

ŠIAULIAI UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS

REGULATION
OF PREPARATION AND DEFENCE OF FINAL WORK (MASTER'S
THESIS) OF SECOND CYCLE STUDY PROGRAMMES

ŠIAULIAI

2015

CONTENTS		
I.	GENERAL PROVISIONS	3
II.	PREPARATION OF MASTER'S THESIS	3
III.	SELECTION AND APPROVAL OF THE TOPIC	4
IV.	DEPARTMENTAL DISCUSSION OF MASTER'S THESIS	5
V.	PRESENTATION OF MASTER'S THESIS TO THE DEPARTMENT	5
VI.	ADVISOR'S EVALUATION	6
VII.	REVIEW	7
VIII.	DEFENCE OF MASTER'S THESIS	7
IX.	EVALUATION CRITERIA OF FINAL WORK	10
X.	EVALUATION CRITERIA OF DEFENCE OF MASTER'S THESIS	10
XI.	APPEAL PROCEDURE	10
XII.	PROVISIONS OF UNDEFENDED MASTER'S THESIS	11
XIII.	FINAL PROVISIONS	11
	ANNEX 1 <i>Example of Request to prepare Master's Thesis</i>	12
	ANNEX 2 <i>Example of Request to correct the topic of Master's Thesis</i>	13
	ANNEX 3 <i>The minutes of departmental discussion of Master's Thesis</i>	14
	ANNEX 4 <i>Example of the cover page of Master's Thesis</i>	15
	ANNEX 5 <i>Example of the title page of Master's Thesis</i>	16
	ANNEX 6 <i>Example of Advisor's evaluation</i>	17
	ANNEX 7 <i>Example of review of Master's Thesis</i>	20
	ANNEX 8 <i>Extract from the minutes of the meeting of Commission of evaluation of final works</i>	23
	ANNEX 9 <i>Example of organisation's/enterprise's review about final Master's Thesis (completed on organisation's letterhead)</i>	24
	ANNEX 10 <i>Recommended official note to organisation/enterprise</i>	25
	ANNEX 11 <i>Scale of evaluation criteria of Master's Thesis</i>	26

REGULATION OF PREPARATION AND DEFENCE OF MASTER'S THESIS OF SECOND CYCLE STUDY PROGRAMMES OF THE FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. The aim of the regulation – to determine general requirements for the preparation and defence of Master's thesis (hereinafter referred to as MT) of second cycle study programmes and to define MT preparation stages and evaluation criteria.
2. The regulation is followed by the students, departments (hereinafter referred to as Department) coordinating the study programme, MT advisors, reviewers, and Evaluation Commissions of Final Works (hereinafter referred to as Commissions).
3. The regulation has been prepared on the bases of the following legal acts and recommendations (actual version):
 - Description of general requirements of the first cycle, full-time degree study programmes (Order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania No. V-501, 2010-04-09),
 - Order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania “Regarding the Approval of Evaluation System of the Study Results” (No. ISAK-2194, 2008-07-24) and “Recommendations to Improve the Evaluation of Study Results”,
 - Study Regulations of Šiauliai University (supplemented during the Senate's meeting, 2015-04-20, report No. SP-05),
 - General principles of description of order of final works' preparation and defence of Šiauliai University (2015-04-29, Šiauliai University Rector's order No.V-232),
 - Study Appel Regulations of Šiauliai University (2013-07-04, Šiauliai University Rector's order No. V-494),
 - Description of the order of elimination of academic debts, exam postponement, resitting exams in order to get a higher mark (2013-11-25, Šiauliai University Rector's order No. V-737).
4. MT is the final stage of the studies when Master student has to show the level of knowledge and understanding, ability to analyse the selected topic, to evaluate the works formerly prepared by other persons of a particular research field, to study individually and to carry out researches in a particular field, to describe the performed research work and to formulate research conclusions clearly and reasonably.

II. PREPARATION OF MASTER'S THESIS

5. MT is awarded 30 credits. The stages of its preparation are as follows: the selection and approval of the topic, departmental discussion of MT, presentation of MT to the Department, defence of MT. The deadlines of MT preparation stages are approved and announced on the website of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts by the Department coordinating the study programme until the beginning of academic year.
6. Final work is prepared in state language except the cases when the parties implementing joint study programmes by mutual agreement decide to prepare final work in English, when studies are carried out according to study programmes for foreigners.

7. When preparing MT a student works individually and not less than once per month consults the advisor, discusses the tasks, work's results. The subject or methodological issues of preparation of MT might be discussed during general consultations organised by the Department and with other professors. The time of professors' consultations and timetable of general consultations are announced by the Departments on the website of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts.
8. In case of contacting the organisations regarding the collection of data necessary for MT it is recommended to have a request officially signed by the Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (Annex 10).
9. While studying particular courses of the study programme, a student collects material for MT, investigates the problem, develops research abilities for writing academic texts.
10. When preparing MT it is recommended to follow the methodical issue prepared by Lileikienė A., Šaparnis G., Tamošiūnas T. (2004). *Methods of Preparation of Master's Thesis*. Šiauliai. Publishing House of Šiauliai University.

III. SELECTION AND APPROVAL OF THE TOPIC

11. Until the 15th of September (if the studies start from the 1st of February – until the 15th of February) the Departments announce, approve, present to the Dean's Office, publish on the website of the faculty and on the notice-boards the lists of suggested research areas, researches suggested by social partners, and researchers of various research areas that can supervise final works.
12. During the first semester until the deadline determined by the department but not later than within one month after announcing the list of supervisors and topics' areas, Master students must present requests with the topic of Master's Thesis signed by the advisor to the administrator of the Department.
13. Final MT might be supervised by University's lecturers who have a degree and perform researches in the field that the final MT is prepared. If the advisor does not perform researches in that field or if the advisor is selected by the way of exception having great practical experience but without a science degree, researcher consultant is appointed to help to prepare the Master's Thesis.
14. Usually at the same time a professor can supervise not more than 15 students' final works. This number does not include the students who have temporarily terminated their studies.
15. Student's selected topic of the MT *must correspond to the student's study field*.
16. A student selects advisor from *the list of lecturers presented by the Department*. When selecting an advisor it is recommended to match the topic of MT with the spheres of advisor's research interests. Having selected the topic and the advisor, the students *must meet the advisor, discuss and formulate the topic of the MT, deadlines, the plan of preparation of the MT* until the deadline determined by the Department but not later than within 1 month from the announcement of topics and list of advisors.
17. The request signed by the student and the advisor (Annex 1) must be presented to the Department not later than within one month after the list of advisors has been announced. If the student does not select the advisor until the deadline, the Department appoints the advisor.
18. Recommended *variants of MT topic's selection*:
 - 18.1. Topics suggested by social partners or topics significant to social partners and other organisations.
 - 18.2. The continuation of course papers and implemented scientific researches corresponding to the subjects of a study programme investigating the topic deeper.
 - 18.3. Topicalities of international, national or regional development.
 - 18.4. Topics corresponding to the spheres of scientific interests of Department's lecturers.
19. The working groups formed by the Department that mentors the study programme revise the preliminary formulations of MT titles and present suggestions for their correction. The suggestions

are published on the website of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (in case of joint study programmes – also on their websites). Having consulted the advisor, the student might consider or not consider the presented suggestions.

20. Until the deadline indicated by the Department in the MT stages but not later than within two months of a semester where the MT is foreseen, the preliminary topics of students' works are approved in the Department's meeting.
21. The MT topic may be revised only until *the date of MT discussion at the Department*. The student having agreed on the corrected title of the topic with the advisor presents a request to the Department (signed by the advisor) regarding the correction of the topic (Annex 2).

IV. DEPARTMENTAL DISCUSSION OF MASTER'S THESIS

22. The Department mentoring the study programme organises the discussion of the MT at the Department not later than one month until the defence of the MT where the students present their final works.
23. The student presents preliminary MT to the advisor following the deadlines of MT preparation stages approved by the Department. Having evaluated the preliminary MT, the advisor completes Part I of the report of departmental discussion of MT (Annex 3). Preliminary MT together with advisor's completed and signed Part I of the report of departmental discussion of MT is presented by the student to the Department following the deadlines of MT preparation stages approved by the Department.
24. If the student does not present preliminary MT to the advisor until the deadline of departmental discussion of MT, the advisor completes Part I of the report of departmental discussion of MT (Annex 3) and presents respective conclusions about the possibility to prepare the MT until the determined deadline and defend it openly. The advisor presents completed report of departmental discussion of MT (Annex 3) to the Department until the deadline of departmental discussion of MT indicated in the MT stages.
25. The Departmental MT discussion is carried out by the commission formed by the Dean's order that during the meeting of departmental MT discussion consults students how to complete successfully and what to improve in their final works.
26. During the departmental MT discussion the commission familiarises with the preliminary MT, listens to the student's presentation of the work and to the answers to the questions and completes Part II of the report of departmental MT discussion (Annex 3).

V. PRESENTATION OF MASTER'S THESIS TO THE DEPARTMENT

27. During Master's studies it is recommended for a student to present the results of MT theoretical analysis, research or results of a part of it in one of the following ways: a) presentation in at least one scientific conference, seminar organised by Šiauliai University or other science and study institutions; b) preparation of a scientific publication; c) presenting the research results to the interested audience of practitioner.
28. The fact of publicity of results of the research or a part of it must be mentioned in the introduction of the work, in the annexes providing the originals or copies of the documents that prove the facts

(certificate of participation in the conference, description of publication's bibliography with annotation, a certificate signed by a representative of an organisation proving the presentation of research results in public).

29. *Not less than 30 calendar days* are given to complete and prepare to defend the MT.
30. *Not less than 2 weeks* until the defence of the MT the Departments present to the administrator of the Dean's Office the list of students who have completed study programme to prepare the Rector's order regarding the permission to defend the MT. The final MT title is entered into Academic information system (hereinafter referred to as AIS) in the Lithuanian and English languages.
31. Due to illness or other essential reasons the Rector may postpone the defence of final works but not longer than 2 months from the end of the exam sessions (vacations not included).
32. Due to important reasons a student has an opportunity temporarily terminate studies for a period not longer than one year and continue studies returning to the same semester (the beginning of the semester) where he/she has left. If during the period of terminated studies the study conditions have changed (the volume of study programme, content, study fee) after the return to continue studies the student signs a new agreement or a supplement of agreement's amendment. Permission to terminate studies temporarily until the beginning of exam session (during the last semester – until Rector's order to defend final works) may be given by the Rector upon the request of the Dean of the faculty.
33. Recommended volume of the final work – around 100-120 thousand characters with spaces excluding reference list and content (up to 70 pages). The volume of collective final work (prepared together by 2 or more students) should be bigger 1,5-2 times than the recommended volume of individual work.
34. MT must be original author's work, the thoughts of other authors must be presented following the requirements of citation. The student confirms this by signing the declaration on the bottom of the title page (see Annex 5).
35. The student following the deadlines of MT preparation stages determined by the Department but not later than 8 working days until public defence, presents 2 printed and bound copies of MT to the Department.
36. *In one of the copies* after the title page two A4 format envelopes are to be attached (for advisor's evaluation and review), at the end of the work the envelope with electronic medium has to be attached.
37. If the MT is prepared according to organisation's *target order* it must be mentioned in the introduction of the work and the organisation's review must be attached at the end of the work (recommended example of review is in Annex 9).
38. The author of the MT is responsible that the MT does not contain information that cannot be declared in public to which publicity restrictions determined by the legal acts of the Republic of Lithuania are applied or that is organisation's confidential information.
39. The student uploads electronic version of the MT into the Lithuanian information system ETD (<https://etd.elaba.lt>) *not later than 7 days until the defence of the MT* (see instruction (<https://etd.elaba.lt>)). The final MT of joint study programme is also uploaded into the academic information system of the University of Pardubice IS/ISTAG <https://portal.upce.cz>.

VI. ADVISOR'S EVALUATION

40. The aim of advisor's evaluation – to evaluate the process of preparation of final work and compliance with the requirements. Evaluation criteria of the MT are indicated in Chapter IX and provided in Annex 11.
41. The student following the deadlines of MT preparation stages determined by the Department but not later than within 3 working days before the deadline of presentation of final works to the Department

presents the final version of the MT to the advisor. The advisor evaluates the MT, completes the MT evaluation form (Annex 6). The student presents the MT to the Department together with *the advisor's evaluation*.

42. The evaluation is written in state language except the cases when the parties implementing joint study programmes by mutual agreement decide to prepare final work in English, when studies are carried out according to study programmes for foreigners.
43. The student who received negative advisor's evaluation has the right to: a) defend the final work in public; b) repeat the course *Master Thesis* and defend the MT not earlier than at the end of another semester (see Chapter XII).

VII. REVIEW

44. Student's MT is reviewed by the reviewer ascribed by the Department.
45. The aim of the review – to evaluate the compliance of the final work with the requirements. Evaluation criteria of the MT are indicated in Chapter IX and presented in Annex.
46. The review is written in state language except the cases when the parties implementing joint study programmes by mutual agreement decide to prepare final work in English, when studies are carried out according to study programmes for foreigners.
47. The reviewer presents written objective, reasoned review within 5 days from the date of presentation the MT to the Department completing the review form (Annex 7). The reviewer evaluates the final work by a mark and presents the conclusion about the MT compliance with the requirements and opportunity to defend it in public. If this evaluation differs by 3 points from the advisor's evaluation, the head of the Department ascribes another reviewer. In this case the commission of evaluation of final works receives two reviews.
48. The student has a right to familiarise with the review at least two days before the defence.
49. The student who received negative reviewer's evaluation has the right to: a) defend the final work in public; b) repeat the course *Master Thesis* and defend the MT not earlier than at the end of another semester (see Chapter XII).
50. In case the reviewer suspects plagiarism in the final work and states this in the review, the Department contacts Šiauliai University library or other responsible subdivision for the check of plagiarism suspicion; the student is familiarised with the conclusion.
51. The Department presents the final work with the review (if needed together with the conclusion about verification/contradiction of plagiarism) to the MT evaluation commission. If the commission proves the fact of plagiarism, the student is deleted from the list of students due to violation of academic discipline upon the request of the Dean and following Rector's order.

VIII. DEFENCE OF THE MASTER'S THESIS

52. The date of defence of final works the Department announces in advance publicly but not later than 2 *weeks* before the defence of final works. For one commission of evaluation of final works it is recommended to defend not more than 15 final works per day.
53. When the MT is prepared by two or more authors it must be defended by all the authors together. In case one of the authors cannot defend the MT due to certain reasons, the student may: a) repeat the

course *Master Thesis* and defend the MT not earlier than at the end of another semester, b) present a request to the Rector to postpone the defence of final work in case of illness or other serious reasons (not longer than 2 months).

54. The final work and its defence is evaluated by the Commission of evaluation of final works that makes the decision about the awarding qualification degree.
55. The members of Commission of evaluation of final works, its chairman are proposed by the Department mentoring the study programme upon the Dean's request for the Rector's order. The Commission must consist of competent specialists scientists of a respective study field, professional practitioners, representatives of social partners. It is recommended that at least one member of the Commission (usually the chairman) would be a professor or an associated professor (supreme or senior researcher) of another higher education institution, an employee of partner institutions.
- 55.1. When *Master's Theses* are defended the Commission must consist of at least 4 members working in that study field.
- 55.2. When *final works of joint study programmes* are defended, a representative from higher education institution together implementing the study programme must participate in the defence.
56. Final works are defended in state language except the cases when the parties implementing joint study programmes by mutual agreement decide to prepare final work in English, when studies are carried out according to study programmes for foreigners.
57. During the defence procedure audio and video recording equipment may be used. The records may be used when investigating the appeals. The students must be informed about the usage of audio and video recording equipment.
58. The defence of final works is minuted. The minutes are written in state language. In cases when the parties implementing joint study programmes by mutual agreement decide to prepare final work in English, when studies are carried out according to study programmes for foreigners, minutes may be written in a foreign language; following the Law on State Language of the Republic of Lithuania the translation into Lithuanian must be added to the minutes.
59. The Commission of evaluation of final works and the students must follow the sequence of the list of students that defend their final works except the cases when the chairman provides otherwise.
60. The order of defence of the MT:
 - 60.1. The chairman of the Commission of evaluation of final works introduces the students with the Rector's order regarding the permission to defend the final works and reminds the requirements that the students must follow during the defence of the MT.
 - 60.2. The student has up to 10 minutes to present the MT. During this time the student has to present the investigated problem, the applied methods, the obtained results, to provide the main conclusions and recommendations. During the presentation the student is not asked the questions.
 - 60.3. After the presentation of the work the Commission introduces the persons participating in the defence with the review and advisor's evaluation. The student answers to the remarks and questions presented by the reviewer. After the student answers to the reviewer's questions and remarks, the members of Commission provide questions and/or remarks related to the final work.
 - 60.4. The members of Commission inform the student if the questions have been answered.
 - 60.5. All people participating in the defence may also ask questions related to the final work.
 - 60.6. During the defence the student must have and present the primary data of the research (completed questionnaires, reports, data matrix, tables of primary data) to the commission of evaluation of final works upon its request in digital or printed form.
61. *The final works are evaluated* after the defence in a closed Commission's meeting. The criteria of evaluation of the MT are indicated in Chapters IX, X and presented in Annex 11. The Commission makes the decision regarding the evaluation by mutual agreement, referring to the remarks of advisor

and reviewer and their suggested evaluations. It is recommended to consider student's research activities if the student has presented the documents about published scientific articles, presented reports in scientific conferences, etc.

62. After successful defence of the work, the Commission suggests to award the student with the respective degree provided in the study programme.
63. After the defence the final works are returned to the Department where they are stored according to the determined order.
64. Undefended works upon students' requests may be rewritten (repeating the study course) and defended not earlier than at the end of next semester (see Chapter XII).
65. After the meeting of the commission of evaluation of final works the chairman of the commission completes the Extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Commission (see Annex 8) and hands written evaluations to each student individually.
66. After the meeting the chairman of the Commission of evaluation of final works enters the MT mark (grade) into electronic register.
67. The minutes of the meeting of the Commission of evaluation of final works are signed by the chairman and all the members of the Commission. The evaluations of the MT and decision about the awarded qualification degree are recorded in the minutes.
68. If student's final work has not be defended it is important to indicate the reasons in the minutes due to which the final work and its defence were evaluated unsatisfactorily by the Commission of evaluation of final works.
69. The secretary of the Commission is responsible for the minutes of the meetings, their submission to the Department of Studies and delivery of defended MT to the Department's archive.
70. The chairman of the Commission of evaluation of final works within three working days after the defence presents a short written report to the head of the Department where he/she evaluates the process of defence procedure, indicates positive aspects of work's defence process and provides suggestions for the improvement of defence process.
71. Evaluating and defending the final work of joint study programme *Regional Development and Governance* the order of the university that enrolled students is in force. The evaluation of the MT is regulated by the documents of Šiauliai University and the University of Pardubice. Considering the particularity of joint study programme there are additional requirements for organisation of evaluation of final work:
 - 71.1. The structure of the Commission of evaluation of final works of joint study programme is approved by respective administration subjects of both partner universities following the determined order at the universities upon the proposal of *Study Programme Committee*;
 - 71.2. At least one representative of partner university must be present in the joint commission of evaluation of final works. Representatives of employees also might be invited as a members of this Commission;
 - 71.3. The advisor of the MT (one of the lecturers working in the programme) writes a report and evaluates work with a mark, the appointed consultant (from a different university then the advisor) writes a report about the work but does not evaluate the work with a mark;
 - 71.4. Following the order determined at the university, one reviewer who prepares a review of the work and evaluates the work with a mark is appointed;
 - 71.5. Final evaluation of the MT is done by the Commission of evaluation of final works of joint study Master's programme during the meeting when the Master's Thesis is defended;
 - 71.6. The appeal of evaluation of the MT is presented at the university where the final work has been defended following the order of appeal of final works' defence.

IX. EVALUATION CRITERIA OF FINAL WORK

72. The main *criteria of evaluation* of final work are as follows:

- 72.1. Relevance of research problem, aim, tasks and/or problem issues and substantiation by the newest scientific theories in a particular field, validity of the hypothesis (if it is needed);
- 72.2. Logical consistency and integrity of the work;
- 72.3. Selection of theoretical concepts actualising the problem. Disclosure of theoretical research access and author's position. Usage of the newest and the most significant works of national and foreign authors that analyse this problem;
- 72.4. Disclosure of theoretical and methodological presumptions of the research, clarity of the selected research strategy (plan) and expedience of methods. Methodological quality of research tools;
- 72.5. Application quality of methods of analysis of empirical research data. Interpretation of empiric research results in the context of investigated problem;
- 72.6. Compliance of work's conclusions, generalisation with the problem issues, hypothesis (if it has been formulated), ability to critically evaluate research results. Concreteness, validity and tangibility of presented recommendations;
- 72.7. Work's compliance with the requirements determined in the Faculty (see Lileikienė A., Šaparnis G., Tamošiūnas T. (2004). *Methods of Preparation of Master's Thesis*. Šiauliai. Publishing House of Šiauliai University);
- 72.8. Correctness of the language.

X. EVALUATION CRITERIA OF DEFENCE OF MASTER'S THESIS

73. The main criteria of defence of the MT are as follows:

- 73.1. The student is able to distinguish and present the essential aspects of final work clearly and concisely;
- 73.2. Argumentatively answers to the questions asked by the reviewer and other participants of defence process and is able to discuss;
- 73.3. During the defence demonstrates that knows the theories related to the problem of the defended work and methods of the performed research, understands the situation and problems of practical sphere analysed in the work, is able to carry out analysis in the context of selected theories.

XI. APPEAL PROCEDURE

74. Appeals may be presented:

- 74.1. Regarding the order of defence of final work;
- 74.2. Regarding the objectivity of evaluation of final work.

75. The appellant must present the appeal *regarding the violation of the procedure of defence of final work, objectivity of evaluation* on behalf of the Vice-Rector for Studies to the administrator of the Dean's Office of the Faculty of Social Sciences within three working days after the announcement of evaluations results.

76. It is not allowed to defend the final work once again in order to receive higher evaluation.

77. The order of appeals is presented in the *Regulations of Study Appeals of Šiauliai University*.

XII. PROVISIONS OF UNDEFENDED MASTER'S THESIS

78. Upon students requests undefended final works can be rewritten (repeating of the study subject) and defended not earlier than at the end of next semester; the Department may decide to include new subjects, modules into the study plan if study programme has partly changed.
79. Students removed from the list of students because have not defended or failed to defend the final work can be admitted to the last year if not more than 4 years have passed after removal from the students' list or in cases when the study programme has not changed. If the study programme has changed new subjects, modules may be included into the study plan upon the decision of the responsible Department.
80. Students that have been removed from the students' list because of low academic achievements who have not defended or failed to defend the final work are admitted to the university and pay tuition fee.
81. Student has to pay the price proportional to subjects' volume for the repeated subject Master's Thesis and new subjects, modules when the study plan has changed. Study fee is determined in student's study agreement.
82. The request to repeat the final work is presented on behalf of the Rector to the Dean's Office *not later than within 5 working days*: a) from the confirmation of a negative evaluation, b) after the announcement of decision of Appeal Commission; c) from the beginning of the new academic year if the student has been removed from students' list.
83. When repeating the subject Master's Thesis, the student is supervised by the same advisor or the Department may appoint another advisor upon student's request. Upon student's request, negatively evaluated MT may be fundamentally improved or be prepared from the beginning.
84. *At the beginning of academic year* the student contacts the advisor regarding the improvement of final work / preparation of a new final work and presents a request signed by the advisor to the Department.
85. The student considers all the instructions presented by the Department and determined deadlines of preparation of the MT applied to the students of respective study programme and study form who prepare final work during that academic year.

XIII. FINAL PROVISIONS

86. The regulation comes into force after being approved by the Council of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts of Šiauliai University.
87. The regulation may be changed, corrected upon the decision of faculty's Council.

Example of Request to prepare Master's Thesis

(name, surname, in capital letters)

(group, specialisation, home address)

(phone number, e-mail)

To the Head of Department
Faculty of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts
Šiauliai University

**REQUEST
REGARDING PREPARATION OF MASTER'S THESIS**

20 -.....-.....

Šiauliai

I request to allow to prepare Master's Thesis on the following topic:

.....
.....

under guidance of advisor

.....

(student's signature, name, surname)

(advisor's signature, name, surname)

Example of Request to correct the topic of Master's Thesis

(name, surname, in capital letters)

(group, specialisation, home address)

(phone number, e-mail)

To the Head of Department
Faculty of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts
Šiauliai University

**REQUEST
REGARDING COORECTION OF THE TOPIC OF MASTER'S THESIS**

20 -.....-.....

Šiauliai

I request to change the topic of my Master's Thesis from

.....
into

.....
The reasons:

.....

(student's signature, name, surname)

(advisor's signature, name, surname)

The minutes of departmental discussion of Master's Thesis

THE MINUTES OF DEPARTMENTAL DISCUSSION OF MASTER'S THESIS

I. ADVISOR'S EVALUATION

Student's name, surname, study programme, specialisation, group

Name of the topic of Master's Thesis

Short advisor's review (advantages and disadvantages)

CONCLUSION about the spheres to be improved.

Advisor of Master's Thesis

(signature, name, surname)

I. DESCRIPTION OF DEPARTMENTAL DISCUSSION OF MASTER'S THESIS

CONCLUSION about the spheres to be improved

Date of discussion:

Chairperson of Commission of
Departmental Discussion of Master's Thesis

(signature, name, surname)

Example of the cover page of Master's Thesis

ŠIAULIAI UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS
DEPARTMENT OF
[to select the appropriate: ECONOMICS, MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION]

Name SURNAME

The student of study programme

TOPIC

Master's Thesis

Šiauliai, 20XX

Example of the title page of Master's Thesis

ŠIAULIAI UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS
DEPARTMENT OF

[to select the appropriate: ECONOMICS, MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION]

Name SURNAME

TOPIC

Master's Thesis

Social Sciences, *[select the appropriate: Economics (L100), Management (N200), Public administration (N700)]*

Advisor of Thesis:
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Name SURNAME

I confirm that presented Master's Thesis to obtain qualification degree in *[select the appropriate: Economics, Management, Public Administration]* is original author's work

(Student's signature)

Example of Advisor's evaluation

ŠIAULIAI UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF

MASTER'S THESIS ADVISOR'S EVALUATION

Šiauliai, XXX-XX-XX

Student's name, surname

Topic of Master's Thesis

.....

<i>Evaluation criteria</i>	<i>Select one option</i>
1. Student's activeness while developing work's conception, performing research, writing thesis (questions to lecturer, discussions about the work, reaction to lecturer's remarks). Systematicity of student's work. Student's progress.	<input type="checkbox"/> appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> basically appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> partly appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> inappropriate
2. Logical consistency and integrity of the work.	<input type="checkbox"/> appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> basically appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> partly appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> inappropriate
3. Selection of theoretical concepts actualising the problem. Disclosure of theoretical research access and author's position. Usage of the newest and the most significant works of national and foreign authors that analyse this problem	<input type="checkbox"/> appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> basically appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> partly appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> inappropriate

<p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	
<p>4. Disclosure of theoretical and methodological presumptions of the research, clarity of the selected research strategy (plan) and expedience of methods. Methodological quality of research tools.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>basically appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>partly appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>inappropriate</i>
<p>5. Application quality of methods of analysis of empirical research data. Interpretation of empiric research results in the context of investigated problem.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>basically appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>partly appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>inappropriate</i>
<p>6. Compliance of work's conclusions, generalisation with the problem issues, hypothesis (if it has been formulated), ability to critically evaluate research results. Concreteness, validity and tangibility of presented recommendations.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>basically appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>partly appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>inappropriate</i>
<p>7. Work's compliance with the requirements determined in the Faculty. Correctness of the language.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>basically appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>partly appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>inappropriate</i>

<p><i>8. Advisor's remarks.</i></p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	
<p><i>Conclusions about the compliance of Master's Thesis to the requirements and a possibility to defend the Thesis in public</i></p> <p>.....</p> <p><i>Suggested evaluation of Master's Thesis</i></p> <p>Advisor of Master's Thesis _____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(position, signature, name, surname)</p>	

Example of review of Master's Thesis

ŠIAULIAI UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS
DEPARTMENT OF

REVIEW OF MASTER'S THESIS

Šiauliai, XXX-XX-XX

Student's name, surname

Topic of Master's Thesis

.....

.....

<i>Evaluation criteria</i>	<i>Select one option</i>
1.Relevance of research problem, aim, tasks and/or problem issues and their substantiation by the newest theories of this field, validity of hypothesis (if necessary).	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>basically appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>partly appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>inappropriate</i>
2. Logical consistency and integrity of the work.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>basically appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>partly appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>inappropriate</i>
3. Selection of theoretical concepts actualising the problem. Disclosure of theoretical research access and author's position. Usage of the newest and the most significant works of national and foreign authors that analyse this problem	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>basically appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>partly appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>inappropriate</i>

.....	
4. Disclosure of theoretical and methodological presumptions of the research, clarity of the selected research strategy (plan) and expedience of methods. Methodological quality of research tools.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>basically appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>partly appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>inappropriate</i>
5. Application quality of methods of analysis of empirical research data. Interpretation of empiric research results in the context of investigated problem.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>basically appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>partly appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>inappropriate</i>
6. Compliance of work's conclusions, generalisation with the problem issues, hypothesis (if it has been formulated), ability to critically evaluate research results. Concreteness, validity and tangibility of presented recommendations.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>basically appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>partly appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>inappropriate</i>
7. Work's compliance with the requirements determined in the Faculty. Correctness of the language.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>basically appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>partly appropriate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>inappropriate</i>
8. Other remarks, reviewer's questions.	

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

Conclusions about the compliance of Master's Thesis to the requirements and a possibility to defend the Thesis in public

.....

Suggested evaluation of Master's Thesis

Reviewer of Master's Thesis _____

(position, signature, name, surname)

Extract from the minutes of the meeting of Commission of evaluation of final works

ŠIAULIAI UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS
DEPARTMENT OF

**EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF COMMISSION
OF EVALUTION OF FINAL WORKS**

Šiauliai
June, 20....., No.

DECIDED:

3.1. To evaluate Master's Thesis of the student
(name, surname)

by
(evaluation grade)

3.2. To award Master's qualification degree in [*to select appropriate: Economics, Management, Public
Administration*]
(awarded degree and/or professional qualification)

Chairperson of the Commission
(degree, name, surname) (signature)

Example of organisation's/enterprise's review about final Master's Thesis (completed on organisation's letterhead)

Organisation's logo

To the Department of Economics/Management/Public Administration
Faculty of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts
Šiauliai University

REVIEW

About final work of (Name, Surname)

Date

Place

The final Master's work [*insert the topic*] of the student Name, Surname of [*insert the study programme*] study programme has been carried out upon [write organisation's/enterprise's name] request. The student has analysed the following aspects of [*please indicate the name of organisation/enterprise*]: [*please indicate the aspects*]. Researches carried out by the student are useful/not useful and will used [*please indicate*].

Position, Name Surname [*fill in*] Signature

Recommended official note to organisation/enterprise

Addressee

Date, No.

REGARDING PRESENTATION OF DATA FOR THE RESEARCH

The student NAME SURNAME of Šiauliai University is performing the research "TITLE". We would request to cooperate and present information and data necessary for the research [please indicate in particular] that will be published.

Dean

Gintaras Šaparnis

Prepared by: Name, Surname, telephone

Scale of evaluation criteria of Master's Thesis

SCALE OF EVALUATION CRITERIA OF MASTER'S THESIS

Evaluation mark	Relevance of research problem, aim, tasks and/or problem issues and their substantiation by the newest theories of this field, validity of hypothesis (if necessary).	Logical consistency and integrity of the work	Selection of theoretical concepts actualising the problem. Disclosure of theoretical research access and author's position. Usage of the newest and the most significant works of national and foreign authors that analyse this problem	Disclosure of theoretical and methodological presumptions of the research, clarity of the selected research strategy (plan) and expedience of methods. Methodological quality of research tools	Application quality of methods of analysis of empirical research data. Interpretation of empiric research results in the context of investigated problem	Compliance of work's conclusions, generalisation with the problem issues, hypothesis (if it has been formulated), ability to critically evaluate research results. Concreteness, validity and tangibility of presented recommendations	Work's compliance with the requirements determined in the Faculty. Correctness of the language
Excellent/very good (10-9)	Research problem is clearly presented and substantiated by the newest science theories, its relevance, scientific novelty, practical significance are clearly reasoned. Hypothesis (if necessary) is original and meaningful.	All parts of the work: introduction, theoretical, practical parts, conclusions, recommendations clearly match each other, and are presented consistently.	Theoretical research access is clearly substantiated in theoretical part. Original author's position regarding the investigated issue is revealed using the newest and the most significant research works. Requirements of scientific language are followed.	Research strategy is appropriate to achieve the aim, it is original, logically validated and clearly described. Data collection and analysis methods are suitable and properly presented. Sufficient amount of arguments is presented that validate the suitability and reliability of research instruments. Research sample was validated, representativeness	More complicated methods of research data analysis are applied, requirements for them are strictly followed. Research results are presented clearly, consistently, distinguishing the essence, demonstrating deeper, comprehensive understanding of the problem. Interpretations of results are original, validated by theory.	The conclusions completely correspond to tasks/problem issues, hypothesis (if were formulated), are structured, original, validated by research results, are discussed in the context of researches of other authors. Suggestions and recommendations are original, concrete, real, related to research material and conclusions.	Work corresponds to the requirements of final works determined in the faculty. There are no language mistakes.

				of research sample was evaluated (for qualitative research), research organisation is clearly described.			
Good/average (8-7)	Research problem is clearly presented and substantiated by science theories, its relevance, scientific novelty, practical significance are reasoned. Hypothesis (if necessary) is meaningful.	All parts of the work: introduction, theoretical, practical parts, conclusions, recommendations match each other, and are related. Clear and logical consistency of the work.	Theoretical research access is basically substantiated, however, expedience of presentation of some material in the work is unclear, there is lack of information purposefully supporting the topic. Methods of theoretical analysis are applied, however, conclusions and generalisations are missing originality and insight. Requirements of scientific language are followed. The most significant scientific works are used.	Selected research strategy is clearly described and is appropriate to achieve the aim of the work. Data collection and analysis methods are presented. Research instruments are argumentatively described and theoretically validated. Research sample is validated, research organisation is described.	Standard data analysis methods are applied properly. Research results are presented clearly, consistently, however, there is a lack of versatility, depth of the problem, original insights are missing. Interpretations of results are not always validated by theory, no logical mistakes.	Conclusions of the work principally correspond to the tasks/problem issues hypothesis (if were formulated), are validated by research results. Suggestions and recommendations are concrete, real, related to research material and conclusions.	Work corresponds to the requirements of final works determined in the faculty. There are some language mistakes.

<p>Sufficient/weak (6-5)</p>	<p>Research problem is not sufficiently revealed and presented inconsistently, practical significance and work's novelty are only stated, however, not properly reasoned. Formulation of hypothesis (if it is indicated) is hardly meaningful.</p>	<p>There is lack of integrity and logical consistency of separate parts of the work.</p>	<p>Theoretical part only partly substantiates the research, redundant information is presented, or there is lack of it. Insufficient logical consistency. Methods of theoretical analysis are scarcely applied, the sources are almost not referred. New, relevant scientific knowledge is not presented. There are subject mistakes.</p>	<p>Selected research strategy is not clearly described and/or is only partly appropriate to achieve the aim of the work. Presentation of data collection and analysis methods, description of research instrument are not comprehensive. Research sample is not validated. Suitability and quality of research instruments is satisfactory.</p>	<p>There are inaccuracies when applying standard methods of data analysis. Research results are presented. They are scarcely interpreted, while interpreting theory is hardly referred to. There are logical mistakes.</p>	<p>Conclusions of the work basically correspond to the tasks/problem issues hypothesis (if were formulated). Facts are stated, conclusions are scarcely validated by research results. Theoretical and practical significance of the work is doubtful. Suggestions and recommendations are not concrete. There are logical mistakes.</p>	<p>Work partly corresponds to the requirements of final works determined in the faculty. There are grammar, syntax, especially style mistakes.</p>
<p>Insufficient (4)</p>	<p>Problem is not from the sphere of study programme or is presented very unclearly, there are logic mistakes. Presented arguments of practical significance and scientific novelty are inappropriate. Formulation of hypothesis (if any) is senseless.</p>	<p>Content of the work does not correspond to the topic or at least one of the parts (introduction, theoretical, practical parts, conclusions, recommendations) is not related to the content of other parts or there are big drawbacks of integrity of all the parts.</p>	<p>Theoretical part of the work largely does not correspond to the topic of the work, does not validate the research. There is no logical consistency, methods of theoretical analysis are not applied. There are no generalisations or they are not significant. Much material is taken from textbooks, unscientific</p>	<p>Research strategy is described very vaguely or is not described at all and only partly suits to achieve the aim of the work. The research is not validated. Description of methods contains a lot of methodological mistakes, inaccuracies. Bad quality of research instruments. Research organisation does</p>	<p>There are essential mistakes of application of methods of data analysis. Research results are presented but basically they are not interpreted or interpretations are not logical. There are many mistakes of data presentation.</p>	<p>Conclusions of the work only partly correspond to the tasks/problem issues hypothesis (if were formulated). Non-essential facts are stated or only some conclusions correspond to research results. Suggestions and recommendations are not concrete, vaguely related to research material. There are many logical mistakes. Theoretical and practical</p>	<p>Work partly corresponds to the requirements of final works determined in the faculty. There are many language mistakes.</p>

			sources.	not follow methodological requirements.		significance of work is doubtful.	
--	--	--	----------	---	--	--------------------------------------	--