

Pro Gradu thesis marking scheme.

(updated May 2nd, 2018)

Two independent examiners mark the *Pro Gradu* as originally handed to them by the student, with additional comments made by the supervisor of the project.

Student (with critical guidance from the supervisor of the project) writes the final version of the thesis and submits it electronically in Laturi according to the separate instruction, before the 12 month deadline.

The supervisor drafts a summary document (maximal one side of A4) to help the examiners. This should include comments on the student's performance during the project (dexterity in the lab, attendance and enthusiasm, ability to plan experiments, ability to discuss data) and on specialized aspects of the final thesis (breadth and depth of introduction, appropriateness of methodologies, significance of the results obtained etc.). This summary should also include details of any problems encountered during the project which should be taken into account e.g. equipment failure, sickness etc. Two copies of this should be passed on to student secretary Kaisa Tuominen.

Reviewers obtain the thesis from Laturi; not from the student directly. This guarantees that reviewers read the very same version which the student submitted. Reviewers independently mark the thesis (out of 50) based on the attached marking scheme. In addition each examiner should produce a report providing feedback on the thesis or a joint report should be produced. This report should not be a mere statement of the examiner's *opinion* on the grade, but instead provide clear *justification(s)* (possibly using some examples) and *feedback* to the student and to Master Degree Program Leader for decision making. After independent grading the examiners must discuss together and agree on the grade to be suggested. If they do not agree on the grade they should justify also this.

The two examiners agree on the recommended grade to be awarded. If the recommended grade is not based on the simple sum of their marks, or if they do not reach a common opinion on it, the examiners should provide a statement on how the recommended grade was obtained. The signed mark sheet (only one copy is returned), plus feedback reports plus additional recommendation statement (if any), should be returned to Kaisa Tuominen.

Assignment of the final mark proceeds via the Master Degree Program Leader. The student is informed of the grade after that and he/she then also receives the feedback of the examiners. If the student does not agree with the grade, he/she can make a justified appeal to the Dean of Education, who then assigns a third examiner if needed. The appeal is free format, but must contain as detailed justifications as possible about the points the student wants to make. The appeal must be submitted within two weeks of receiving the grading and reviewers' report.



Statement on Pro Gradu thesis for Master of Science degree

Student	Name:	Student number:
	Degree programme: Biochemistry	
	Subject area:	

Thesis	Code and credits:	
	Title of thesis:	

Date Pro gradu work started

Date Pro gradu thesis submitted

Extensions granted (weeks)

Examiners	Name:		
	Degree and position:		

Marks	The grading system used: 1 = fail... 10 = outstanding		Examiner's marks	Examiner's marks
	I	Introduction		
II	Materials and methods			
III	Results			
IV	Discussion			
V	General presentation			
	Total			

Total marks awarded (out of 100):	
-----------------------------------	--

Suggested grade (5, 4, 3, 2, 1 or fail):	
---	--

Date:	Oulu,
-------	-------

Examiners' signatures:			
Name (typed or block letters):			

Marking Criteria:

10	Outstanding	I / II / III Covers the topic comprehensively with no irrelevant material and shows good understanding of the research area
		IV. Demonstrates full understanding of the topic within a wider context and shows complete critical analysis of the data presented
		V. Standard of language outstanding
8-9	Excellent	I / II / III Covers the topic comprehensively with little irrelevant material and shows good understanding of the research area
		IV. Demonstrates full understanding of the topic within a wider context and shows critical analysis of the data presented i.e. good awareness of assumptions made in, and limitations of conclusions
		V. Standard of language very high. Diagrams, tables etc. detailed, relevant and visually pleasing
6-7	Good	I / II / III Covers most aspects of the topic with little or no irrelevant material. Shows broad understanding of the research area
		IV. Demonstrates substantial understanding of the topic within a wider context and shows some critical analysis of the data presented.
		V. Standard of language high. Diagrams, tables etc. detailed and relevant
5	Satisfactory	I / II / III Covers the core material of the subject area, possibly with some errors. Not placed within a broader scientific context.
		IV. Demonstrates limited or patchy understanding of the topic and its context. Shows limited critical and analytical abilities
		V. Standard of language satisfactory. Diagrams, tables etc lacking detail and relevance
3-4	Poor	I / II / III Not all core material covered and frequent errors/misunderstandings. Lacks depth
		IV. Demonstrates little understanding of the topic and its context. Little evidence of critical and analytical abilities
		V. Standard of language weak. Diagrams lacking detail and relevance
1-2	Fail	I / II / III Covers very little relevant material and contains many errors/misunderstandings
		IV. Demonstrates little or no understanding of the topic and its context. No evidence of critical or analytical abilities
		V. Standard of language very poor. Illegible. Not proof-read. Diagrams tables etc. lacking detail and relevance or no relevant diagrams.

Grades Mark

100 - 86 points	Grade 5
85 - 71 points	Grade 4
70 - 56 points	Grade 3
55 - 41 points	Grade 2
40 - 25 points	Grade 1