

Rules and guidelines for Master Theses in the Earth Sciences Master's program

A guide for students, advisors, examiners and course coordinator

Applicable from March 2016 until replaced by a new version

1	General information	3
1.1	Objectives and scope of a Master Thesis.....	3
1.2	The Master's Theses course	3
1.3	Different types of theses	3
1.4	Submitting journal papers instead of a thesis	4
1.5	Thesis language	4
1.6	Prerequisites for registering, beginning and carrying out a thesis.....	4
1.7	Deliverables	5
1.8	Registration of the thesis	5
1.9	Thesis workplace	5
1.10	Financial support.....	5
2	Thesis Workflow	6
2.1	Overview of the thesis workflow.....	6
2.2	Phase 1: From initial idea to registration.....	6
2.2.1	Finding a project.....	6
2.2.2	Establishing the thesis team – roles and responsibilities.....	6
2.2.3	Writing a thesis plan.....	8
2.2.4	Thesis time plan	8
2.2.5	Thesis registration	9
2.3	Phase 2 - Carrying out the project	9
2.3.1	Seminar attendance	9
2.3.2	Discussions with advisor(s).....	9
2.3.3	Discussions with examiner and course coordinator	10
2.3.4	Kick-off and half-time seminar	10
2.4	Phase 3: Submission of the first complete draft and Seminar	10
2.4.1	Submitting a first draft to the advisor(s)	10

2.4.2	Seminar – Thesis Defense	10
2.5	Phase 4: Grading and completing a thesis	11
2.5.1	After the seminar – final version for grading	11
2.5.2	Grading process	11
2.5.3	The grade’s relation to the thesis plan.....	11
2.5.4	Grading	11
2.5.5	Explanation of the grading grading form and grading criteria.....	12
2.5.6	If the examiner decides to grade the thesis with U (failed).....	12
2.5.7	Printing the thesis	12
2.5.8	Reporting of the final grade.	13
2.5.9	Publishing the thesis on the Departments web page	13
2.6	Specific comments on the timing of Phases 3 and 4	13
3	Appendices	14
3.1	Grade report form	14
3.2	Printing requisition form	14
3.3	Thesis registration form (to be submitted to course coordinator)	14
3.4	Regler för examensarbeten med flera författare	14
3.5	Rules for grading of degree project for the degree of master at the faculty of science	
	14	

Preface

This manual has been assembled by the Department of Earth Science's education committee (*Programkommitté geovetenskap*) in cooperation with the course coordinator for the courses GV0430-GVG045-GV0460. The manual is designed to guide students, advisors, examiners and the course coordinator through the process of completing a **Master's Thesis** in the Earth Sciences program (GVC). It includes information that is important to know about prior to the start of a Master's Thesis project, as well as during the execution and completion of your thesis.

A similar, yet not in all respects comparable document exist:

- Bachelor Theses in Earth Science

A **complementary writing manual** describes how student reports and thesis at the Department of Earth Science, University of Gothenburg should be organized and written. This writing manual is currently in preparation. A preliminary version that should be regarded as valid for Master's Theses in Earth Sciences as well can be found as a part of the document describing the rules for writing bachelor theses (<http://gvc.gu.se/utbildning/examensarbeten-och-avhandlingar>).

1 General information

1.1 Objectives and scope of a Master Thesis

Successfully completing a Master Thesis (Geovetenskapligt examensarbete, GV0430, GV0445, GV0460) is an essential prerequisite for obtaining a Master's degree in Earth Sciences at the University of Gothenburg.

The purpose of a Master's Thesis is to give the student a significant experience in planning, carrying out, critically evaluating, and presenting (orally and in writing) a research project within the field of Earth sciences – under supervision of one or more experienced supervisors.

A Master thesis has to have scientific significance and thus has to be based on relevant research questions and/or testing of scientific hypothesis and scientifically sound methodology has to be applied. The scientific quality of a Master Thesis project is assessed by a staff member from the University of Gothenburg (examiner) who has a teaching-position ("läraranställning", see section 2.2.2.3).

1.2 The Master's Theses course

The thesis project is taken as a course. The student must register for this course prior to the start of the project (see section 1.8). The appropriate courses are "Geovetenskapligt examensarbete, GV0430 (30hp), GV0445 (45hp), GV0460 (60hp).

Master's Thesis can be carried out at different speeds and students can begin their thesis work at any time of the academic year (note that the date the thesis starts is part of the project plan and requires thus approval by the thesis team, see sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3).

1.3 Different types of theses

Students can choose to do theses with 30, 45 or 60 credits (20 weeks, 30 weeks, 45 weeks). The program committee strongly recommends to write 60hp theses.

The student needs to understand that the thesis project is considered to be a full-time project. ‘Half-speed’ projects and projects with varying intensity and pace can be arranged on request. Theses can even be interrupted to take other courses. The corresponding arrangements have to be discussed with the study advisor and the thesis team (see section 2.2.2) in good time before the thesis project starts.

The course plans for the three individual courses can be found at:

<http://kursplaner.gu.se/pdf/kurs/sv/GV0430>

<http://kursplaner.gu.se/pdf/kurs/sv/GV0445>

<http://kursplaner.gu.se/pdf/kurs/sv/GV0460>

1.4 Submitting journal papers instead of a thesis

It is possible to submit a Master’s thesis in “Ph.D. thesis style”. Ph.D. theses in natural sciences in Sweden are usually submitted by attaching a number (3-5) articles that are published in peer reviewed scientific journals along with a 20-50 pages summary of the entire work (called kappa). The Ph.D. candidate has to describe in this kappa what her/his contribution to the articles was (it should encompass major parts of writing, planning and performing the works described in the article). The articles can have the status “published” (i.e. printed in the respective journal or online), accepted for publication by the journal editor or “manuscript in preparation”.

In general, it is possible to do follow the same procedure for Master’s Theses. However, the following needs to be considered:

1. This type of theses report requires intensive discussion with supervisors, examiner and course coordinator and their approval
2. A document has to be provided that describes in detail the individual contributions of the student(s) to the manuscript or article. As more than one author are involved the rules described in 2.2.2.1 have to be followed.
3. The “kappa” i.e. the summary of the theses has to clearly describe the work performed by the student and its individual results

Students should consider that preparing a journal article at the standard required by international scientific journals with good reputation is usually more demanding than writing a traditional thesis report. If several co-authors are involved, the process of writing can be delayed by missing or incomplete contributions of co-authors.

1.5 Thesis language

The thesis should be written in English. It may be written in Swedish if the student can support an argument for it.

1.6 Prerequisites for registering, beginning and carrying out a thesis

To carry out a thesis requires a team which is, besides the student, comprised of the main advisor, optionally one or several technical advisor(s) and an examiner.

To obtain a Master of Science in Earth sciences the student needs to have received a Bachelor degree (180 hp¹ including a thesis of 15 hp). Details can be found in the respective course plans (see section 1.3).

From the course plan: *“För tillträde till kursen krävs kandidatexamen om 180 hp i geovetenskap som innehåller minst 30 hp inom relevant ämnesområde samt genomgångna avancerade kurser i geovetenskap om minst 15 hp med minst godkänt resultat. Studerande med likvärdig utbildning med minst 180 hp avslutade geovetenskapliga kurser kan efter prövning beredas tillträde till kursen.”*

1.7 Deliverables

The project is to be presented in written form in a thesis. The project is also to be presented orally at a public seminar (thesis defense seminar).

From the course plan: *”Projektarbetet redovisas skriftligt genom en uppsats som skall redovisas vid ett seminarium. Deltagande i seminarieövningar är obligatoriskt. Lärare som sätter betyg äger dock medge studerande befrielse från skyldigheten att delta i viss undervisning.”*

In addition, students have to present their project plan in the beginning of their project and give a short report after approximately half of the project time has passed.

See section 2.3.4: Kick-off and half-time seminar

And section 2.4.2: Seminar – Thesis Defense

1.8 Registration of the thesis

Each thesis has to be registered before the actual start of the project. Preparatory work (e.g. developing a project plan) can be carried out prior to the official start of the project. Students who work on a thesis which is not correctly registered cannot expect that this work is considered part of the thesis (see section 2.2.5).

1.9 Thesis workplace

The thesis work can be carried out at any other location than the Department of Earth Sciences in Gothenburg as long as the main advisor, examiner and course-coordinator are informed about the progress and problems regularly.

1.10 Financial support

Each student is entitled to financial support by the department. The current (2016) support levels are: 5000 kr for a 30hp, 7500 kr for a 45hp, 10000 kr for a 60hp thesis. These figures do not mean that each student gets this amount automatically, it means that a sum up to the stated amount can be used on request. The expenses have to be justified, approved by the advisor and receipts are to be presented. Students are advised to check with their advisor what the most appropriate way to spend the money is. Usually it is recommended to perform purchases using the beställare-ID of the main advisor.

The department however does not support projects that require substantial financial support unless the project is supported by the advisor’s research funds.

¹ hp=högskolepoäng, points

The advisors have to check with the department head if the relation of expenses to the thesis project is unclear. A budget for the thesis has to be provided in the individual project plan.

2 Thesis Workflow

2.1 Overview of the thesis workflow

A thesis project comprises the following phases:

Phase 1 - before the official start: finding a project, determining advisors, examiner, developing a project plan, registration

Phase 2 - Carrying out the project, field work, lab work, literature review, discussions with advisor and examiner, half-time seminar

Phase 3 - submitting: draft to the advisor(s), revisions, planning of defense seminar, seminar,

Phase 4 - grading and grade reporting: submission to examiner, last changes, grading, printing, reporting

Unlike the bachelor thesis, a Master Thesis project can start and end at any time of the year.

2.2 Phase 1: From initial idea to registration

2.2.1 Finding a project

The thesis project can be an evaluation of field measurements or surveys, laboratory studies, analysis of existing data or, in specific cases, a literature study. It has to have a strong relation to Earth Sciences.

A student cannot expect that a thesis project is assigned to her/him. The student has to actively and in good time explore possible topics for their Master thesis. It is strongly recommended that a thesis project is developed together with one or more advisors.

It is theoretically possible, though not recommended, that a student develops a thesis project entirely on her/his own and finds an advisor for this project later.

A thesis project can also be arranged with and carried out under the supervision of one or several *technical advisors* who are not employed at the Department of Earth Sciences (Consultancies, employees of other departments, other universities, other organizations dealing with research questions within Earth Sciences). In this case a *main advisor* from the Department of Earth Sciences is needed (see section 2.2.2).

2.2.2 Establishing the thesis team – roles and responsibilities

The team needed to carry out a Master Thesis project is comprised of the student or group of students working on a project, a main advisor, optionally one or more technical advisor(s), an examiner and the course coordinator.

2.2.2.1 Student or group of students

Every thesis project is an independent study where the responsibility for the project lies mainly with the student.

It is possible, sometimes even recommended, to perform project work in a team with other students. It is furthermore possible to write one thesis report together. In this case the regulations described in Document "Dnr G 8 1780/08 - Regler för examensarbeten med flera författare (Beslutsfattare Naturvetenskapliga fakultetsnämnden)" apply. See appendix.

2.2.2.2 *Advisor(s)*

It is the advisor's responsibility to ensure that the project is suitable to be finished on-time, and to meet with the student regularly and monitor progress. The advisor also critically evaluates the in-handed drafts of thesis manuscript, and provides advice on how to improve, shorten/lengthens etc. Depending on where and how the thesis is performed one or more advisors may be required.

2.2.2.2.1 *Technical advisor(s)*

The person or group of persons guiding the student(s) through the thesis process from the initial idea to completion, providing assistance in all technical questions around the thesis. Technical advisor can be anyone with sufficient technical expertise to carry out and support the thesis project. Whether or not the expertise of the technical advisor is sufficient is judged by the main advisor and examiner. If the technical advisor does not have the qualification to be main advisor (see 2.2.2.2.2), a main advisor has to be assigned.

2.2.2.2.2 *Main Advisor*

The main advisor has to be a staff member of the Department of Earth Sciences and should have expertise in the subject of the thesis. The main advisor can be at the same time technical advisor. The main advisor has to guarantee that the thesis topic and the research questions are scientifically relevant and that the project is carried out in a scientifically appropriate way. In cases where the main advisor is not a staff member with a "läroanställning" (see section 2.2.2.3) at GEO, the course coordinator has to be consulted.

2.2.2.3 *Examiner*

The examiner grades the thesis after consulting the advisor. The examiner is, together with the course coordinator, responsible that the thesis is carried out as described in the thesis plan and that problems of any nature that could form an obstacle to a successful completion of the thesis are solved. It is not the responsibility of the examiner to explore if such problems exist.

The examiner is a staff member from the University of Gothenburg who has a teaching-position ("läroanställning"). To be an examiner, a staff member must have one of the following positions: professor, universitetslektor, universitetsadjunkt, biträdande universitetslektor, forskarasistent, adjungerad professor, gästprofessor, adjungerad universitetslektor, adjungerad universitetsadjunkt, gästlärare, samt senior professor.

2.2.2.4 *Course Coordinator*

A teacher at the Department of Earth Science who is responsible for the Master Thesis course. The course coordinator informs students about the formal requirements of a thesis, organizes seminars and short courses around thesis writing, presentations and research related skills. The course coordinator is in charge of the GUL course page. The course coordinator maintains a list of the students involved in thesis work with a checklist over their progress including project description, advisor's name, and examiner's name.

The course coordinator has to be informed about all formal issues regarding the theses, i.e. start and end date, delays and extensions, seminar dates.

The course coordinator is responsible to report the grades to study administration.

2.2.2.5 *Opponent*

The opponent is typically another Master's student who is to critically read through the *final version* of the thesis looking carefully at the structure, grammar and style, and scientific content and argument. The opponent leads the discussion after the seminar with comments and questions based on the seminar and the opponent's careful reading the thesis.

Each student also has to serve as an opponent for another student's oral presentation.

2.2.3 **Writing a thesis plan**

When the subject and topic have been agreed upon between the student and advisor(s), the student, with the help of the advisor(s), needs to write a project description. This project description needs to be delivered to the advisor and examiner, who must approve and sign the plan prior to the start of the course/project.

The project description must include the following information:

- Student's name, address, telephone numbers and e-mail address.
- Thesis working title
- All advisors' and examiner's name, telephone number and e-mail.
- A short description of the project including
 - Background and motivation of the project
 - Major project goals
 - Research questions to be answered and/or hypothesis to be tested
 - Methods to be applied (including a description of the availability of required equipment, software etc.)
 - Anticipated results in relation to the set objectives
 - Data availability and/or options to acquire field/lab data
 - Economy: a list of all costs involved in the project and the source of these funds.
 - Feasibility assessment by the student (the overall feasibility is assessed by advisor/examiner, see below)
 - Time plan.

Prior to the projects initiation, the main advisor and the examiner are responsible for evaluating the feasibility of the study.

When the project description is completed and signed by the student, the advisor(s) and the examiner, copies are delivered to the course coordinator and the student advisor (studievägledaren) using the thesis registration form (see appendix).

2.2.4 **Thesis time plan**

The time frame of a Master Thesis differs from the time plan for bachelor thesis in that:

- a) Thesis can be started at (almost) any time within the timeframe of the Master's Program
- b) Thesis can be spread out over longer periods, interrupted and carried out at less than 100%

The thesis time plan has to be adjusted to the individual study plan and approved by the study advisor, in particular when theses are carried out over longer periods.

It is evident, that unforeseeable events can require adjustments to the time and work plan. In this case, it is the student's responsibility to inform the thesis team about the required adjustments in good time. Changes to the time plan have to be documented and communicated to the Course Coordinator.

The time plan should be as specific as necessary and possible as well as realistic. A gant chart is recommended to show dependencies between different thesis elements.

NOTE WELL: The grade VG cannot be obtained if a thesis is finished not-more-than three months after the approved date of termination.

A thesis can be considered finished the day the examiner reports the final grade to the course coordinator.

2.2.5 Thesis registration

The students register for the thesis course (see course codes above) as for any other course. This means, a student can register for the course without having a project, a project plan, an advisor and examiner. It is however strongly recommended not to do this but to follow the procedure described in this document.

The thesis itself has to be registered with the course coordinator using the form provided (appendix). This can only be done after the thesis plan has been approved and signed by all partners of the thesis team (see section 2.2.3).

By signing the thesis plan, all partners involved, including technical (external) advisor(s) confirm that they have read and understood this present document, and are aware of their responsibilities. It is the student's responsibility to make sure that all required signatures are made.

The student has to be registered in the GUL event which will be done automatically when the student registers for the course.

2.3 Phase 2 - Carrying out the project

A thesis project is worth 30, 45 or 60 hp, and therefore the student should expect to work 20, 30 or 40 weeks, respectively, on their project, **fulltime**. If the thesis is not, or only partly, carried out fulltime, the thesis period is extended accordingly. This needs to be discussed with and approved by the study administration and the thesis team.

2.3.1 Seminar attendance

Quotation from the course plan: "Projektarbetet redovisas skriftligt genom en uppsats som skall redovisas vid ett seminarium. *Delta i seminarieövningar är obligatoriskt. Lärare som sätter betyg äger dock medge studerande befrielse från skyldigheten att delta i viss undervisning.*"

It is strongly recommended that students carrying out a Master's Thesis project attend the respective seminar series. In the case of students with a focus on Geology this would be the course GVG400/500, Geology seminar 1 and 2.

2.3.2 Discussions with advisor(s)

Regular meetings and/or meetings on demand are essential for the successful conduct of a thesis project. The number and length of meetings, joint field trips and demonstrations of lab-equipment / software depend largely on the subject and individual setup of the thesis.

The minimum of supervision time a student can expect from all advisors (sum of time spent by all advisors) is 45minutes per week in average.

At these meetings the advisor defines the most appropriate methods, helps to develop the research question, evaluates the originality, creativity and degree of risk taking, checks the quality, comprehensiveness and scholarly approach, discusses the structure and presentation and analyses critically. The aim of the meetings is to identify at an early stage any lack of analysis or engagement, poor presentation, inadequate methods or scope.

2.3.3 Discussions with examiner and course coordinator

The examiner and course coordinator have to be informed in good time about all events and problems that could lead to a delay or changes in the thesis plan.

2.3.4 Kick-off and half-time seminar

Soon after the thesis start the student should give a short presentation (5-10 minutes) at a suitable forum (e.g. in the geology seminar GVG400/500) to introduce the thesis work plan to teachers and fellow students.

After about 50% of the thesis time the student should give a presentation of about 10-20 minutes on the progress and the future plans at a suitable forum.

The approximate dates for these two seminars have to be stated in the thesis plan. Dates have to be arranged together with the thesis team.

2.4 Phase 3: Submission of the first complete draft and Seminar

2.4.1 Submitting a first draft to the advisor(s)

In good time before the thesis defense (see section 2.4.2) the student has to submit a complete draft version to the advisor(s), which the advisor(s) will carefully read and comment. Based on these comments the student will prepare a revised version that is submitted to the opponent and examiner at least two weeks before the seminar. Opponent and examiner will usually not comment on this version before the seminar.

Whether or not individual sections of a thesis can be sent to the advisors in advance can be negotiated. It is however important that an advisor can refuse to read and comment on incomplete drafts that do not comprise all the required sections (see writing manual).

The exact modalities of the procedure between submission of the first draft and thesis defense are not prescribed by this manual. It is, however important that the individual modalities of the process are discussed and agreed on in good time. The student is responsible for all delays that occur as a result of not contacting the thesis team and opponents soon enough.

The student is however not responsible for any delays caused by the advisors and examiner.

2.4.2 Seminar – Thesis Defense

All students must present their thesis work at a public seminar. The date of the seminar is arranged by the Course Coordinator following a discussion with the entire thesis team. The advisor(s), in any case the main advisor, opponent, and examiner must be present at the seminar. The opponent is chosen by the advisor after consulting with the course coordinator and is usually a student working on a thesis project in a similar field.

2.5 Phase 4: Grading and completing a thesis

The thesis grade is determined by the examiner after consultation with the advisor.

The entire thesis team, and in particular the students, have to be aware that the thesis compiled at the Dept. of Earth Sciences will be publicly available at the library and through the internet. They will form materials that are used in evaluations of the course program and used by other parties to evaluate the students' competence, for example in the course of job applications. A crucial part in preparing a thesis that is free from technical and language errors is thus a time plan that allows enough time for editing the final version before it is published. All parties involved need to be aware that this can be a time consuming process.

2.5.1 After the seminar – final version for grading

After the seminar, the opponent and the examiner give their comments to the presentation and the draft thesis they obtained before the seminar to the student. Based on these comments and any other comments from advisors and others, the student prepares a final version to be sent to the examiner for grading.

This version is read for a last time by the advisor(s). After optional final revisions **and with the advisor's approval** the student sends the thesis to the examiner for grading

2.5.2 Grading process

The grading system for the course is U, G, and VG, where U is failure (underkänd), G is pass (godkänd), and VG is pass with distinction (välgodkänd).

The examiner grades the version obtained after final revisions by the student and approval of the advisors (see section 2.5.1). The examiner can choose to make comments and ask the student(s) to make changes. Typically, the examiner will let the students know if these changes are required to lift the grade from U to G or from G to VG. The student can choose to make or not to make the changes recommend by the examiner. Not doing the recommended changes will usually result in a lower grade.

See Appendices (3.5) for a detailed description of the grading process.

2.5.3 The grade's relation to the thesis plan

In order for the thesis to receive the top grade of VG, it is important that it is completed within the set time frame.

If a student fails to submit the grading version to the examiner (see section 2.5.1) three month after the planned finishing date for the thesis the thesis will be grade U if the student fails to provide convincing reasons for the delay and no discussion with the thesis team has taken place.

The grade is based on the final manuscript, but also the student's performance and conduct during the projects course period.

2.5.4 Grading

The following grading form has been developed by the Science Faculty for grading theses. The grading is based on the following 5 criteria:

- Understanding
- Implementation
- Results, analysis, and interpretation

- Oral presentation
- Written report

Under several of these points, the examiner will also consider the student's ability to carry out the project independently as well as their ability to keep to the time plan.

The examiner will use the following grading scale for each of the five criteria:

- 0 - Nonexistent
- 1 - Unsatisfactory
- 2 - Sufficient
- 3 - Good
- 4 - Excellent

The final grade shall be based on all five assessment criteria. A final grade of Pass (G) requires at least a grade of '2 – Sufficient' for each of the criteria 1-5 above. If sub-criteria are used, the average value for the main criterion must be at least 2. A grade of Pass with Distinction (VG) requires at least 85 per cent of the maximum total score (in addition to a grade of Pass for all five criteria). It is however possible to assign different weights to different criteria by increasing the maximum score for one or several of them, for example by adding one or several sub-criteria which are subject to the same assessment scale. Any sub-criteria and weighting structure used must be documented and made available to the students at the commencement of the degree project course.

2.5.5 Explanation of the grading form and grading criteria

The grading criteria are explained in detail in the following documents and their appendices:

- RULES Dnr V 2014/495: RULES FOR GRADING OF DEGREE PROJECT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER AT THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE
- RULES Dnr V 2014/494: RULES FOR GRADING OF DEGREE PROJECT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER (60 CREDITS) AT THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE
- Appendix, Detailed assessment criteria, second cycle

These documents are accessible for staff members at: <http://science.gu.se/intranat/dokument/> and are attached to this document as an Appendix.

2.5.6 If the examiner decides to grade the thesis with U (failed)

From the course plan: *“Student har rätt till byte av examiner, om det är praktiskt möjligt, efter att ha underkänts två gånger på samma examination. En sådan begäran ställs till institutionen och skall vara skriftlig.”*

2.5.7 Printing the thesis

When the thesis is finished, the seminar is given, and the final version is approved, the thesis is to be printed as part of GVC's publications B-series. To be published in a B- series, the thesis must have the text format, reference style, and layout that is required. The format for the cover and the first page are set by the *vaktmästeriet*.

1. The student needs to first contact the library to obtain a number in the B series, and in order to do this, the student must deliver the final title of the thesis.
2. Printing is done by the *vaktmästeriet*. The student will give the completed version of the text to the *vaktmästeriet* on a USB stick as well as a *black and white* printout, with the

page numbering in the bottom middle of each page. Students may check with vaktmästeriet if files can be submitted via email

3. At the same time, the student must fill out a REKVISITION EXAMENSARBETE form that can be obtained from *vaktmästeriet* (the Printing Office)(see appendix).
4. The cover page and the title page will be constructed by the *vaktmästeriet*. However, the student may wish to include a photo or figure to be placed in the ‘square’ on the cover. This must be delivered to the *vaktmästeriet* as well.
5. GVC will pay for a certain number of color pages (3-5) in the thesis, but if the number of these is large, the student and/or the advisor will have to pay for these.
6. The vaktmästeriet will copy, add cover and title pages, and bind the thesis.

GVC pays for 10 copies of the student’s thesis in b/w—any additional copies must be paid for by the student or advisor. Of these 10 copies, 2 go to the library, three to the department (including advisor and examiner), and 5 go to the student. The rules about how much the department pays for are currently changing.

2.5.8 Reporting of the final grade.

Once the examiner has determined the final grade, the examiner submits the grading sheet (see appendix) with the written evaluation to the course coordinator.

The course coordinator will check if the thesis has been submitted for printing. If this is the case the course coordinator will report the final grade to study administration who will subsequently report the grade in Ladok.

2.5.9 Publishing the thesis on the Departments web page

A pdf of the final thesis should be placed on the GVC website. However, examiner and course coordinator can decide to only put the title but not the full text on the web page if the student has failed to correct significant errors or the overall quality of the thesis is questionable.

It is the course coordinators responsibility to make sure the pdf is published after approval of the examiner.

2.6 Specific comments on the timing of Phases 3 and 4

The student has to be aware that the process between submitting the first draft to the advisor(s) and finishing the thesis (reporting of the grade) can take considerable time, depending on how mature the draft is and the availability of advisors, examiner and opponent. It is the student’s responsibility to see that this process is straight forward and fast. It is in particular important to announce the submission of draft reports etc. well in advance (several weeks). It cannot be expected that anyone can thoroughly read and comment a 60+ pages document in one day with one-day notice.

Foreseeable delays have to be reported and discussed.

The student is however not responsible for any delays caused by the advisors and examiner.

Note! The Thesis Defense Seminar is not identical with “being done”! Experiences from the past show that 6 month pass in average between defense seminar and grade reporting. Many students defend but never finish. It is the main purpose of this manual to reduce this time span and the number of students who never finish. In the future any delay beyond the finishing date stated in the time plan will thus lead to a grade lower than VG.

3 Appendices

3.1 Grade report form

3.2 Printing requisition form

3.3 Thesis registration form (to be submitted to course coordinator)

3.4 Regler för examensarbeten med flera författare

3.5 Rules for grading of degree project for the degree of master at the faculty of science

Grade report form Master's Thesis

Grade report for independent study in (subject)

Course number: GV04____

Hp: hp

Semester:

Year:

Name:

Project title:

Advisor:

Criteria ⁱ	Grade (0-4 points)
Understanding	
Implementation	
Results, analysis and interpretation	
Oral presentation	
Written report	
Total	

0-X p = U; X-Y p = G; Y-Z p = VG ⁱⁱ

Total grade:

Date

Examiner

Criteria

ⁱ to be adjusted to local needs and these can be weighted differently plus may include several subheadings

REKVISITION examensjobb

Beställande handledare: Telefon:

Kopiering Svart/vit Sidantal Upplaga.....

Man får 5 gratis färg fler med lärarens tillstånd.....

Kopiering färg Antal ex: Sidan:,,

SERIE: **Studentens namn:**

Examen **mail:**

- Kandidat (Bachelor) 15 hec**
 Magister (Master one-year) 30 hec
 Master (Master two-year) 30 45 60
ÅR 201.....

Uppsats	B serien	C serien
Bibliotek	2 ex	2 ex
Avdelning: ex ex
..... ex ex
..... ex ex
..... ex ex
Eleven får	5 exex
Extra bet av elev:	ex
Extra:.....ex
Betalas av:		

OBS!

Vid examensarbete skall följande information beaktas

Lämnas: svartvit enkelsidig förlaga ej hålad ej häftad sidnummer centrerad.

Skriv **färg F** i övre högra hörnet på sv/v förlagan.

B-nr beställs på Biblioteket när arbetet är färdig för tryckning.

En diskett eller **USB** med arbetet i **Word** och **PDF** lämnas (kan vara i delar appendix, introduktion, bilagor)

Avdelningen betalar för **5 färgsidor** som är ett **måste resten, betalas av elev eller handledare**

Priser:	Inbindning + omslag:	7:-	Färg A4 dubbelsidig utskrift	3:-
	Färg A3 enkelsidig utskrift	3:-	Färg A4 enkelsidig utskrift	1.50:-
	Svartvit kopiering internt:	0.40:-	Svartvit kopiering externt	0.60:-

INDIVIDUAL PROJECT PLAN

Degree project in Earth Sciences, advanced level (Master of Science)

Course name:	Geovetenskaplig examensarbete	Course code:	GV04__	Credits	
Year (start):		Period:	<input type="checkbox"/> Jan-Mar <input type="checkbox"/> Mar-Jun <input type="checkbox"/> Jun-Sep <input type="checkbox"/> Sep-Nov <input type="checkbox"/> Nov-Jan		

Student details

Name:		Personal id#:	
Address Street			
Area code		City	
Epost:		Phone:	

Project title (preliminary):

The project will be carried out at (specify location including office and laboratory):			
Does this project require an ethical permit?	Yes	Permit number	
	No		

Supervisor (GU)

Name:		Position:	
Department:			
Email:		Phone:	

External supervisor (if applicable)

Name:		Position:	
Organization:			
Street			
Area code		City	
Email:		Phone:	

Examiner

Name:	
-------	--

Project plan

Add on separate page, the plan should include the following headings:

- **Background** short description of scientific background
- **Aim and/or hypothesis**
- **Methods** planned experimental set-up including statistics if relevant for the project
- **Budget estimates costs of the project**
- **Time plan** rough sketch for the entire project, including all stages of the experimental work, analysis, writing and preparing oral presentation. Add preliminary dates for examination (oral and written). Also add deadlines for getting feedback from your supervisor, and how you will keep in contact
- **Other information** e.g., participation in seminars, training courses, books

By signing this form, I confirm that I have read and accept the rules and responsibilities explained in the guidelines for carrying out a Master's Thesis project at the Department of Earth Sciences, University of Gothenburg

Signature, supervisor (GU)

Signature, student

Signature, external supervisor

Signature, examiner (GU)

Date

Signature course leader

To be submitted to the course coordinator **before** registration



GÖTEBORGS UNIVERSITET

Naturvetenskapliga fakulteten

REGLER

Dnr G 8 1780/08

Regler för examensarbeten med flera författare

Beslutsfattare Naturvetenskapliga fakultetsnämnden

Handläggare Laila Johannesson

Beslutsdatum 2008-05-07

Giltighetstid tillsvidare

Sammanfattning

Regler för examensarbeten med flera författare

Bakgrund

Vid examination skall den enskilde studentens prestation kunna urskiljas. Då ett examensarbete resulterar i en rapport med flera författare behövs ett system för att kunna urskilja de olika författarnas bidrag till arbetet.

Rörande upphovsrätten till texten i rapporten finns ingen komplikation. Denna rätt tillfaller i sin helhet författarna oberoende av deras antal.

Regler

Då planen för examensarbetet fastställs skall följande meddelas de medverkande för att en examination av de medverkandes enskilda prestationer skall kunna göras.

- En loggbok skall föras under arbetet som utvisar de medverkandes enskilda insatser exempelvis arbetspass och studieavbrott. Loggboken skall vara del av underlaget vid examinationen.
- I rapportens förord skall i förekommande fall anges vilka delar som skall tillskrivas respektive författare. Där skall också anges att en loggbok förts över de enskilda medverkandes prestationer under arbetet.

Examination av examensarbete med flera författare får således inte ske utan att loggbok inlämnats och rapportens förord uppfyller villkoren ovan.



GÖTEBORGS UNIVERSITET

Faculty of Science

RULES

Ref. G 8 1780/08

Rules for degree projects with multiple authors

Decision maker	The Board of the Faculty of Science
Contact person	Laila Johannesson
Date of decision	7 May 2008
Period of validity	Until further notice

In the event of problems of interpretation or differences between the Swedish and English text, the Swedish text, which constitutes the basis of the information, shall always take precedence.

Summary

Rules for degree projects with multiple authors

Background

The contribution and performance of each individual student must be identifiable in connection with all examinations. In cases when a degree project results in a report with more than one author, a system to distinguish the contribution of each involved author is required.

As regards the copyright issue in such cases, the rules are clear – the copyright for the entire work is owned by the authors regardless of how many they are.

Rules

In the development of a plan for the degree project, the following information must be conveyed to the participants in order to facilitate proper assessment of individual contributions.

- A log indicating the individual contributions of the participant shall be maintained throughout the development of the degree project/report. The log shall be used in the assessment of students.
- If applicable, the preface of a report with multiple authors shall indicate which part(s) of the report each author has contributed. In addition, the preface shall state that a log of the authors' individual contributions in the development of the report has been maintained.

Thus, assessment of a degree project with multiple authors requires that a work log has been submitted and that the report includes a preface written according to the specifications above.



UNIVERSITY OF
GOTHENBURG

RULES
Dnr V 2014/495

RULES FOR GRADING OF DEGREE PROJECT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER AT THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE

Published	http://science.gu.se/utbildning/student-vid-fakulteten/ , http://science.gu.se/intranat/dokument/
Decision-maker	Dean
Responsible body	Education Officer Marcus Svensson
Date of decision	2014-05-27
Period of validity	Until further notice

RULES FOR GRADING OF DEGREE PROJECT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER AT THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE

Degree projects are graded by a specially appointed examiner following consultation with the student's supervisor. The examiner and the supervisor shall not be the same person.

The grading scale used for degree projects generally comprises Fail (U), Pass (G) and Pass with Distinction (VG).

Assessment criteria

The examiner's assessment of a degree project shall be based on the following general criteria:

1. Understanding
2. Process
3. Results, analysis and interpretation
4. Oral presentation and communication
5. Written presentation

The five assessment criteria are assessed using the following five-step scale:

- 0 - Non-existent
- 1 - Unsatisfactory
- 2 - Sufficient
- 3 - Good
- 4 - Excellent

The final grade shall be based on all five assessment criteria. A final grade of Pass (G) requires at least a grade of '2 – Sufficient' for each of the criteria 1-5 above. If sub-criteria are used, the average value for the main criterion must be at least 2. A grade of Pass with Distinction (VG) requires at least 85 per cent of the maximum total score (in addition to a grade of Pass for all five criteria). It is however possible to assign different weights to different criteria by increasing the maximum score for one or several of them, for example by adding one or several sub-criteria which are subject to the same assessment scale. Any sub-criteria and weighting structure used must be documented and made available to the students at the commencement of the degree project course.

In order to facilitate the assessment and clarify the differences between the grades Pass (G) and Pass with Distinction (VG), a number of concrete requirements that must be fulfilled for the respective grade level are presented below. It should be up to the respective Department/programme to decide which of these requirements are relevant for the course in question.

Additional assessment criteria can be used as needed; see appendix *Bedömningsunderlag, självständigt arbete* for a list.

The requirements are specified for the five main criteria. The respective levels of the assessment scale above (0-4 points) require the following distribution of the three grades U, G and VG.

0 (Non-existent)	U (Fail) assigned for more than half of the criteria
1 (Unsatisfactory)	Roughly equal numbers of U (Fail) and G (Pass)/VG (Pass with Distinction)
2 (Sufficient)	G (Pass)/VG (Pass with Distinction) assigned for all criteria; any U (Fail) can be compensated for with a VG (Pass with Distinction)
3 (Good)	No U (Fail); roughly equal numbers of G (Pass) and VG (Pass with Distinction)
4 (Excellent)	No U (Fail); VG (Pass with Distinction) assigned for more than half of the criteria

Additional information

- In order to ensure that Master's students meet the degree requirement that they must "demonstrate the ability in speech and writing both nationally and internationally to clearly report and discuss his or her conclusions and the knowledge and arguments on which they are based in dialogue with different audiences", all degree projects must be presented orally and in writing. If the work is written in Swedish, it must include an English abstract.
- All students must have access to written guidelines covering all assessment criteria at the commencement of the course.
- To ensure that a degree project meets the applicable requirements, a written plan (a synopsis and study plan or equivalent, which shall include an overview of the research question and the content, and a time plan for the work to be carried out) must be submitted and approved by the examiner and supervisor at the commencement of the course).

Assessment criteria for degree projects at second-cycle level

1. Understanding

The student shall demonstrate an understanding of the task at hand, for example in relation to the questions: What am I expected to do, how am I expected to do it and why should I do it? This requires broad general competence within the subject area, specialised knowledge in certain sub-areas, extensive insight into current research and development work and the ability to place the aim of the task in a scientific context.

Assessment: The examiner should, in consultation with the supervisor, make a comprehensive assessment based on both the student's oral and written presentations and discussions with the student during the course of the project.

2. Process

The student shall demonstrate the ability to plan and carry out the prescribed task (experiments/fieldwork/theoretical task) by critically, autonomously and creatively identifying and formulating questions, problems and issues. The student shall also demonstrate the ability to integrate knowledge and analyse, assess and deal with complex phenomena, issues and situations even with limited information as well as to undertake the task within predetermined timeframes. Social and ethical aspects must also be considered throughout the course of the project.

Assessment: The assessment is primarily based on the supervisor's judgement, yet the student's ability to plan and comply with given timeframes should also be assessed directly by the examiner.

3. Results, analysis and interpretation

The student shall process and analyse the results achieved (theoretical or practical) based on specialised knowledge about methods applicable in the subject area as well as demonstrate the ability to draw own conclusions based on the underlying work. The student shall also be able to relate the results to a larger context using available literature. Autonomy and ability to take initiative shall also be considered in the assessment. The quality of achieved results *per se* must not affect the assessment, unless the quality can be linked to the manner in which the project was carried out.

Assessment: These requirements are primarily assessed based on the written presentation, but the oral presentation must also be considered.

4. Oral presentation and communication

The student shall adapt the oral presentation of the project to the target audience in order to raise interest in the research question. The presentation must have a clear structure and all the content must be correct. Any visual material must be readable/viewable and appropriate for the presentation. The allotted timeframe must be respected. The student must establish good contact with the audience and shall be able to answer questions and discuss the results. The student's ability to orally convey his or her results during the course of the project and to communicate in a scholarly manner should also be assessed under this heading. Any contributions as a reviewer of fellow students shall also be assessed according to the above.

5. Written presentation

The written report shall comply with established practice in the respective scientific field. To this end, the students must have access to detailed field-specific guidelines for the design of the essay. Regardless of scientific field, the presentations must be linguistically correct, clear and logical, and shall be able to raise the reader's interest in the topic addressed. All conclusions drawn must be derived from the results and be well substantiated. Relevant literature shall be objectively cited, and the in-text referencing and reference list must be properly designed.

Detailed assessment criteria

See appendix *Detailed Assessment Criteria, Second Cycle*.



UNIVERSITY OF
GOTHENBURG

RULES
Dnr V 2014/494

RULES FOR GRADING OF DEGREE PROJECT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER (60 CREDITS) AT THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE

Published	http://science.gu.se/utbildning/student-vid-fakulteten/ , http://science.gu.se/intranat/dokument/
Decision-maker	Dean
Responsible body	Education Officer Marcus Svensson
Date of decision	2014-05-27
Period of validity	Until further notice

RULES FOR GRADING OF DEGREE PROJECT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER (60 CREDITS) AT THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE

Degree projects are graded by a specially appointed examiner following consultation with the student's supervisor. The examiner and the supervisor shall not be the same person.

The grading scale used for degree projects generally comprises Fail (U), Pass (G) and Pass with Distinction (VG).

Assessment criteria

The examiner's assessment of a degree project shall be based on the following general criteria:

1. Understanding
2. Process
3. Results, analysis and interpretation
4. Oral presentation and communication
5. Written presentation

The five assessment criteria are assessed using the following five-step scale:

- 0 - Non-existent
- 1 - Unsatisfactory
- 2 - Sufficient
- 3 - Good
- 4 - Excellent

The final grade shall be based on all five assessment criteria. A final grade of Pass (G) requires at least a grade of '2 – Sufficient' for each of the criteria 1-5 above. If sub-criteria are used, the average value for the main criterion must be at least 2. A grade of Pass with Distinction (VG) requires at least 85 per cent of the maximum total score (in addition to a grade of Pass for all five criteria). It is however possible to assign different weights to different criteria by increasing the maximum score for one or several of them, for example by adding one or several sub-criteria which are subject to the same assessment scale. Any sub-criteria and weighting structure used must be documented and made available to the students at the commencement of the degree project course.

In order to facilitate the assessment and clarify the differences between the grades Pass (G) and Pass with Distinction (VG), a number of concrete requirements that must be fulfilled for the respective grade level are presented below. It should be up to the respective Department/programme to decide which of these requirements are relevant for the course in question.

Additional assessment criteria can be used as needed; see appendix *Bedömningsunderlag, självständigt arbete* for a list.

The requirements are specified for the five main criteria. The respective levels of the assessment scale above (0-4 points) require the following distribution of the three grades U, G and VG.

0 (Non-existent)	U (Fail) assigned for more than half of the criteria
1 (Unsatisfactory)	Roughly equal numbers of U (Fail) and G (Pass)/VG (Pass with Distinction)
2 (Sufficient)	G (Pass)/VG (Pass with Distinction) assigned for all criteria; any U (Fail) can be compensated for with a VG (Pass with Distinction)
3 (Good)	No U (Fail); roughly equal numbers of G (Pass) and VG (Pass with Distinction)
4 (Excellent)	No U (Fail); VG (Pass with Distinction) assigned for more than half of the criteria

Additional information

- In order to ensure that Master's students meet the degree requirement that they must 'demonstrate the ability in speech and writing both nationally and internationally to clearly report and discuss his or her conclusions and the knowledge and arguments on which they are based in dialogue with different audiences', all degree projects must be presented orally and in writing. If the work is written in Swedish, it must include an English abstract.
- All students must have access to written guidelines covering all assessment criteria at the commencement of the course.
- To ensure that a degree project meets the applicable requirements, a written plan (a synopsis and study plan or equivalent, which shall include an overview of the research question and the content, and a time plan for the work to be carried out) must be submitted and approved by the examiner and supervisor at the commencement of the course).

Assessment criteria for degree projects at Master's (60 credits) level

1. Understanding

The student shall demonstrate an understanding of the task at hand, for example in relation to the questions: What am I expected to do, how am I expected to do it and why should I do it? This requires broad general competence within the subject area, specialised knowledge in certain sub-areas, extensive insight into current research and development work and the ability to place the aim of the task in a scientific context.

Assessment: The examiner should, in consultation with the supervisor, make a comprehensive assessment based on both the student's oral and written presentations and discussions with the student during the course of the project.

2. Process

The student shall demonstrate the ability to plan and carry out the prescribed task (experiments/fieldwork/theoretical task) by autonomously identifying and formulating questions, problems and issues. The student shall also demonstrate the ability to integrate knowledge and analyse, assess and deal with complex phenomena, issues and situations even with limited information as well as to undertake the task within predetermined timeframes. Social and ethical aspects must also be considered throughout the course of the project.

Assessment: The assessment is primarily based on the supervisor's judgement, yet the student's ability to plan and comply with given timeframes should also be assessed directly by the examiner.

3. Results, analysis and interpretation

The student shall process and analyse the results achieved (theoretical or practical) based on specialised knowledge about methods applicable in the subject area as well as demonstrate the ability to draw own conclusions based on the underlying work. The student shall also be able to relate the results to a larger context using available literature. Autonomy and ability to take initiative shall also be considered in the assessment. The quality of achieved results *per se* must not affect the assessment, unless the quality can be linked to the manner in which the project was carried out.

Assessment: These requirements are primarily assessed based on the written presentation, but the oral presentation must also be considered.

4. Oral presentation and communication

The student shall adapt the oral presentation of the project to the target audience in order to raise interest in the research question. The presentation must have a clear structure and all the content must be correct. Any visual material must be readable/viewable and appropriate for the presentation. The allotted timeframe must be respected. The student must establish good contact with the audience and shall be able to answer questions and discuss the results. The student's ability to orally convey his or her results during the course of the project and to communicate in a scholarly manner should also be assessed under this heading. Any contributions as a reviewer of fellow students shall also be assessed according to the above.

5. Written presentation

The written report shall comply with established practice in the respective scientific field. To this end, the students must have access to detailed field-specific guidelines for the design of the essay. Regardless of scientific field, the presentations must be linguistically correct, clear and logical, and shall be able to raise the reader's interest in the topic addressed. All conclusions drawn must be derived from the results and be well substantiated. Relevant literature shall be objectively cited, and the in-text referencing and reference list must be properly designed.

Detailed assessment criteria

See appendix *Detailed Assessment Criteria, Second Cycle*.

Appendix, Detailed assessment criteria, second cycle

1. Understanding

U (Fail)	G (Pass)	VG (Pass with Distinction)
The theme is poorly connected to the main field of study and its importance is poorly motivated	The theme is relevant for the main field of study, is clearly justified and related to a broader context	The theme is of great interest for the development of the main field of study and the importance is well argued and related to broader theoretical aspects
The research problem is not clearly defined and/or problematised	The research problem is well described, justified and problematised and is well defined in relation to previous studies	The research problem is critically, logically and purposefully substantiated and is well defined in relation to previous research
The research problem is poorly grounded in theory and previous knowledge/research	The research problem is clearly grounded in theory and the discussion on previous knowledge/research is balanced in terms of extent and depth	The research problem is clearly grounded in theory, and previous knowledge/research is discussed critically in relation to the problem area and is balanced in terms of extent and depth
The presentation of the theoretical frame of reference is superficial or missing; an account of relevant research is missing	The theoretical frame of reference is clear and well reflected on; relevant research is presented	The presentation of the theoretical frame of reference has depth, is critically analysed and constitutes a clear basis of the work; relevant research is problematised
Concepts are vaguely described/defined and do not contribute to increased understanding of the problem area	Concepts are described/defined at a basic level and contribute to increased understanding of the problem area	Concepts are well chosen, justified and defined and are linked to each other
The aim and research questions are one-sided or too wide, not clearly formulated and/or related to the research problem	The aim and research questions are clearly formulated and logically derived in relation to the research problem	The aim and research questions are clearly formulated, logically derived and very well substantiated in relation to the research problem
The choice of method* is not related to the aim and research questions	The choice of method* is relevant in relation to the aim of the work	The choice of method* is innovative and relevant in relation to the aim of the work and previous research, and reasons for the choice are presented
The method/approach is not or is only superficially described and justified	The method/approach is described clearly and logically	The method/approach is clearly and logically described and justified

2. Process

U (Fail)	G (Pass)	VG (Pass with Distinction)
The planning of the method/design is inadequate or irrelevant for the research question and not well grounded in methodological literature	The planning of the method/design is well thought-out, logical and rooted in relevant methodological literature	The planning of the method/design is well thought-out, systematic and rooted in relevant methodological literature
Theoretical and practical methods are not applied in an appropriate manner	Theoretical and practical methods are applied in an appropriate manner	Theoretical and practical methods are applied in an appropriate, creative and logical manner
Insufficient practical ability to independently carry out the project	Sufficient practical ability to independently carry out the project (ability in relation to several analytical and/or practical methods)	Very strong practical ability to independently carry out the project (ability in relation to several analytical and/or practical methods)

Insufficient insight regarding relevant safety-related, environmental and ethical aspects	Insight regarding relevant safety-related, environmental and ethical aspects	Good insight regarding relevant safety-related, environmental and ethical aspects; ability to independently make adequate risk assessments and act in accordance with the outcome
Has not followed oral and written instructions	Has followed oral and written instructions	Has followed oral and written instructions and has also taken own well-grounded initiatives if needed
Does not comply with stipulated timeframes	Complies with stipulated timeframes	Complies with stipulated timeframes
Has not independently searched for/found relevant literature or other processes and objects of comparison	Has for the most part independently searched for relevant literature and when applicable other processes and objects of comparison	Has independently searched for relevant literature and when applicable other processes and objects of comparison
Lack of autonomy during the writing process and/or has not responded to constructive criticism	Autonomy during the writing process and has responded to constructive criticism	Significant autonomy during the writing process, requested support if needed and has responded very well to constructive criticism

3. Results, analysis and interpretation

U (Fail)	G (Pass)	VG (Pass with Distinction)
The presentation of results does not correspond to the research question and the aim of the work	The presentation of results corresponds to the research question and the aim of the work (balanced in terms of extent and depth)	The presentation of results corresponds well to the research question and the aim of the work (balanced in terms of extent and depth)
The presentation of results is incomplete, unstructured and lacks logic	The presentation of results is well structured, logical, objective and to the point and is related to the aim and discussion	The presentation of results is well structured, logical, objective and to the point and is related well to the aim and discussion
The figures and tables presented are insufficient (missing and/or not relevant) and do not add significant value to the work	The figures and tables presented are relevant and clearly reflect the results	The figures and tables presented add clarity to the presentation of results and contribute significant value to the work
Figures and tables are of poor quality	Figures and tables are clear and logically structured as well as correct according to established scholarly norms	Figures and tables are clear and logically structured as well as correct according to established scholarly norms with a well thought-out layout
Poor interpretation of results and other information	Correct interpretation of results and other information	Correct and independent interpretation of results and other information
The critical analysis is missing or superficial and lacks focus; the coupling between the results and previous studies and/or the theoretical frame is poor or missing	The critical analysis takes into account previous research, the theoretical framework and is factually grounded	The critical analysis problematises and relates to the theoretical framework and previous research
The choice of method of analysis is not justified	The choice of method of analysis and its application are justified	The choice of method of analysis and its application are well justified
Strengths and weaknesses of the method are not reported	Strengths and weaknesses of the method are reported and evaluated critically and suggestions for change are addressed	Strengths and weaknesses of the method are reported and evaluated critically and suggestions for change are addressed
The argumentation is fragmented and shows no credibility	The argumentation is logical, consistent and credible	The argumentation is well thought-out, creative and well-grounded

Conclusions are not presented or not well substantiated	Conclusions are relevant in relation to the results	Conclusions indicate a good ability to formulate scientific arguments for, as well as present, own conclusions
Implications for praxis and further research are not presented	Implications for and transferability to praxis and further research are stated	The implications have potential for innovation and development of the main field of study, praxis and further research
Ethical and social standpoints are missing or insufficient in the work	Ethical and social standpoints are justified and discussed in the work	Ethical and social standpoints are critically discussed and continuously justified and discussed in the work

4. Oral presentation and communication

U (Fail)	G (Pass)	VG (Pass with Distinction)
The presentation is unstructured and incoherent	The presentation follows a clear structure	The presentation follows a clear and well thought-out structure
Inappropriate prioritisation of central vs. peripheral problems	Relevant prioritisation of central vs. peripheral problems	Very relevant prioritisation of central vs. peripheral problems
Overall layout inconsistent and/or makes it difficult to follow and assimilate the information given	Overall layout clear and uniform	Overall layout clear, uniform and well thought-out
Figures etc. insufficiently presented	Figures etc. well adapted to the presentation	Figures etc. well adapted to the presentation with a well thought-out and consistent layout
Aim/research question vaguely presented	Aim/research question clearly presented	Aim/research question very clearly presented
A holistic perspective is missing, the presentation provides insufficient background information	Relevant background information is presented	A clear holistic perspective showing that the student is well grounded in the subject
Presentation of the author's own results is not satisfactory	Clear presentation of the author's own results	Clear presentation of important parts of the work and choices made
Presentation of the author's own results is not satisfactory; the author cannot answer several important questions about the method used and the course of action	The author's own results are presented clearly and are summarised; important parts of the work and choices made are also presented	The author's own results are presented clearly and are summarised well; over and above the written presentation, the observers present are told of how the essay came to completion and which course of action was taken
Conclusion missing or vaguely formulated	Clear conclusion	The conclusion is clearly linked to purpose/research question
Poor engagement and contact with the audience	Good contact with the audience	Good contact with the audience, good engagement
Unclear presentation	Calm and clear presentation that progresses well without major interruptions	Calm and clear presentation that progresses well without interruptions
The presentation does not correspond to the allotted timeframe (too short or too long)	The presentation corresponds to the allotted timeframe	The presentation corresponds to the allotted timeframe without any signs of stress
The presentation is not well suited for the target audience	The presentation (content and extent) is well suited for the target audience	The presentation (content and extent) is very well suited for the target audience
Insufficient/weak scientific argumentation	The scientific argumentation is objective and to the point	The scientific argumentation is well developed, creative, objective and to the point
The student reviewer's questions/arguments are not addressed	The student reviewer's questions/arguments are addressed with scientific argumentation, and	The student reviewer's questions/arguments are addressed effectively with a well-developed

	the discussion is characterised by objectivity and relevant arguments	scientific argumentation, and the discussion is characterised by objectivity, relevant arguments and thorough familiarity with the subject
Poor reviewing of other students' essays; obvious strengths and weaknesses are overlooked	Careful reviewing of other students' essays, where both strengths and weaknesses are discussed	Very careful reviewing of other students' essays, where both strengths and weaknesses are discussed

5. Written presentation

U (Fail)	G (Pass)	VG (Pass with Distinction)
The essay does not sufficiently follow the provided guidelines	The essay follows the provided guidelines	
The extent of the essay does not correspond to the content of the course	The extent of the essay corresponds well to the content of the course	
Overall, the work lacks a common thread and a general structure, and there are flaws in the design that affect readability negatively	Overall, the work follows a common thread and is well-structured and well-designed	Overall, the work follows a common thread and is logically structured; the overall design is well worked-out and adds value to the work
The text in subsections is unstructured and not logical	The text in subsections is clearly structured	The text in subsections is clearly and logically structured
Headings and text do not match or only partly match	Headings and text match	Headings are clear and match the text well
The work lacks a uniform layout	The layout of headings and other text is essentially clear and uniform	The layout of the headings and other text is clear, uniform and well worked-out
Figures and tables do not follow guidelines, captions are missing/are of poor quality	Figures and tables follow provided guidelines (numbering, references made etc.), captions are included and correct	Figures and tables follow provided guidelines (numbering, references made etc.), captions are well-formulated and add extra value
Spelling, grammar and punctuation are often incorrect	Correct spelling, grammar and punctuation	Correct spelling, grammar and punctuation
The language used is unclear and sometimes logically flawed	Overall, the language used is clear, correct and concise	The language used is consistently correct, concise and coherent, which makes the text clear, well-formulated and interesting
The language used is more everyday than scholarly; adequate terminology is not used appropriately	Overall, the language used is scholarly and adequate terminology is used correctly	The language used consistently corresponds to a high scholarly level and adequate terminology is used correctly
Abbreviations/acronyms are poorly defined	Abbreviations/acronyms are defined	Abbreviations/acronyms are always defined and their use is well thought-out
The reference literature is not satisfactory in terms of extent and/or level	The reference literature is relevant, both broad and deep and connected to the aim of the work	The reference literature is innovatively and critically selected and is of great depth; the reference literature is also well-connected to

		the aim of the work
The in-text referencing shows weaknesses and/or is inconsistent	The in-text referencing is consistent and complies with established referencing systems	The in-text referencing is consistent and of adequate extent as well as complies with established referencing systems
The list of references is missing or inconsistent	The list of references is complete, consistent and complies with established referencing systems	The list of references is complete, consistent and complies with established referencing systems

* The fact that the method is often chosen by the supervisor and not the student must be considered.

Peer Review Form

Author:

Master's Thesis manuscript:

The main purpose of the review is to help the author improve the manuscript. In this context it is important that you give honest answers rather than being politely positive or unnecessarily vague. In addition to the notes within the manuscript, please answer the following questions. For each of the questions that you answer "Partly" or "No", please explain these on the backside or on a separate paper. "Yes" means that you can not see anyway to improve this part of the manuscript (this is normally not so common as is "Partly"). You can also explain a "Yes" answer if you like. Give a copy of your review to the author and to the Course Examiner.

	Yes	Partly	No
1. Is the title concise, informative and reflecting the content?			
2. Is the abstract informative and dealing with			
3. Does the author introduce the problem/hypotheses well?			
4. Are the objectives clearly stated?			
5. Are the methods appropriate for the objectives?			
6. Are the methods sufficiently described to allow judgment of the results?			
7. Have you found any errors of fact or interpretation?			
8. Are observations and interpretations clearly identified?			
9. Has due account been taken of previous work in the field?			
10. Are the interpretations scientifically sound?			
11. Does the discussion connect well with the issues raised in the introduction?			
12. Are the references written in a consistent and proper format?			
13. Are the illustrations relevant, instructive and well composed?			
14. Is the language usage grammatical and clear?			
15. Should the length of the manuscript appropriate (not too short or too long)?			

Please also specify:

What is the main strength of this paper?

What is the main weakness, and how can this best be addressed in revision?

Any other comments?

Reviewer's signature