		Master thesis evaluation matrix - Infrastructure-civil engineering MSc							
		Evaluation criteria				**Assessment Scores**			
Components	**Viewpoints**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	University advisor	Outside advisor (optional)	Reviewer	Final Exam Committee
Thesis content elements	**Task difficulty**	The level of difficulty falls short of what is expected at the MSc level.	Degree of difficulty is simple, easy at the MSc level.	Average difficulty at the MSc level.	Complex and degree of difficulty above average at the MSc level.	3	3	3	
	Problem, goals	Not included in the thesis.	The author deals with it only tangentially.	The author touches on it, but not in sufficient detail.	The author deals with it in sufficient detail.	3	3	3	
	Use of literary sources	No literature sources.	There are occasional literature sources, but they are either inadequate or not closely related to the topic of the thesis.	The author uses literature sources and supports his claims accordingly. Uses standard sources. A critical analysis related to the cited literature is omitted.	The author uses literature sources and uses them organically during his argument. The range of literature used is wide, the author also covers a critical analysis of the literature.	3	3	3	
	Method, data collection	Not included in the thesis.	The author deals with it only tangentially.	The author touches on it, but not in sufficient detail.	The author deals with it in sufficient detail.	3	3	3	
	Results	The presentation of results is confusing and relevance of the figures/tables is questionable.	The presentation of the results is difficult to follow and not obvious, the figures/tables help understanding to a limited extent.	The results are properly presented by the author, the figures/tables partly help the interpretation of the results.	The presentation of the results is structured logically by the author, with adequate detail. The figures/tables used greatly aid interpretation.	3	3	3	
	Evaluation and critical review of results (discussion)	Not included in the thesis.	The author deals only tangentially with the evaluation of the results.	The author touches on the evaluation of the results, but not in sufficient detail.	The author evaluates (interprets) the results in sufficient detail.	3	3	3	
	Summary (conclusions)	Not included in the thesis.	The author deals only tangentially with the description of the main conclusions.	The author covers his main conclusions, but not in sufficient detail.	The author provides a systematic presentation of the main conclusions, referring back to the problem and objectives raised in the introduction.	3	3	3	
Thesis writing style, clarity, format	**Structure and scope of the thesis**	The structure of the thesis is confusing, the length of the chapters is disproportionate, and the length of the thesis is inadequate.	The thesis structure is adequate, the length of the thesis is not.	The structure of the thesis is adequate, with minor disproportions in terms of its structure, and the length of the thesis is adequate.	The structure of the thesis is clear and proportionate, with possible minor errors, the length of the thesis is adequate.	3	3	3	
	Readability, style	Incorrect style, spelling mistakes.	The style is acceptable, scattered typos and spelling errors.	Proper style, few typos.	Readable style, negligible number of spelling errors.	3	3	3	
	Figures, tables, equations, references	The quality of the figures/tables/equations is not adequate, their numbering and references in the text are missing.	The quality of the figures/tables/equations is acceptable, their numbering and references in the text are incorrect or incomplete.	The quality of the figures/tables/equations, their numbering and references in the text are appropriate.	The quality of the figures/tables/equations, their numbering and references in the text are good, with negligible errors.	3	3	3	
	Formatting: page breaks, list of figures and tables, table of contents, Harvard references	Incorrect formatting, missing lists, missing references.	Formatting errors, incomplete lists, incomplete references.	Formatting is correct, only minor errors in the list and references.	Neat formatting, minor errors in the list and references.	3	3	3	
Oral defense (presentation and professional discussion)	**Presentation skills**	Bad presenter (lack of confidence, confused presentation).	Acceptable, but below average.	Average.	Good.				3
	Structure, content quality of presentation	The lecture does not help the understanding of the topic, the content elements are confused.	The presentation helps to understand the topic, some content elements are incomplete.	The presentation helps to understand the topic, the structure and content of the presentation are of an average standard.	Clean, clearly structured performance, good quality with content.				3
	Discussion skills closely related to the thesis	Presenter cannot answer basic questions.	Presenter gives an answer, but it is either partially wrong or does not answer the question.	Presenter gives satisfactory answers to the questions asked.	Presenter gives good answers to the questions asked, and supports the points of discussion with appropriate professional arguments.				3