

Bachelor's thesis, assessment template A

Kimmo Tuominen, David Weir, Elina Palmgren 10/2019

The following three aspects are assessed: i) **the content of the thesis**; ii) **structure and appearance**; and iii) **work during the preparation of the thesis**.

In assessing i) **the content of the thesis**, the following aspects are taken into account:

- Introduction to the topic of the thesis and detailed definition of the topic (research question).
- Use of source literature.
- Presentation of the results, and how they are linked to the topic of the thesis.
- The extent, reasonableness and diversity of the conclusions.

In assessing ii) **structure and appearance**, the following aspects are taken into account:

- The outline of the thesis.
- Academic writing style, correctness of language, readability.
- The layout and length.
- Use, clarity and quality of equations, tables and figures.
- Use of citations.

In assessing iii) **work during the thesis process**, the following aspects are taken into account:

- The author's independent work, as supported by the supervisor.
- Active correspondence between the author and supervisor.
- Ability of the author to assimilate methods used.
- Sticking to the schedule as agreed.

Each aspect i)-iii) is assessed on a scale of 0–5 (see below for further information). The minimum requirement for the acceptance of a thesis is a grade of at least 1 in each category. The final grade is the average of the three scores.

	0	1	2	3	4	5
Content	Essential elements are missing from the contents (e.g. conclusions). There are no sources, or they have not been used.	The thesis is a reprise of literature based on a few sources, without the author's own reflection. The thesis does not demonstrate the author's familiarity with the topic.		The background of the topic and its relationship to the thesis's central contents are well presented. There are sufficient sources. The results are presented well, with consideration given to their implications. The conclusions include the author's independent reflection.		The background of the topic is introduced from multiple points of view. The scope is clearly defined. There are enough sources and their usage is multifaceted. Presentation of the results is excellent and well connected to the topic at hand. Conclusions are comprehensive and they show insight into the topic.
Structure and layout	The thesis is not structured at all. Academic writing style is not used. Citations are missing. The layout is not as instructed. Equations and figures do not support the text. There are frequent, major mistakes in for example, punctuation and compound words.	There are major weaknesses in the structure of the thesis or usage of academic writing style. Citation technique and the use of sources are inadequate. The thesis is considerably longer/shorter than specified, or its layout is seriously inadequate. Figures are carelessly made or of poor quality, and do not support the text or other contents. Equations are unclear, unnecessary, incorrect, or the symbols are not explained.		The thesis is well-structured and written in an academic writing style. Citation technique is in accordance with the expected academic style. The layout and length are as specified. Figures and tables are illustrative and support the other contents. Equations are in balance with the text. The thesis is written in good Finnish, Swedish or English.		The thesis is excellently structured and written in an academic writing style. Citation technique is in accordance with the expected academic style. Layout and length are as specified. Figures and tables are made with care, they are illustrative and support other contents. Equations are sufficient and in good balance with the text. The thesis is written in good Finnish, Swedish or English.
Work process	The supervisor was not updated on progress; there was no cooperation with the supervisor. The thesis took an extremely long time to prepare.	The role and views of the supervisor are clearly visible in the thesis. The author's ignorance of the methods used, or the results obtained, is evident. The thesis was finished significantly more slowly than agreed.		The author has demonstrated their ability to carry out independent work, but the views of the supervisor are still evident in the end result. The author sticks to the agreed schedule.		The author works independently, supported by the supervisor. The thesis shows that the author has assimilated concepts and techniques from the literature. The author sticks to the agreed schedule and informs the supervisor about possible delays.

Content:

5: The background of the topic is introduced from multiple points of view. The scope is clearly defined. There are enough sources and their usage is multifaceted. Presentation of the results is excellent and well connected to the topic at hand. Conclusions are comprehensive and they show insight into the topic.

4: *Not quite 5 – but more than 3.*

3: The background of the topic and its relationship to the thesis's central contents are well presented. There are sufficient sources. The results are presented well, with consideration given to their implications. The conclusions include the author's independent reflection.

2: *Not quite 3 – but more than 1.*

1: The thesis is a reprise of literature based on a few sources, without the author's own reflection. The thesis does not demonstrate the author's familiarity with the topic.

0: Essential elements are missing from the contents (e.g. conclusions). There are no sources, or they have not been used.

Structure and layout:

5: The thesis is excellently structured and written in an academic writing style. Citation technique is in accordance with the expected academic style. Layout and length are as specified. Figures and tables are made with care, they are illustrative and support other contents. Equations are sufficient and in good balance with the text. The thesis is written in good Finnish, Swedish or English.

4: *Not quite 5 – but more than 3.*

3: The thesis is well-structured and written in an academic writing style. Citation technique is good and in accordance with the expected academic style. The layout and length are as specified. Figures and tables are illustrative and support the other contents. Equations are in balance with the text. The thesis is written in good Finnish, Swedish or English.

2: *Not quite 3 – but more than 1.*

1: There are major weaknesses in the structure of the thesis or usage of academic writing style. Citation technique and the use of sources are inadequate. The thesis is considerably longer/shorter than specified, or its layout is seriously inadequate. Figures are carelessly made or of poor quality; they do not support the text or other contents; there are too few figures; etc. Equations are unclear, unnecessary, incorrect, or the symbols are not explained.

0: The thesis is not structured at all. Academic writing style is not used. Citations are missing. The layout is not as instructed. Equations and figures do not support the text. There are frequent, major mistakes in for example, punctuation and compound words.

Work process:

5: The author works independently, supported by the supervisor. The thesis shows that the author has assimilated concepts and techniques from the literature. The author sticks to the agreed schedule and informs the supervisor about possible delays.

4: *Not quite 5 – but more than 3.*

3: The author has demonstrated their ability to carry out independent work, but the views of the supervisor are still evident in the end result. The author sticks to the agreed schedule.

2: *Not quite 3 – but more than 1.*

1: The role and views of the supervisor are clearly visible in the thesis. Especially the author's ignorance of the methods used, or the results obtained, is evident. The thesis was finished significantly more slowly than agreed.

0: The supervisor was not updated on progress; there was no cooperation with the supervisor. The thesis took an extremely long time to prepare.