

Total score	4-6	7-11	12-16	17-23	24-27.5
Grade	Sufficient (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)