Stockholms universitet

2025-06-10

GRADING CRITERIA TEMPLATE

This template applies to all Degree Project courses (Thesis courses) at the Department of Physical Geography.

Course code and name: _____

Student's name: _____

Personal ID: _____

Thesis title:

_____

_____

Swedish title:

_____

_____

(*a translated title is required by LADOK*)

Supervisor(s): _____

Overall grade for the project: A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ Fx ☐

Date of examination: _____

Examiner : _____

Assessor: _____

FINAL GRADE:

A, Excellent = 40 – 36 pts
B, Very good = 35 – 32 pts
C, Good = 31 – 28 pts
D, Satisfactory = 27 – 24 pts
E, Sufficient = 23 – 20 pts
F, Insufficient = < 20

Stockholms universitet

GRADING CRITERIA

Content (1-3 pts for each grading criterion, 60%)

Each criterion (1–12) is awarded a maximum of 3 points, except criterion 13, which is awarded a maximum of 4 points. The points are summed to determine the final grade.

1. Relevance of background and motivation

Is the research question clearly motivated?
Is the background presented in a way that makes the topic understandable?
Is the research related to a broader context?

2. Scientific rigour in formulating the research problem (aim and research question).

Is the aim/research question clearly formulated, well delimited and realistic?
Does the student demonstrate an understanding of the research context and justify the need for the study?
How well is the aim connected to the theoretical or empirical context?

3. Extent and relevance of literature coverage

Are the results sufficiently discussed against relevant research?
Is the review critical and analytical rather than descriptive?

4. Justification and critical assessment of method selection

Are the chosen methods appropriate in relation to the aim?
Are the methods suitable for answering the research question?
Has the student discussed alternatives and reflected on the reliability of the method?

5. Clarity and quality of results

Are the results presented in a clear and structured way?
Are figures and tables informative, accurate and captions self-explanatory?
Are measurement units and statistical results correctly reported?
Do the results directly address the question?
Are results separated from interpretation?

6. Thoroughness and criticality of analysis

Is the analysis conducted systematically?
Is there reflection on uncertainties and alternative interpretations?

7. Contextualisation and conclusions

Are the results clearly discussed against to previous research?
Is there a thoughtful discussion of the implications of the findings?
Are the conclusions well-founded and clearly linked to the results?
Are knowledge gaps clearly identified by the study?

8. Complexity

Is the depth of the analysis appropriate for the scope of the thesis (15-60 hp)?
Has the student used concepts, methods or theory in a way that shows a deep understanding of the subject?
Does the thesis go beyond what is typically expected within the scope of the thesis level?

Written presentation and form (1-3 pts for each grading criterion, 30%)

9. Structure and scientific presentation

Is the text logically structured with clear sections (introduction, method, results, discussion, conclusion)?
Is there a clear thread throughout the work?

10. Language quality

Is the language, correct, and academic?
Are there any grammatical or stylistic issues?

11. Quality of figures and tables

Are figures and tables readable, relevant, and correctly labeled?

12. Proper scientific referencing

Are citations complete and correctly formatted according to an established referencing style?
Are all statements requiring support backed by references?

Oral presentation **(1-4 pts,** 10%)

13. Oral presentation

Is the presentation, well-structured and easy to follow?
Are the visual aids used effectively to support the content?
Does the student demonstrate a good understanding of the topic and is able to respond to questions clearly and analytically?

Totalsum: | |

Late submission

One of the expected learning outcomes is to complete the independent project within the designated timeframe. A consequence of late submission without reasonable cause is that the grade will be lowered by one or two steps, depending on the level of the independent project (bachelor's or master's). In cases of significantly delayed submissions, the grade will always be an E.

It is the student's responsibility to inform the supervisor and the programme coordinator of any periods of absence from the studies due to unforeseen circumstances, such as illness or parental leave. Valid absence does not result in a lower grade but must be supported by documentation if requested.

The following applies to **Bachelor's** level:	The following applies to **Master's** level:
1–7 days – grade lowered by 1 step	1–14 days – grade lowered by 1 step
8–14 days – grade lowered by 2 steps	15–21 days – grade lowered by 2 steps
More than 14 days – grade E	More than 21 days – grade E

Stockholms universitet

Description of the grading criteria

1. Relevance of background and motivation

The study needs to be clearly and extensively anchored in relevant current challenges and scientific background. The background needs to give a clear motivation to the aim of the study by building on existing knowledge and identified open questions. The scientific literature presented here needs to give context to the study, and provide information to allow the reader to understand the topic.

2. Scientific rigour in formulating the research problem (aim and research question).

The research question needs to be clearly and scientifically formulated. The question should clearly stem from the motivation above. It needs to be specific in order to allow for a conclusive and testable empirical answer (even int the case where the study itself is unable to give a conclusive answer). To be scientific, the question needs to be falsifiable and empirically measurable, regardless of the method employed (be it qualitative or quantitative). The question also needs to be realistic given the length of the thesis.

3. Extent and relevance of literature coverage

Are the results sufficiently discussed against relevant research?

Is the review critical and analytical rather than descriptive?

The study needs to relate to existing research, both in the background/motivation and in the discussion. The breadth of the scientific literature sited should represent the length (in credits) of the thesis. For the literature to be used effectively, the study needs to clearly and structurally contrast its own arguments with the literature.

4. Justification and critical assessment of method selection

The study needs to give a persuasive motivation of the suitability of the method in relation to the research question. The method needs to be anchored in the scientific literature. When needed, the study can make use of multiple methods as long as their relative purpose is well motivated. The study needs to identify and discuss the limitations of the chosen method and their possible implications for the results.

5. Clarity and quality of results

The results should clearly answer the research question, relying only on what the chosen method reveals. The study needs to clearly assess if the results are conclusive within the confines of the study, and make clear statements that will be the basis of the discussion. The results need to be clearly supported by the study's empirical data or model analyses, and make clear use of relevant aids (table, figures, diagrams..).

6. Thoroughness and criticality of analysis

The analysis needs to transparently explain the reasoning behind the result statements, based solely on the study's own empirical data. It needs to be well structured, rational and critical.

7. Contextualisation and conclusions

The study needs to put its results in the context of the broader relevant scientific literature. The discussion (contextualisation) needs to be structured, whereby clear statements and arguments from the study are discussed against the literature. The study needs to identify and discuss possible implications from its results, and from there formulate clear conclusions and possibly recommendations, and identify remaining open questions.

8. Complexity

It is important that the study reflects an understanding and depth of analysis corresponding to that of the master's level of education. Furthermore, the content and depth of the study needs to agree with that expected the time available to develop the study (15-60hp). The level of complexity is assessed based on either the student's ambition to exceed the existing body of knowledge at the start of the study, or on the student's ability to apply and integrate theoretical concepts, methods, tools and analyses from the master's programme with additional approaches relevant to the topic.