Master's thesis (YAMK) evaluation criteria (UAS)

Scope of	Fail	1	2	3	4	5
evaluation Topic and objectives						
Weight 4						
Justification of the choice of the topic Weight 1	Topic chosen not justified or justification includes incorrect information.	Topic chosen justified based on student's competences or development of his or her work.	The topic is justified scarsely and from the organization's point of view.	The topic chosen justified from the point of view of the mandator's organization development.	The student justifies the choice of the topic from the point of view of the development of the field in question.	The student justifies the choice of the topic from the point of view of its relevance for the field in question. Reforms in the job market, research or artistic originality, societal relevance.
Limitation of the scope Weight 1	Scope is not limited.	The student has limited the topic but justifies it only from one point of view.	The student has limited the topic from several points of view but fragmented.	The student limits the topic justifying it in various ways.	The student limits the topic justifying it in various ways as one entity.	The student limits the topic justifying it critically from various points of view.
Definition of the objectives Weight 2	No definition of the objectives.	Limited definition of the objectives.	Objectives defined too vaguely or too generally. They should be detailed.	Essential objectives related to development, research or artistic process defined.	Clearly limited and expressed objectives related to development, research or artistic process.	Objectives defined suitable for the thesis. Objectives contain a new viewpoint.
Theoretical framework and essential concepts Weight 4	Fail	1	2	3	4	5

Data search and sources Weight 2 Theoretical framework and concepts Weight 2	No description of the choice of sources and/or no source criticism. The student does not master the compilation of theoretical framework and/or identify essential concepts in the work.	Sources include random choices of non-essential, unilateral, out of date or secondary sources which support only parts of the study. The student builds a fragmented theoretical framework vaguely related to the objectives set. The student identifies essential concepts, but the discussion is disconnected.	The student selects sources supporting the research and the phenomenon in question. Source material mostly upto-date and original. The student creates a theoretical framework with references and identifies essential concepts. Theoretical framework is linked to the topic but the relationships between different concepts and theories is not clarified.	The student selects essential sources related to the phenomena in question. Some international sources. The student creates a relevant theoretical framework limited to the topic and phenomenon in question. Fluent and logical use of essential concepts, relationships between different concepts and theories demonstrated.	The student selects various topical sources relevant to the study. The student has a good overview of domestic and international sources related to the research topic. The student creates a relevant and justified theoretical framework limited to the topic and the phenomenon in question appropiately. The student analyzes, compares and summarizes essential concepts and theories.	The student selects various topical and international sources. In case of a less researched topic, the student uses sources from relating fields. The student shows his or her expertise in the study field with the choice of sources. Critical evaluation of the source data. The student discusses research data critically and extensively. A justified synthesis is drafted based on the theoretical framework and presented as an illustrative frame. Discussion on essential concepts is logical, critic and insightful.
Implementation Weight 6	Fail	1	2	3	4	5
Development, working and	Approach or method	Approach and/or methods	Approach and method	Approach and methods chosen for	Approach and methods chosen for	Approach and methods

research methods. Weight 3	documented and/or used erroneously or not documented at all.	documented narrowly based on literature on methods. Errors in the approach and/or methods chosen.	documented based on literature on methods. Faults in using the approach and/or methods.	the development or research activity documented based on literature on methods.	the development or research activity documented and justified also based on international literature on methods. The student masters the approach chosen and methods in practice.	documented, justified, used and evaluated critically based on international literature on methods.
Description and analysis of the data Weight 2	Incomplete set of data does not answer to the research or development problem.	Fragmented or narrow set of data only partially suitable as a solution for a research or development task. Data analysis superficial or non-existing.	Data collected serves the research or development problem, but the data and the data analysis are incomplete.	Sufficient data collection reliably suitable for the research or development problem. Data analysis documented logically.	Sufficient reliable data collection suitable for research or development problem. Data collection and analysis documented in various ways logically.	Carefully collected large data reliably suitable for research or development problem. Data collection and analysis documented in various ways logically. Diverse analysis and credible conclusions. Expert analysis process documented.
Independent process management	The student is not capable of planning and implementing the thesis	The student plans and implements the thesis relatively	The student plans and implements the thesis independently with	The student plans and implements the thesis independently and	The student plans and implements the thesis independently and	The student makes a plan and implements the thesis
Weights 1	independently nor	independently but does not know	guidance.	benefits appropriately from	benefits from agreed guidance.	independently and responsibly with

	benefits from guidance offered.	how to benefit from guidance.		guidance. Responsible cooperation with the commissioner, goal-oriented progress.	Proactive and responsible towards the commissioner, ready for new development.	results. Analytical assessment of working process and capable of developing it. Expert attitude during guidance process and with the mandator.
Results and discussion Weight 8	Fail	1	2	3	4	5
Presentation of the results/output Weight 1	No presentation of the results or the output or the results are incorrect.	Results/output presented superficially, incorrectly or listing. Development or research problems answered incompletely.	Results or output presented with a poor link to new developments or research problems.	Results presented answer the development or research problems in a justified and illustrative way.	Results presented answer the development or research problems in a justified, logic and illustrative way.	Significant results presented give an answer the development or research problems in a justified, logic and illustrative way.
Relation between the results and theory Weight 2	No results presented.	Narrow analysis of results not linked to the theoretical background.	Results presented in relation to the theoretical background, but the approach is limited.	The relationship between the results and theory illustrated. Results analyzed from different points of view.	The relationship between the theory and results clearly justified and interpreted. Analytical and multifaceted discussion.	The relationships between the theory and results demonstrated, justified originally, critically and in a multifaceted way.
Relevance of the results in the working life Weight 1	No relevance. The feedback from the mandator states significant defects in the work.	Results/output are little relevant. Feedback from the mandator states	Limited relevance of the results/output. The mandator is mostly satisfied with the results.	Results/output is relevant for the mandator or the work is generally interesting in the	Results/output are convincing and applicable in the field in question. The mandator is	Results/output are significant and applicable when developing the field in question.

		defects in the work.		field in question. The mandator is satisfied with the results.	very satisfied with the results.	Excellent feedback from the mandator.
Credibility Weight 1	No analysis or incorrect analysis of credibility.	Superficial analysis of the credibility.	Some analysis of credibility but only on some parts of the work.	Credibility analyzed in relation to critical parts in work process. The student is partially capable to theoretically analyze the credibility.	Credibility assessed and reflected throughout the work. The student shows to master the theoretical principles in evaluation.	Credibility assessed and reflected thoroughly. Critical argumentation. Excellent combination of student's thesis process to theoretical principles when evaluating the credibility.
Research ethics Weight 1	No research ethics presented. Plagiarism detected.	Research ethics respected but narrowly discussed.	Research ethics respected. Ethical questions discussed in critical points of the thesis.	Research ethics respected. Ethical questions discussed in consideration of critical points of the thesis.	Research ethics respected. Expert level interpretation and analysis of the ethical principles linked to the whole thesis.	Research ethics respected. Insightful and critical analysis of ethical questions related to his/her own work.
Conclusions and future work Weight 2	No conclusions.	Conclusions and ideas for development presented but not justified.	Conclusions and ideas for development presented partially related to the research.	Conclusions and ideas for development based on conclusions presented and justified.	Justified conclusions and ideas for development clearly based on the research.	Justified and clear conclusions. Innovative and feasible ideas for new development based on the thesis and work methods.
Reporting Weight 4	Fail	1	2	3	4	5
Written language	No logic structure. Lot of linguistic	Numerous linguistic	Linguistically mostly correct, formal	Linguistically mostly correct, clear	Fluent, linguistically correct analytical	Vivid, fluent, linguistically

	errors.	deficiencies. Titles	language. Broad or	formal language.	formal language.	correct analytical
Weight 3	Cumbersome	fragmented and	fragmented titles.	Titles refer to the	Titles refer to the	formal language.
	sentences against	illogical.	References follow	essential content.	essential content	Titles illustrate well
	linguistic and	References do not	partially SAMK	References and list	and approach.	the essential
	grammatical rules.	follow SAMK	instructions.	of references follow	References and list	content and
	Incomplete	instructions, or	Accessibility	partially SAMK	of references	approach.
	references.	they are written in	requirements	instructions.	systematically	Systematically
		several different	mostly respected.	Accessibility	according to SAMK	drafted references
	Plariarism	styles. Accessibility		requirements	instructions.	and list of
	detected.	requirements		mostly respected	Accessibility	references
		partially respected.			requirements	following SAMK
					mostly respected.	instructions.
						Accessibility
						requirements
						respected.
Layout	Layout instructions	Unfinished layout.	Several errors in	Finished report	Finished report	Layout instructions
	not followed.	Instructions only	layout in respect to	follows mostly the	according to the	respected and
		partially respected.	the thesis	thesis instructions	thesis instructions.	finished,
Weight 1			instructions.			appropriate
						illustrative work.