**Instructions for assessing Bachelor’s theses**

The work of assessing a Bachelor’s thesis is divided into several components: a numerical evaluation is performed according to the assessment criteria and verbal justification is given for it; a summary is written evaluating the thesis as a whole, and a justification is written for the grade. In its final approved form, the overall grade for the bachelor’s thesis is either Pass (corresponding to numerical grades 1 to 4) or Pass with Distinction (5). The numerical evaluation is marked on the table with a checkmark (“X”). A numerical grade of 0 means the thesis has major flaws.

|  |
| --- |
| **Thesis topic and objective** Defining the topic and its scope. Research questions. Setting the objectives. Choice of methods (for experimental research work).* 1–2: The scope of the topics is too narrow or too broad, or possibly the thesis fails to address the subject. The objectives lack clarity, detail, or precision, or they have been misunderstood.
* 3–4: The thesis has clear objectives, and its scope is appropriate to the purpose.
* 5: The presentation of the objectives is very clear, and the thesis scope is very well defined.
 |
| **Structure** Analysis and order of presentation of the contents. Illustration.* 1–2: The contents have not been analysed or broken down into logical divisions (chapters, sections, etc.), or the order of presentation is poorly suited to the discussion. The cross-referencing between the parts of the thesis is distracting. Terms and concepts are used before they have been properly defined.
* 3–4: The thesis is well organised, and there are no significant weaknesses in the thesis structure.
* 5: The thesis analysis is very clear, and the structure is well-suited to the topic discussed. The order of presentation of the topics discussed and the ‘narrative thread’ of the thesis are natural; cross-referencing between the parts of the thesis is used only when warranted.
 |
| **References** Quality, quantity, and utilisation of sources and literature. Referencing conventions. * 1–2: The sources are of poor academic quality, insufficient quantity, or selected without reflection. The author has made only a superficial acquaintance with the sources, referred to them incorrectly, or used them too dependently (over-quoting) when writing the thesis. There are flaws in the list of references or in the mechanics of citing references.
* 3–4: Most of the sources are of high academic quality, sufficient in number, and aptly chosen. The author shows a command of referencing conventions and integrating references as a part of the text, and there are no major flaws in the list of references.
* 5: The sources are aptly chosen with a critically minded evaluation, are of high academic quality (peer-reviewed publications), and are necessary to cover the scope of the thesis. The author shows a very natural command of the sources, and the references are reported clearly in the text (referencing).
 |
| **Conclusions and achievement of objectives** Argumentation. Answering research questions. Scheduling. Ability to work independently.* 1–2: Following the reasoning behind the conclusions is difficult, and any experiments conducted cannot be repeated based on how they were reported in the thesis. The conclusions are drawn from narrow evidence, they are weakly supported or even unfounded. The objectives and results of the thesis are possibly not in alignment. The research questions remain partly unaddressed. The completion of the thesis required significant input from the thesis advisor, or the thesis was not completed within the given or agreed time frame.
* 3–4: The conclusions were drawn from the references in a justifiable manner, and the research questions were answered to a satisfactory extent. The thesis was completed within the given/agreed time frame.
* 5: The results of the thesis have been examined in light of the sources and their transferability has been thoroughly evaluated. The conclusions are accurate, critical, and demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the thesis topic. The results address the research questions thoroughly. Any experiments conducted are repeatable. The student worked on the thesis independently and in accordance with the given schedule.
 |
| **Thesis language and formatting** Spelling. Formatting. Finalising the thesis.* 1–2: The level of detail in the discussion varies significantly between different parts of the thesis. The text meanders and includes irrelevant material. Numerous spelling mistakes and grammatical errors make the text difficult to read.
* 3–4: The thesis language is appropriate, and its format is well-organised and clear.
* 5: The thesis appearance is polished, and its language and style are impeccable.
 |
| **Oral presentation** Introduction. Structure. Command of the topic. Enthusiasm of delivery. Intelligibility of presentation. Use of voice. Audience engagement. Use of examples. Slides. Time management.* 1–2: The student has problems grasping the topic. The presentation does not proceed in a logical order or focusses on irrelevant aspects of the work. The student goes overtime or leaves key elements out of the presentation, suggesting a lack of rehearsal.
* 3–4: The presentation gives a good overall idea of the Bachelor’s thesis to the audience and moves at the appropriate level of abstraction.
* 5: The presentation is convincing to the audience, and the author appears to have a broad-based knowledge of the topic.
 |

The verbal part of the evaluation statement focusses on evaluating the thesis constructively and giving justifications for the numerical grade, especially when the grade is at either extreme end of the grading scale. The conclusions and evaluation part should restate the objectives and conclusions/results of the thesis. If the thesis does not merit a grade of Good (the numerical grade of 3), the thesis advisor should return it to the student for corrections.