

14.5.2019

**Competence-based thesis assessment criteria at master's degree level (EQF level 7) 2019**

No arithmetic mean or weightings are applied in thesis assessment. A master's thesis is assessed as a qualitative overall assessment according to competence-based assessment criteria. The recommended length of the master's thesis is on average 70-100 pages without appendices.

Area	Fail 0	Adequate 1	Satisfactory 2	Good 3	Very good 4	Excellent 5
<b>1 Topic</b>						
<b>Justification of the choice of topic</b>  <i>The student</i>	Fails to justify the delineation of the topic or the justification contains incorrect information.	Justifies the choice of topic from the viewpoint of developing their own competence or work.	Justifies the choice of topic from the viewpoint of their work community.	Justifies the choice of topic from the viewpoint of developing the commissioner's organisation.	Justifies the choice of topic from the viewpoint of developing the professional field.	Justifies the choice of topic from the viewpoint of its significance: reform of working life, novelty value of research or societal significance.
<b>Delineation of the topic</b>  <i>The student</i>	Has not delineated the thesis topic.	Delineates the topic one-sidedly, only justifying it from a single viewpoint.	Delineates the topic from several different viewpoints, but they remain separate from one another.	Delineates the topic from several different viewpoints and justifies the delineation.	Delineates the topic from several different viewpoints and the justification forms a coherent whole.	Delineates the topic with critical justification and assessment.
<b>Definition of objectives</b>  <i>The student</i>	Does not define the objectives.	Defines the objectives, but they are in need of further clarification.	Defines the objectives incompletely or too broadly.	Defines the principal objectives relevant for development work or research.	Defines relevant objectives that have been delineated clearly.	Defines challenging objectives with a new viewpoint that have been delineated clearly.

14.5.2019

Area	Fail 0	Adequate 1	Satisfactory 2	Good 3	Very good 4	Excellent 5
<b>2 Knowledge base</b>						
<b>Information retrieval and source material</b>  <i>The student</i>	Does not describe the information retrieval and choice of the source material. Does not understand source criticism.	Describes the information retrieval. Selects source material that is random and partially irrelevant. Uses second-hand sources.	Describes the information retrieval. Chooses sources that support the topic and phenomenon being discussed. Mostly uses primary sources.	Describes the systematic information retrieval of source material. Selects source material that is relevant to the thesis topic and the phenomenon being discussed. Uses current, reliable and primary sources. Also uses international sources.	Describes the systematic information retrieval of source material. Chooses source material that is diverse, current, reliable and relevant. Demonstrates conversance with the topic being studied with their use of Finnish and international sources.	Describes a systematic retrieval of sources. Also uses sources from other fields if the existing research on the topic is sparse. Demonstrates expertise and familiarity with the topic through their choices of sources and their critical assessment.
<b>Appropriateness and construction of the knowledge base</b>  <i>The student</i>	Is not able to compile a knowledge base related to the topic.	Compiles an incoherent knowledge base by summarisation of sources that is inadequately connected to the thesis objective or delineation.	Compiles the knowledge base by summarising the sources. Connects the knowledge base to the topic but fails to present the interrelations between concepts and theories.	Constructs a relevant knowledge base that has been delineated according to the topic and the phenomenon being discussed. Shows the interrelations between concepts and theories.	Constructs a relevant and duly substantiated knowledge base that has been delineated according to the topic and the phenomenon being discussed. Uses the knowledge base to create a synthesis.	Discusses the research in the professional field comprehensively and critically. Uses the knowledge base to create a duly substantiated synthesis that is presented as an illustrative frame of reference.
<b>Use of key concepts</b>  <i>The student</i>	Does not recognise the key concepts.	Recognises the key concepts.	Defines key concepts.	Uses key concepts fluently and correctly.	Analyses and compares the key concepts and prepares summaries of them.	Masters consistently the key concepts defined. Discusses concepts critically and insightfully (e.g. creates a new definition).

14.5.2019

Area	Fail 0	Adequate 1	Satisfactory 2	Good 3	Very good 4	Excellent 5
<b>3 Implementation</b>						
<b>Description and use of development or research methods</b>  <i>The student</i>	Describes and/or uses their chosen method incorrectly.	Describes their chosen method by summarising method literature. Uses the method in an inappropriate way.	Describes their chosen method with the help of method literature. Uses the method in a partially inappropriate way.	Uses and describes their method chosen for the development or research task and substantiates the use of the method by making reference to method literature.	Describes, substantiates and uses a method that is suitable for their chosen development or research task. Substantiates the use of the method competently by also making reference to international method literature.	Describes, substantiates, uses and assesses their chosen method and its use. Critically substantiates the choice by also making reference to international method literature. Potentially develops a customised method to address the needs of research.
<b>Suitability and reliability of data</b>  <i>The student</i>	Collects insufficient data due to which its reliability is poor in view of the development or research task.	Collects scattered data due to which its suitability and reliability are questionable in view of the development or research task.	Collects data that makes it possible to address the development or research task, but its reliability is questionable.	Collects data that is sufficiently comprehensive and makes it possible to reliably address the development or research task.	Collects comprehensive data that makes it possible to reliably address the development or research task and based on which diverse analyses can be made.	Collects carefully chosen, comprehensive data that makes it possible to address the development or research task and based on which diverse analyses can be made and reliable conclusions can be drawn.
<b>Description and analysis of data</b>  <i>The student</i>	Does not describe the data or data analysis.	Describes the data, but the description of the data analysis remains theoretical.	Describes the data and its analysis superficially or the analysis has methodological problems.	Describes the data and its analysis sufficiently systematically and with reasoning.	Describes the data and its analysis systematically and transparently.	Describes the data and its analysis systematically and critically. Presents a carefully reasoned analysis making versatile use of the data.

14.5.2019

Area	Fail 0	Adequate 1	Satisfactory 2	Good 3	Very good 4	Excellent 5
<b>Self-contained process management</b>  <i>The student</i>	Is not capable of independent planning and execution.	Plans and executes the thesis fairly independently. Is unable to make full use of the tutoring received, but shows a certain degree of ambition.	Plans and executes the thesis independently and is able to make use of the tutoring received.	Plans and executes the thesis independently and is able to make use of the tutoring received. Engages in collaboration responsibly and ambitiously contributes to the progress of the thesis.	Plans and executes the thesis independently and is able to make use of the agreed-upon tutoring process. Demonstrates initiative, development ability and research-oriented thinking.	Plans and executes the thesis independently, responsibly and effectively. Assesses their working process analytically and demonstrates ability to develop it. Demonstrates their expertise in the tutoring process.
Area	Fail 0	Adequate 1	Satisfactory 2	Good 3	Very good 4	Excellent 5
<b>4 Results and discussion</b>						
<b>Presentation of results and addressing the development or research questions</b>  <i>The student</i>	In unable to present the results or the results are false.	Presents the results superficially, in the form of a list and/or insufficiently. Addresses the development or research questions insufficiently.	Presents partly illustrated results whose connection to the development or research questions remains thin.	Presents results that address the development or research questions in a well-reasoned and illustrative manner.	Presents results that address the development or research questions in a logical, well-reasoned and illustrative manner.	Presents significant/generalisable results that address the development or research questions in a logical, well-reasoned and illustrative manner.
<b>Dialogue between key results and theory</b>  <i>The student</i>	Does not present the discussion of the results.	Does not present the discussion of the results in relation to the knowledge base.	Presents modest discussion of the results in relation to the knowledge base.	Substantiates the relationship between theory and the results.	Substantiates the relationship between theory and the results with clear reasoning and interpretation.	Substantiates the relationship between theory and the results with insightful and critical reasoning and interpretation.

14.5.2019

Area	Fail 0	Adequate 1	Satisfactory 2	Good 3	Very good 4	Excellent 5
<b>Reliability</b>  <i>The student</i>	Does not present a reliability assessment or it is incorrect.	Discusses reliability superficially by mainly summarising the sources.	Assesses reliability superficially. Only focuses the discussion on a part of the thesis.	Assesses reliability so as to cover the critical areas of the thesis.	Assesses and reflects reliability thoroughly, showing mastery of the theoretical bases as well.	Assesses and reflects reliability with critical argumentation. Connects own work and discussion of theory.
<b>Research ethics review</b>  <i>The student</i>	Does not present any research-ethical assessment.	Complies with research ethics. Discusses ethical questions from a narrow viewpoint.	Complies with research ethics. Discusses ethical questions in relation to their own work.	Complies with research ethics. Discusses ethical questions with due consideration given to the critical aspects of the thesis.	Complies with research ethics. Competently analyses, assesses and interprets ethical questions. Connects the discussion to the thesis as a whole.	Complies with research ethics. Discusses research-ethical questions that are relevant to their own work insightfully and critically.
<b>Presentation of conclusions</b>  <i>The student</i>	Does not present conclusions.	Presents conclusions and development ideas without substantiating them. The working life tutor's feedback points out deficiencies in the thesis.	Presents conclusions and development ideas that are to some extent connected to the points of departure of the thesis. The working life tutor is mostly satisfied with the result.	Presents conclusions and duly substantiated further action and/or development proposals based on them. The working life tutor is satisfied with the result	Presents duly substantiated conclusions and further action and development proposals based on them that are clearly connected to the points of departure of the thesis. The working life tutor is highly satisfied with the results.	Presents conclusions that are versatile and to the point as well as further action and development proposals that are clearly connected to the points of departure of the thesis and to practice. The working life tutor's feedback is very positive

14.5.2019

Area	Fail 0	Adequate 1	Satisfactory 2	Good 3	Very good 4	Excellent 5
<b>5 Reporting</b>						
<b>Accuracy and illustrativeness of reporting, oral presentation</b>  <i>The student</i>	Is unable to report consistently and illustratively. There are observations of violations of good scientific practice. Presents orally directly from a written report. Does not follow the instructed time. Does not show expertise.	Reports illustratively. The report contains illogicalities and shortcomings. Illustrative oral presentation, the structure is inconsistent, and the content is not targeted at the audience. Does not follow the instructed time. Demonstrates expertise weakly.	Reports consistently and illustratively. There are minor shortcomings in the reporting. Takes the audience into account in their oral presentation, but the content remains unstructured in part. Adheres to the given time limit. Demonstrates expertise.	Reports consistently, in a well-reasoned manner and illustratively (in writing and orally). Adheres to the given time limit. Demonstrates convincing expertise.	Reports logically, analytically and in an interesting way. Demonstrates expert thinking both orally and in writing. Adheres to the given time limit.	Reports convincingly, presenting a logically coherent whole. Demonstrates critical thinking both orally and written as well as the ability to connect one's own work to the development of the field. Adheres instructed time. Demonstrates convincing expertise.
<b>Language and formal style of the thesis Compliance with reporting instructions</b>  <i>The student</i>	Does not write acceptable text in the formal style. Does not follow JAMK's reporting instructions.	Writes unstructured text with many different repeated language and style errors. Follows JAMK's reporting instructions insufficiently.	Writes partly unstructured text with many different language and style errors. Follows JAMK's reporting instructions insufficiently.	Writes structured text with occasional language and style errors. Follows JAMK's reporting instructions.	Writes structured text in fluent and almost error-free formal style. Follows JAMK's reporting instructions.	Writes in argumentative, insightful and error-free formal style. Follows JAMK's reporting instructions.