

Master's thesis evaluation matrix_30 ECTS theses (TRANSMED, psychology and logopedy): GRADES and their descriptions

	0 (rejected)	1 (passable, includes some major weaknesses)	2 (satisfactory, the work broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses)	3 (good, the work addresses the criterion well, but has a number of shortcomings)	4 (very good, the work addresses the criterion well, but there are some shortcomings)	5 (excellent, the work addresses the criterion very well, any shortcomings are minor)
<p>Examination of the research topic and formulation of the research question</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The relevance of the topic and approach · Formulation of the research objectives and questions 		<p><i>The research objectives and questions are unclearly formulated and/or poorly justified. The relevance of the topic is unclearly presented.</i></p>		<p><i>The research objectives and questions are adequately formulated and based on an appropriate justification. The relevance of the topic is argued adequately.</i></p>		<p><i>The research objectives and questions are insightful and based on an excellent justification. The relevance of the topic is solidly argued.</i></p>
<p>Knowledge of the research field</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Expertise and familiarity with relevant concepts, theoretical background, and previous research publications · Appropriate and critical use of relevant source material · Critical appraisal of other researchers' claims 		<p><i>The knowledge of the research field is superficial and/or fragmentary. Critical analysis of the literature is very limited.</i></p>		<p><i>The knowledge of the research field is good, with a well-structured use of existing theories and previous research. A critical scientific argumentation is present.</i></p>		<p><i>The knowledge of the research field is excellent, with an insightful use of existing theories and previous research. A critical, argumentative appraisal is present throughout the text.</i></p>
<p>Research methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Clear description and justification of data collection, if applicable · Clear presentation of methods and materials · Appropriateness of the analytic strategy · Consideration of research ethics, if applicable 		<p><i>The methods are poorly justified and unclearly presented.</i></p>		<p><i>The methods are well justified and clearly presented.</i></p>		<p><i>The methods are very well justified and their presentation is excellent.</i></p>

Master's thesis evaluation matrix_30 ECTS theses (TRANSMED, psychology and logopedy): GRADES and their descriptions

<p>Research results and their presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The analysis of data · The ability to focus on central information · Clarity of reporting, and the relationship between graphs, figures and tables and the body of the text 		<p><i>The data analyses and /or the reporting of the results are poorly organized.</i></p> <p><i>The ability to focus on central information is seriously compromised.</i></p>		<p><i>The data analyses and the reporting of the results are well organized. Tables, figures and the text form a fluent entity.</i></p> <p><i>The ability to focus on central information is good.</i></p>	<p><i>The data analyses and their reporting are very well organized. Tables, figures and the text form a fluent, convincing entity, with all relevant aspects well considered.</i></p> <p><i>The ability to focus on central information is excellent.</i></p>
<p>Discussion and conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The comparison of research results with previous research and literature · The thoroughness, plausibility and innovativeness of conclusions · The assessment of the importance of results and the proposal of future research topics · The critical assessment of methods and results and their validity · Ethical perspectives of the research, if applicable 		<p><i>The comparison of the results with previous research is insufficient and any conclusions and future directions are poorly justified.</i></p> <p><i>The critical assessment of the results and their validity is very limited.</i></p>		<p><i>The comparison of the results with previous research is adequate, with a clear sense of how the current research contributes to knowledge within the field. Conclusions and future directions are adequately outlined.</i></p> <p><i>The critical assessment of the results and their validity is good, with a clear understanding of the potential limitations and their relation to used methods.</i></p>	<p><i>The comparison of the results with previous research is highly systematic and focused, with a well-argued view of how the current research contributes to knowledge within the field.</i></p> <p><i>Conclusions and future directions are insightfully outlined. The critical assessment of the results and their validity is very well-grounded in thorough understanding of the used methods.</i></p>
<p>Scholarly presentation and final polishing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The use of a clear and coherent structure · The ability to write in an academic style · Correct language use · Appropriate and consistent citation style and a clear, accurate list of references · Coherent layout 		<p><i>The work follows the general conventions in scientific writing and presentation but the structure of the work is incoherent and /or the use of language and academic writing is at poor level, including clear inconsistencies in the citation style and/or reference list.</i></p>		<p><i>The structure of the work is clear and coherent and the use of language and academic writing is at a good level, including appropriate citation style and reference list.</i></p>	<p><i>The structure of the work is highly functional and the use of language and academic writing is at an excellent level, including appropriate citation style and reference list. The work is polished; there are practically no shortcomings in the communication style and visual outlooks.</i></p>

