**DEGREE THESIS PREPARATORY COURSE III.**

**DEGREE THESIS EVALUATION SHEET I.**

**Name of the student:**

**Neptun code:**

**Thesis title:**

**Name of the thesis supervisor:**

1. **Evaluation of the literature and bibliography used in the thesis:**

Number of literary references: .. pcs (online references: .. pcs)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Grade |
| The number, diversity and modernity of the literary sources used1. Few, poorly selected, not peer-reviewed, one-sided, outdated sources.
2. The use of a large number of up-to-date, peer-reviewed sources that are closely related to the topic.
 | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Literary references in the text1. There are no references in the text, all have been left out.
2. In-text references are accurate, all sources in the bibliography appear in the text.
 | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| The format of the bibliography1. The reference list does not appear in the specified format.
2. The references are in full compliance with the formal requirements.
 | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| ESTABLISHING A PARTIAL GRADE If any grade is fail (1), then the partial grade is fail (1). If the grades are at least pass (2), then we calculate an average. |  |

**Written evaluation**:

1. **Evaluation of the structure, editing and linguistic clarity of the thesis:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Grade |
| The structure of the thesis1. The length of the thesis is less than the minimum required, not articulated, the introduction, the description of the methodology or the conclusion is missing, stating the objectives is missing.
2. The length of the thesis is in line with the requirements, its introduction clearly indicates and delineates the topic, is proportionate; the objective(s) defined by the author are clear, unambiguous, the chosen structure is in line with the nature of the thesis, the requirements are fully met.
 | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| The quality and style of the editing1. The articulation of the text within individual chapters is inappropriate, negligent, the subheadings are incomplete, inconsistent, unclear, the table of contents is incomplete, page numbering is incorrect, in some places the text is not edited in justified format, etc.
2. Carefully edited and articulated, in line with the requirements, etc.
 | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Evaluation of the professional adequacy of the figures, illustrations and tables1. A small number of poorly chosen figures, reference to them cannot be found in the text or is inaccurate, the tables and graphs are incomplete (e.g. source, unit of measurement), the titles of the figures/tables are incomplete, incorrect, etc.
2. An adequate number of high quality figures and tables, the references and sources are correct and their editing is impeccable.
 | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Evaluation of the clarity of the thesis according to grammatical and stylistic considerations1. Improper sentences, inconsistent use of foreign words and phrases, spelling mistakes, phrases that jeopardize the intelligibility, etc.
2. Properly formulated and structured sentences that follow the rules of the English language, adequate clarity, correct use of professional terminology, there are no typos, spelling mistakes, etc.
 | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| ESTABLISHING A PARTIAL GRADE If any grade is fail (1), then the partial grade is fail (1). If the grades are at least pass (2), then we calculate an average. |  |

**Written evaluation**:

1. **Evaluation of the content of the degree thesis**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Grade |
| The author’s knowledge of the subject, the thoroughness, professionalism and modernity of the work1. The title and the content do not match. Significantly important parts are missed or not mentioned at all. Too general, modest knowledge. The preparedness, factual knowledge and level of understanding are low standard. There is no individual concept, the content part essentially consists of summaries of 1-2 sources. Carelessly put together, vague, unfocused, confusing, low quality work. The content comparison of sources is completely missing, the approach of the topic is outdated, obsolete, strongly questionable from the professional point of view.
2. The title and the content are consistent with one another. The pronounced parts of the content are highlighted, they have been explained and elaborated in details. Based on the thesis, the author’s general/in-depth knowledge of the subject is apparent. The structure of the thesis is logical; the chapters are coherently built on one another. The author’s approach is modern, characterized by professional credibility (appropriate terminology, professional correctness). The information, facts and findings in the thesis are professional and relevant, during the evaluation the author preserved his/her objectivity. The thesis is professionally high quality.
 | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |

**Written evaluation**:

1. **Other comments, suggestions and questions about the degree thesis:**

**DEGREE THESIS PREPARATORY COURSE III.**

**DEGREE THESIS EVALUATION SHEET I.**

**ASSESSMENT SHEET**

**Name of the student:**

**Neptun code:**

**Thesis title:**

**Name of the thesis supervisor:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | GRADE |
| Evaluation of the literature and bibliography used in the thesis  |  |
| Evaluation of the structure, editing and linguistic clarity of the thesis  |  |
| Evaluation of the content of the degree thesis |  |
| FINAL GRADE based on the average of the partial grades if the grade of the content evaluation is fail (1), the final grade can only be fail (1) too |  |

**In addition to the grade, the degree thesis must be qualified as per the following** (underline the appropriate section):

**Overall, the degree thesis in its present form**

 can be released for thesis defense requires partial revision requires complete revision

 (can be bound without corrections) (needs corrections) (not acceptable)

.........................................................

Opponent’s signature

Debrecen,