

Scope of evaluation	Fail	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Definition of the scope of the study and goals</b>  <b>Weight 1</b>	Student does not justify the relation between the scope of the study and his or her own studies. Incomplete objectives/research problems/assignments.	Student demonstrates the relation between the scope of the study and his or her own studies. Objectives/research problems/assignments should have been more complete.	The scope of the study is based on working life and related to student's studies. Objectives/research problem/assignments should have been clarified.	The scope is based on working life and related to the studies. Relatively clear objectives /research problems/assignments.	The scope meets the needs of the working life and studies. Clear and well-defined objectives/research hypotheses/assignments.	The scope is topical, relevant and meets the needs of the job market and studies. Clear and well-defined goals/research hypotheses/assignments.
<b>Concepts and sources in the theoretical framework</b>  <b>Weight 2</b>	Very narrow theoretical framework with no description of essential concepts. Very few and/or poor sources. A considerable quantity of direct quotations or plagiarism.	Narrow and imprecise theoretical framework. Few and partially outdated sources. Sources cited mechanically.	Narrow theoretical framework and description of concepts. Few and/or limited sources. Sources cited mechanically.	Theoretical framework and essential concepts based on previous research. Various sources used, although partially mechanically. The student analyzes some of the sources.	Theoretical framework and concepts documented based on a wide range of previous studies. The student knows how to use sources of good quality, related to the topic, professionally without referring to them mechanically. The student assesses the sources convincingly.	Theoretical framework and concepts defined based on a wide range of essential topical data. The student applies sources of good quality, related to the topic, professionally in diverse ways. The student assesses convincingly and critically the sources selected.
Scope of evaluation	Fail	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Selection of the methods,</b>	No description of methods chosen, or incorrect description or	Methods are documented but irregularly. Incomplete	Methods documented but irregularly.	Methods documented and the student knows	Methods chosen are documented and the student knows how to	Methods chosen are justified and presented

<b>documentation and use</b>  <b>Weight 2</b>	incorrect use of selected and documented methods. No description of data collection/process/project and no justifications.	description of data collection/process/project and no justifications of choices made.	Superficial documentation of data collection/process/project with no justifications of choices made.	how to use them. Data collection and analysis or process/project documented and partially justified.	use them. Data collection and analysis or process/project documented in multiple ways with justified choices.	analytically and used competently. Data collection and analysis/process/project documented analytically in various ways. Justified choices.
<b>Relevance of the thesis</b>  <b>Weight 2</b>	The objectives set are not reached. Implementation and output are not credible in the working life. The work/results are not relevant due to deficiencies.	The objectives set partially reached. Implementation and output only partially credible in real working life. The work/the results could potentially be relevant. Feedback from the mandator points out clear deficiencies in the thesis.	Objectives set are partially reached. Implementation and results only partially credible in working life. The work/results can be referred to partially. Feedback from the mandator focuses on incomplete work.	The objectives set by the student are met. Implementation and the output are credible in the real working life. The results could partially be relevant. Mainly good feedback from the mandator.	Objectives are reached well. Credible solutions for working life. The thesis output/results are relevant after some minor modifications. Good feedback from the mandator.	Objectives reached excellently. The thesis implementation and results show the competence to find creative and credible solutions for working life. Relevant results/output. Excellent feedback from the mandator.
<b>Scope of evaluation</b>	Fail	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Credibility of the results/research and ethical recommendations</b>  <b>Weight 1</b>	No description of credibility or quality. Ethical recommendations not taken into consideration and/or the student has performed against these principles.	Inaccurate or erroneous description of reliability and quality. The output/results reported inaccurately or erroneously. Incomplete consideration and respect of ethical recommendations.	Reliability and quality documented partially and superficially as well as incomplete reporting on reaching the results/output. Incomplete consideration of ethical recommendations	Reliability and quality assessed and documented, reaching the results reported. Ethical recommendations discussed slightly inaccurately but they have been respected.	Reflective assessment of reliability and quality, clear reporting on reaching the results. Ethical recommendations discussed and respected.	Evaluation and documentation of reliability is analytical and reflective. Transparent reporting of results/output. Ethical recommendations respected and discussed in multiple ways.

			and/or problems in respecting them.			
<b>Reporting and structure</b>  <b>Weight 1</b>	Informal language with lot of linguistic errors. Structure not suitable for the work. Non finished layout. The format used does not fulfil SAMK thesis requirements. References against SAMK instructions or other instructions agreed with the supervisor. Accessibility requirements not respected.	Formal language but with linguistic and style errors and not always logic. An illogic structure. Correct layout but the format is incomplete in the light of SAMK thesis instructions. Incomplete references in relation to SAMK reference instructions or other instructions agreed with the supervising teacher. Accessibility requirements partially respected.	Formal language but slightly illogic and fragmented. Some linguistic and style errors. The structure is not always suitable for the work or the phenomenon in question. Correct and finished layout. Format partially according to SAMK thesis instructions. References partially according to SAMK instructions or other instructions agreed with the supervising teacher. Accessibility criteria mainly respected.	Clear reporting. Structured formal language with some style and language errors. Relatively clear structure and suitable for the scope. Finished layout. SAMK layout mostly respected. SAMK reference instructions or other format agreed with the supervisor mostly followed, as well as accessibility requirements.	Partly convincing and clear reporting. Structured formal language with some style and language errors. Clear structure suitable for the scope. Polished layout in SAMK thesis format. References in SAMK format or in the form agreed with the supervisor. Accessibility requirements respected.	Convincing and clear reporting. The structure is logical and clear. Well-structured correct formal language. Polished layout in SAMK thesis format. References in SAMK format or in another form agreed with the supervisor. Accessibility requirements have been respected.
<b>Self-reflection during the thesis process</b>  <b>Weight 1</b>	The student cannot assess his or her own competences nor the relevance of the thesis.	Insufficient assessment of own skills. A considerable need for guidance. The student does not demonstrate the relevance of the thesis.	Partially realistic assessment of own skills' development. A considerable need for guidance. Some understanding of the relevance of the thesis.	Realistic assessment of development of own competences. Work completed partially independently. The student benefits from guidance. Some understanding of the relevance of	Realistic and critical assessment of student's own competences. The work is completed independently. The student benefits from guidance in a proactive and responsible way. The relevance of the thesis and possible new	Very realistic and critical assessment of development of own competences. Independent and self-steering working methods. Proactive and responsible use of guidance. Relevance and new development

				the thesis and/or possibilities for development.	development demonstrated.	possibilities demonstrated in multiple ways.
--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------	--