## Master's thesis assessment matrix: faculties of agriculture and forestry, biological and environmental sciences, and pharmacy

ASSESSMENT AREA		FAIL OR DEFICIENT	PASSABLE 1	SATISFACTORY 2	GOOD 3	VERY GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5
1. Thesis objective and research questions	1.1.	The thesis has no objective, or it is presented very unclearly.	The thesis objective and research questions are described narrowly, and their connection to the theoretical background remains unclear.	The thesis objective and research questions are described, but their connection to the theoretical background is partly unclear.	The thesis objective and research questions are clear and fairly well connected to the theoretical background.	The thesis objective and research questions are very clear, justified and commendably connected to the theoretical background.	The thesis objective and research questions are extremely clear and superbly justified, and demonstrate both in-depth knowledge of the theoretical background and independent thinking.
2. Scholarly framework and use of sources	2.1.	The theoretical background is totally inadequate or unrelated to the research questions.	The description of the theoretical background is narrow, unbalanced and deficient, and its connection to the objectives is difficult to establish.	The description of the theoretical background is mostly balanced, but its connection to the objectives is not very clear.	The description of the theoretical background is appropriate, and its connection to the objectives is for the most part clearly established.	The description of the theoretical background is appropriate and justified, and its connection to the objectives is well established.	The description of the theoretical background is analytical, insightful and justified, and the connection to the objectives is very well established.
	2.2.	No perspective has been selected or concepts defined.	The perspective selected and concepts used are poorly suited to the thesis topic.	The perspective selected and concepts used are suited to the thesis topic, but their use is at times inconsistent.	The perspective selected and definition of concepts are appropriate, and the concepts are for the most part used consistently.	The perspective selected is insightful. The concepts are appropriately defined and consistently used.	The perspective selected is insightful. The definition of concepts is analytical and justified, and they are used very consistently.
	2.3.	The thesis makes little reference to the scholarly source literature, or the references are haphazard. Sources are misinterpreted.	The use of source literature is one-sided and indicates the author's scant knowledge. The source literature includes few peer-reviewed publications.	References to the source literature highlight key issues, but the use of peer-reviewed literature is one-sided. The text is mostly summarising in nature.	Most of the source literature consists of peer-reviewed publications, and their use is appropriate. The source literature is used with versatility and interpreted with supporting arguments.	Most of the source literature consists of peer-reviewed and well-selected publications, and their use is appropriate. The source literature contains old and new sources relevant to the research questions. Findings from different sources are synthesised into meaningful themes.	The use of the source literature demonstrates the author's excellent knowledge and analytical approach, and includes the latest peer-reviewed research. The source literature is examined critically and with versatility. Findings from different sources are commendably combined.

ASSESSMENT AREA		FAIL OR DEFICIENT	PASSABLE 1	SATISFACTORY 2	GOOD 3	VERY GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5
3. Research data and method	3.1.	The description of the material, including its acquisition, is highly deficient or non-existent. The research is not replicable from the description of the material. The material is unsuitable or insufficient for the thesis.	The description of the material, including its acquisition, is limited and unclear. Based on the description, the research could be replicated only to a small extent. The material is scarce for the thesis. The author's command and description of the research methods are deficient.	The description of the material, including its acquisition, is mostly comprehensible. The research is only partly replicable from the description of the material. The material is sufficient for the thesis. The author's command and description of the research methods are mostly sufficient.	The description of the material, including its acquisition, complies with responsible research conduct. The material is sufficient and suitable for the thesis. The research is largely replicable from the description of the material. The author's command and description of the research methods are good.	The description of the material, including its acquisition, is thorough and complies with responsible research conduct. The material is sufficient and suitable for the thesis. The research is replicable from the description of the material. The author's command and description of the research methods are very good.	The description of the material, including its acquisition, is thorough and analytical and complies with responsible research conduct. The material is sufficient and suitable for the thesis. The research is reliably replicable from the description of the material. The author's command and description of the research methods are excellent.
	3.2.	The material is not analysed, or the analysis is erroneous.	The material is analysed, but the analysis contains numerous errors.	The material is analysed well, and the analysis responds partly to the research questions.	The material is analysed well, and the analysis responds to the research questions.	The material is analysed well, in depth and carefully, and the analysis responds well to the research questions.	The material is analysed very well, in depth and carefully, and the analysis is justified in terms of the research questions.
	3.3.	No research ethics issues are reported.	Some research ethics issues are mentioned.	Some research ethics principles are explained, but the explanation contains deficiencies.	Research ethics principles are explained fairly well.	Research ethics principles are explained well.	Research ethics principles are explained commendably and analytically.
4. Presentation of thesis results*	4.1.	The research results are not presented, or they are unrelated to the thesis topic.	Key research results are presented, but the presentation is deficient or unclear. Results are illustrated. The connection between the thesis objectives and results remains weak.	The presentation of the research results is superficial or inconsistent. The figures and tables are understandable, but do not conform to academic style or the instructions given. The connection between the text and the figures and tables remains poor. The research objectives and results are connected.	The research results are reported clearly and consistently. The figures and tables conform to academic style and the instructions given, and support the text. The key results are identified and presented. The research results answer the research questions.	The research results are reported clearly and consistently. The figures and tables are well compiled, conform to academic style and the instructions given, and support the text. The key results are highlighted well, and the connection between the research objectives and results is good.	The research results are reported clearly, precisely and consistently. The reliability of the results can be assessed based on the presentation. The figures and tables are insightfully chosen, conform to academic style and the instructions given, and support the text commendably. The presentation of the key and other results is commendably balanced and aligned with the research questions.
		*Any failure of test arran	 gements or destruction of resul	 ts must not affect thesis assessment.			

ASSESSMENT AREA		FAIL OR DEFICIENT	PASSABLE 1	SATISFACTORY 2	GOOD 3	VERY GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5
5. Discussion and conclusions	5.1.	The results are not examined, or their examination is unconnected to the topic.	The examination of the results is very limited and one-sided. The results are repeated rather than discussed.	The examination of the results is fairly limited and mostly superficial. The research results are examined using literature on the theoretical thesis background. The examination of the results is connected to the research questions.	The results are examined well and with versatility. The research results are examined using literature on the theoretical thesis background. The examination of the results clearly answers the research questions.	The results are examined very well and with versatility. The research results are examined theoretically and extensively in light of the scholarly literature.	The results are examined commendably and with versatility. The examination of the results is critical and demonstrates an excellent ability to apply the theoretical premise. The results are linked highly commendably to previous research.
	5.2.	No further research topics or application opportunities for the thesis are presented.	Some further research topics or application opportunities for the thesis are mentioned.	The consideration of further research topics or application opportunities for the thesis is one-sided.	The consideration of further research topics or application opportunities for the thesis results is good.	The consideration of further research topics or application opportunities for the thesis results is insightful.	The consideration of further research topics or application opportunities for the thesis is versatile and convincing, and concrete ways of implementing further research are presented.
	5.3.	The reliability of the results is not examined, or the examination is unrelated to the thesis.	The reliability of the thesis results is examined.	The reliability of the results is examined partly appropriately for the research task.	The reliability of the results is examined appropriately for the research task.	The reliability of the results is examined in a versatile and well-justified way.	The reliability of the results is examined critically and in a versatile and very well-justified way.
	5.4.	No conclusions are presented.	Some conclusions on the thesis are mentioned.	Some conclusions on the thesis results are presented and connected to the context and objectives.	Justified conclusions on the thesis results are presented and connected to the context and objectives.	Well-justified conclusions on the thesis results are presented and aligned appropriately with the context and objectives.	Well-justified conclusions on the thesis results are presented and aligned very well and analytically with the context and objectives.
6. The thesis as an academic text	6.1.	The presentation of the thesis is deficient. The thesis content is irrelevant to the topic, or essential sections are missing.	The thesis contains the essential sections, but their content is in many cases deficient. The work as a whole is unbalanced.	The thesis contains the essential sections and forms an understandable whole.	The thesis contains the essential sections in the correct order, and the text is logical. The text conveys the author's scholarly thinking.	The thesis is a logical, clear and well-integrated whole. The text clearly conveys the author's scholarly thinking.	The thesis is logical and a thoroughly clear, appropriately aligned a well-integrated whole. The text conveys very well the author's scholarly thinking.
	6.2.	The thesis does not meet the technical requirements for academic prose and writing.	The thesis is written in academic prose, but the technical requirements for academic writing are poorly met.	The thesis is written in academic prose, but the technical requirements for academic writing are not fully met.	The thesis is written in fairly fluent and polished academic prose and meets the technical requirements of academic writing.	The thesis is written in precise and almost flawless academic prose and successfully meets the technical requirements of academic writing.	The thesis is written in precise, fluent and polished academic prose and commendably meets the technical requirements of academic writing.
7. Work during the thesis process	7.1.	The student has assumed no responsibility for the thesis process or schedule.	Although the student's work has progressed, their commitment to the agreed schedule and plan has been poor.	The student has worked in a targeted way, but has only partly followed the agreed plan and schedule.	The student has worked actively and in a targeted way, and has mostly followed the agreed plan and schedule.	The student has worked in a targeted way and shown initiative and an active approach. The student has followed the agreed objectives, plan and schedule.	The student has worked in a very targeted way, shown initiative and an active approach at all stages of the process, and commendably followed the agreed plan and schedule.
	7.2.	The student has not accepted any supervision or feedback from the supervisor.	The student has not used the feedback given during the process.	The student has accepted the supervision and feedback offered, but used it only to a very limited extent during the process.	The student has accepted the supervision and feedback offered and used it well during the process.	The student has accepted the supervision and feedback offered and used it very well during the process.	The student has accepted the supervision and feedback offered and used it commendably during the process.