

### *Pro Gradu* thesis marking scheme.

The system for marking the *Pro Gradu* projects has now changed, with two independent examiners marking the thesis as originally handed to them by the student, with additional comments made by the supervisor of the project. The new marking scheme thus goes:

Student (with critical guidance from the supervisor of the project) writes the final version of the thesis and hands three copies of it to Tuula Koret before the 12 month deadline.

The supervisor drafts a summary document (maximal one side of A4) to help the examiners. This should include comments on the students performance during the project (dexterity in the lab, attendance and enthusiasm, ability to plan experiments, ability to discuss data) and on specialized aspects of the final thesis (breadth and depth of introduction, appropriateness of methodologies, significance of the results obtained etc). This summary should also include details of any problems encountered during the project which should be taken into account e.g. equipment failure, sickness etc. Two copies of this should be passed on to Tuula Koret.

Tuula Koret then passes one copy of the thesis, one copy of the supervisor summary sheet and one copy of a statement from the Project coordinator regarding problems relating to the project (if any) onto the two departmentally assigned examiners, who independently mark the thesis (out of 50) based on the attached marking scheme. In addition each examiner should produce a report providing feedback on the thesis.

The two examiners agree on the recommended grade to be awarded. If the recommended grade is not based on the simple sum of their marks, the examiners should provide a statement on how the recommended grade was obtained. The signed mark sheet (only one copy is returned), plus feedback reports plus additional recommendation statement (if any), should be returned to Tuula Koret.

Assignment of the final mark proceeds via the Departmental Council as before.



**Statement on Pro Gradu thesis for Master of Science degree**

<b>Student</b>	Name:	Social security number:
	Degree programme: <b>Biochemistry</b>	
	Subject area:	

<b>Thesis</b>	Code and credits:	
	Title of thesis:	
	Supervisor:	
	<b>If part of a research project:</b> Project name and leader:	

<b>Examiners</b>	Name:		
	Degree and position:		

<b>Marks</b>	The grading system used: 1 = fail... 10 = outstanding	Examiner's marks	Examiner's marks
	I Introduction		
	II Materials and methods		
	III Results		
	IV Discussion		
	V General presentation		
	Total		

Total mark awarded (out of 100): \_\_\_\_\_

Grade suggested: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Oulu,

Examiners' signatures: \_\_\_\_\_

Name (typed or block letters): \_\_\_\_\_

Marking Criteria:

10	Outstanding	I / II / III Covers the topic comprehensively with no irrelevant material and shows good understanding of the research area
		IV. Demonstrates full understanding of the topic within a wider context and shows complete critical analysis of the data presented
		V. Standard of language outstanding
8-9	Excellent	I / II / III Covers the topic comprehensively with little irrelevant material and shows good understanding of the research area
		IV. Demonstrates full understanding of the topic within a wider context and shows critical analysis of the data presented i.e. good awareness of assumptions made in, and limitations of conclusions
		V. Standard of language very high. Diagrams, tables etc. detailed, relevant and visually pleasing
6-7	Good	I / II / III Covers most aspects of the topic with little or no irrelevant material. Shows broad understanding of the research area
		IV. Demonstrates substantial understanding of the topic within a wider context and shows some critical analysis of the data presented.
		V. Standard of language high. Diagrams, tables etc. detailed and relevant
5	Satisfactory	I / II / III Covers the core material of the subject area, possibly with some errors. Not placed within a broader scientific context.
		IV. Demonstrates limited or patchy understanding of the topic and its context. Shows limited critical and analytical abilities
		V. Standard of language satisfactory. Diagrams, tables etc lacking detail and relevance
3-4	Poor	I / II / III Not all core material covered and frequent errors/misunderstandings. Lacks depth
		IV. Demonstrates little understanding of the topic and its context. Little evidence of critical and analytical abilities
		V. Standard of language weak. Diagrams lacking detail and relevance
1-2	Fail	I / II / III Covers very little relevant material and contains many errors/misunderstandings
		IV. Demonstrates little or no understanding of the topic and its context. No evidence of critical or analytical abilities
		V. Standard of language very poor. Illegible. Not proof-read. Diagrams tables etc. lacking detail and relevance or no relevant diagrams.

Grades	Mark
Laudatur	91-100
Eximia cum laude approbatur	76-90
Magna cum laude approbatur	61-75
Cum laude approbatur	51-60
Non sine laude approbatur	41-50
Lubenter approbatur	31-40
Approbatur	25-30