

**FINAL PAPER EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

1. Final papers shall be evaluated by the state/final examination committees (the 'committees').
2. In the process of final paper defence, each committee member, including the chair of the committee, shall evaluate the paper and fill out the *Evaluation Form of a Committee Member* (Annex No. 1).
3. After the defence of each final paper, the *Review* (final paper reviewer's evaluation – Annex No. 2) and the *Report* (contents of the final paper supervisor's report – Annex No. 3) shall be read.
4. The final evaluation of the final paper shall be made as a result of discussions in a closed committee meeting based on the evaluations offered by the committee members (taking into account the evaluation of the reviewer and the supervisor) by open simple majority voting. In the event of a tied vote, the vote of the committee chair shall be decisive. The committee member who is the supervisor of the paper being evaluated shall not participate in the vote.
5. The results of the discussion and evaluation of the final paper shall be presented by the committee chair in the *Evaluation Form of the Committee Chair* (Annex No. 4).
6. The evaluation approved at the committee meeting shall be announced by the chair or vice-chair of the committee. Voting results and details shall not be made public.

**Note:** The final paper shall be evaluated on a rating scale as follows: with distinction – 10, excellent – 9, very good – 8, good – 7, almost good – 6, satisfactory – 5, almost satisfactory – 4, and the evaluation below 4 – unsatisfactory. Score 10 is acceptable in the case of an outstanding result confirmed by external expertise (victory in a competition/olympiad, award of a bonus/prize, presentation at an international or republican conference, publication of a research article, etc.).

### Evaluation Form of a Committee Member

Final paper defence date: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee member: \_\_\_\_\_

No	Student (first name, surname)	Theme of the paper	Supervisor	Compliance of the research with the theme chosen (by scope and contents)	Ability to apply the knowledge, skills and competencies acquired during studies to solve the tasks set in the paper	Ability to format the final paper according to the requirements	Ability to present the results of the research	Ability to discuss and answers questions	Final evaluation proposed	Final evaluation approved
				1-10	1-10	1-10	1-10	1-10	1-10	1-10
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										

**Evaluation breakdown:**
**10 – evaluation higher than the study programme requirements,**
**6-9 – good evaluation within the study programme requirements**
*(Committee member's signature)*

**4-5 – satisfactory evaluation within the study programme requirements,**  
**1-3 – evaluation lower than the study programme requirements**

### **Final paper aspects evaluated by the reviewer**

A standard Review Form (Annex No. 5) shall be used where the reviewer evaluates the paper on the rating scale of 1 to 10 based on the criteria as follows:

1. Topicality of the theme
2. Compliance of the research with the theme chosen
3. Ability to apply the knowledge, skills and competencies acquired during studies to solve the tasks and meet the goal set in the paper
4. Ability to format the final paper in accordance with the requirements
5. Practical use of the research results
6. Academic novelty (for MA students)
7. Overall evaluation.

### **Final paper aspects evaluated by the supervisor**

A standard Report Form (Annex No. 6) shall be used where the final paper supervisor evaluates the paper on the rating scale of 1 to 10 based on the criteria as follows:

1. Independent research work
2. Compliance with the research timeline
3. Following the supervisor's instructions
4. Ability to apply the knowledge, skills and competencies acquired during studies to solve the tasks and meet the goal set in the paper
5. Ability to format the final paper in accordance with the requirements

### Evaluation Form of the Committee Chair

Defence date \_\_\_\_\_

No.	Student (first name, surname)	Committee member  (first name, surname)	Committee member  (first name, surname)	Committee member  (first name, surname)	Committee member  (first name, surname)	Committee member  (first name, surname)	Committee chair  (first name, surname)	Reviewer	Final evaluation	For	Against
1.											
..											

**Evaluation breakdown:**

**10 – evaluation higher than the study programme requirements,**

**6-9 – good evaluation within the study programme requirements**

**4-5 – satisfactory evaluation within the study programme requirements,**

**1-3 – evaluation lower than the study programme requirements**

*(Committee chair's signature)*

## STANDARD REVIEW FORM

**TRANSPORT AND TELECOMMUNICATION INSTITUTE****REVIEW**

on the bachelor's thesis/master's thesis/diploma paper

'(theme)'

of \_\_\_\_\_, student of the faculty of \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer**

(first name, surname, academic degree or position)

(date)

**Evaluation according to the 1-to-10 rating scale:**

1. Topicality of the theme \_\_\_\_\_ ( )
  2. Compliance of the research with the theme chosen \_\_\_\_\_ ( )
  3. Ability to apply the knowledge, skills and competencies acquired during studies to solve the tasks and meet the goal set in the paper \_\_\_\_\_ ( )
  4. Ability to format the final paper in accordance with the requirements \_\_\_\_\_ ( )
  5. Practical use of the research results \_\_\_\_\_ ( )
  6. Academic novelty (for MA students) \_\_\_\_\_ ( )
- Overall evaluation (overall score)** \_\_\_\_\_ ( )

**Reviewer's critical feedback:****Opinion:**

The author of the paper (*deserves/does not deserve*) to be awarded (the academic degree/professional degree / qualification).

(Reviewer's signature)

STANDARD SUPERVISOR'S REPORT FORM  
 TRANSPORT AND TELECOMMUNICATION INSTITUTE

***REPORT***

*on the bachelor's thesis/master's thesis/diploma paper*

'(theme)'

of \_\_\_\_\_, student of the faculty of \_\_\_\_\_

**Supervisor**

(first name, surname, academic degree or position)

(date)

**Evaluation according to the 1-to-10 rating scale:**

1. Independent research work \_\_\_\_\_ ( )
2. Compliance with the research timeline \_\_\_\_\_ ( )
3. Following the supervisor's instructions \_\_\_\_\_ ( )
4. Ability to apply the knowledge, skills and competencies acquired during studies to solve the tasks and meet the goal set in the paper \_\_\_\_\_ ( )
5. Ability to format the final paper in accordance with the requirements \_\_\_\_\_ ( )

**Supervisor's critical feedback:**

**Opinion:**

The author of the paper (*deserves/does not deserve*) to be awarded (*the academic degree/professional degree / qualification*).

(Supervisor's signature)