Evaluation matrix for Master's theses of the Faculty of Biological and Environmental Sciences

	SATISFACTORY – WEAK Does not achieve the average learning objectives (corresponds to the grades of 1–2)	GOOD Achieves the average learning objectives (corresponds to the grades of 3–4).	EXCELLENT Exceeds the average learning objectives (corresponds to the grade of 5).
GRADE/ FEATURES ASSESSED	APPROBATUR – LUBENTER APPROBATUR – NON SINE LAUDE APPROBATUR	CUM LAUDE APPROBATUR – MAGNA CUM LAUDE APPROBATUR	EXIMIA CUM LAUDE APPROBATUR – LAUDATUR
CAPACITY FOR SCIENTIFIC THOUGHT, FAMILIARITY WITH THE RESEARCH TOPIC			
Introduction • Presentation of the theoretical background • Research question	The description of the theoretical background is narrow or skewed. The purpose of the work is narrowly described, and the reasoning is unclear. The research question remains ambiguous, and its relation to the background literature is presented unclearly.	The key theoretical background is explained, and its connection to the purpose of the work is clear. The research question is clear, but lacks broader significance.	The theoretical starting point and the description of concepts show profound familiarity with the background to the research. The purpose of the thesis is clearly linked to the theoretical background. The research question is described succinctly and argued critically. Its connection to the background literature is evident.
Literature	The use of sources is selective or otherwise deficient. Literature of key importance is missing.	The use of sources is appropriate but not particularly creative or comprehensive.	The use of sources is comprehensive and appropriate, and includes all the key sources, both old and new.
Analysis and conclusions • Linkage between the results and the literature • Evaluation of the reliability of the results	The analysis focuses largely on the student's own results and fails to properly show linkages to the literature.	The key results are highlighted and discussed in relation to the research question and the literature. The analysis is reliable but not particularly broad.	The analysis is broad, critical and even original. The results are excellently linked to the literature. The conclusions form a logical continuum to the theoretical background and research question. The material is used and analysed excellently. The reliability of the results is evaluated critically and thoroughly.
Cohesiveness of the work as a whole	The work is poorly balanced and deficient in many respects.	The work presents all the required elements in a logical order. However, minor deficiencies exist.	The work is logical and consistent throughout.
PROFICIENCY IN THE USE OF RESEARCH METHODS			
Execution of the work • Description of the material and methods • Empirical work and analysis • Compatibility of theory and empirical work	The description of the material and methods is incomplete or the selection has been made on insufficient grounds. The methods are not fully mastered, and the empirical work is limited or excessive. Theory and empirical work are poorly connected.	The material and methods are properly described and used. The scope of the empirical work is appropriate enough. The empirical work is linked to theory.	The material and methods are described clearly, in compliance with good scientific practice. The methods are used in a versatile and exemplary manner. The scope of the work is fully appropriate. Theory and empirical work are connected ingeniously.
Results Presentation of the results	Poor use has been made of the material. The results are presented superficially, or even incorrectly. Reporting is unclear. The figures, tables and text are inconsistent.	Good use has been made of the material. The results are presented logically, and reporting is clear. The figures and tables are clear and support the text.	Excellent use has been made of the material. The results are presented clearly and logically, they offer scientifically novel information or add to existing knowledge in the field. The figures and tables support each other and the text well.
PROFICIENCY IN ACADEMIC WRITING			
Presentation, revision and technical execution	The writing mostly follows the style of academic language, but contains many mistakes. The bibliography and/or references contain errors. The layout complies with the instructions. The tables, figures and appendices are appropriate, but sometimes unclear.	The text is written in good, correct and clear academic language. The use of terminology is appropriate. The text reflects the writer's academic thinking. The bibliography and references are mainly faultless. The tables, figures and appendices are clear, and the layout complies with the instructions.	Excellent use of language is a major strength of work graded *laudatur*. The language is polished and easily flowing, as expected of academic writing. The text excellently reflects the author's academic thinking and understanding. Terminology is used expertly. The bibliography and references are faultless and comply with the practices in the field (the instructions given). Textual references to the literature are made fluently. The layout complies with the instructions. The use of figures, tables and appendices supports the text well.