Lappeenranta-Lahti University of Technology LUT
Doctoral Research Assessment Tool to be used in discussions between the student and the supervisor

Student _____   Supervisor _____ Date _____

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Scientific novelty	• No novelty • Very little novelty • Unclear aim and relevance • Plagiarism	• Adequate scientific novelty • Clear aim, research questions and definitions	• Remarkable novelty both in details and as a whole • Particularly informative and concise • There is every likelihood that the study will be a premise of further research, education and applications
Realization of work	• Failed setting of problem and research questions • Weak hypotheses • Determinations missing or poorly done • References missing, incomplete or insignificant • Unethical work	• Well-presented research problem and definitions • Appropriate hypotheses • Reveals some depth of knowledge in subject matter • References are right, appropriate and complete • The study adheres good scientific manners and ethical principles	• Presentation of the research problem superior • Exceptionally significant hypotheses • Reveals exceptional depth of subject knowledge • Reveals well developed critical thinking skills • The realization reveals the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines
Documentation	• Documentation is incomplete • Arguments are poorly presented • Exhibits lack of knowledge in subject area • Does not form a coherent whole • Information is not detailed enough	• Complete documentation • Arguments are well presented • Exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area • Forms a coherent whole and offers also PhD-level information is details	• Documentation is exceptionally good • Arguments are skillfully presented and justified • Exhibits superior knowledge in subject area and understanding in relation to other areas • Excellent work both in entirety and detail levels
Publications ☐ *Attribute not applicable*	• Too few publications as a whole • Not enough publications in scientific level journals • Insufficient contribution	• Adequate number of publications • Publication level at least JUFO 1 • Adequate contribution	• Especially good quality publications • Publication level JUFO 2 – JUFO 3 • Self-contained publishing • Significant public data

Lappeenranta-Lahti University of Technology LUT
Doctoral Research Assessment Tool to be used in discussions between the student and the supervisor

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality of science	• Arguments are incorrect, incoherent, or flawed • Objectives are poorly defined • Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills • Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature • Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts • Demonstrates limited originality • Displays limited creativity and insight	• Arguments are coherent and clear • Objectives are clear • Demonstrates average critical thinking skills • Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature • Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts • Demonstrates originality • Displays creativity and insight	• Arguments are superior • Objectives are well defined • Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills • Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature. • Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts • Demonstrates exceptional originality and independence • Displays exceptional creativity and insight
Contribution to discipline	• Limited evidence of discovery • Limited expansion upon previous research • Limited theoretical or applied significance • Limited publication potential	• Some evidence of discovery • Builds upon previous research • Reasonable theoretical or applied significance • Reasonable publication potential	• Exceptional evidence of discovery • Greatly extends previous research • Exceptional theoretical or applied significance • Exceptional publication potential
Quality of writing	• Writing is weak • Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent • Numerous citations • Organization is poor • Documentation is poor	• Writing is adequate • Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent • Only few citations • Organization is logical • Documentation is adequate	• Writing is publication quality • No grammatical or spelling errors apparent • Author's own text • Organization is excellent • Documentation is excellent
Overall Assessment	• Does not meet expectations	• Meets expectations	• Exceeds expectations

Comments: