

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING OF MASTER'S THESIS

The results of the defense of the master's thesis /master's project are determined by:

1. The "excellent" rating is given for the work in which: the statement of the problem includes the justification of the relevance, scientific novelty of the topic, the formulation of the purpose and objectives of the study, the definition of its object and subject, the analysis of sources, the content and structure of the study correspond to the set goal and objectives, the conclusions of the author differ in scientific novelty and practical significance, the presentation of the material differs logical and semantic completeness, the conformity of the conclusions of the work with its main provisions and the objectives of the study is noted, the requirements for the design of scientific papers have been met. During the public defense of the work, the applicant showed a confident command of the material, the ability to clearly, argumentatively and correctly answer the questions posed, defend his own point of view.
2. The "good" rating is given for a dissertation work in which: the statement of the problem characterizes the features of the study quite fully, the content of the work as a whole corresponds to the goals and objectives of the study, the work takes into account the latest achievements in the study of the problem, the presentation of the material is mainly descriptive, the final conclusions of the work as a whole correspond to its main provisions and the objectives of the study, the basic requirements for the design of scientific papers were met, the public defense of the work showed a fairly confident command of the material, however, insufficient ability to clearly, argumentatively and correctly answer the questions posed and defend their own point of view.
3. The "satisfactory" rating is given for the work in which: the statement of the problem does not reflect the specifics of the problems of the chosen topic, does not fully characterize the research objectives, the content of the work does not fully correspond to the research objectives, the database of research sources is fragmentary and does not allow to qualitatively solve all the tasks set in the work, new approaches to the research problems are not taken into account in the work, the presentation of the material is descriptive in nature, the conclusions presented in the work, they do not fully comply with its main provisions and tasks, a number of requirements for the design of scientific papers were violated, during the public defense, an uncertain possession of the material, inability to defend one's own position and answer questions were manifested.
4. The "unsatisfactory" rating is given for a work in which: the introduction of the work does not have a logical structure and does not perform the function of setting the research problem, there is no methodology and methodology of research in the introduction, the content of the work basically does not correspond to the topic, goals and objectives of the study, the base of research sources is insufficient to solve the tasks, the work is mainly abstract the nature, the requirements for the design of scientific papers are not met, the conclusions obtained do not correspond to the main provisions and tasks set, during the

public defense of the dissertation, insecure possession of the material, inability to formulate one's own position was manifested.

**EVALUATION SHEET OF THE DISSERTATION WORK
at the meeting of the problem commission**

№	Basic parameters	Mark 1- 10
1	justification of relevance	
2	научная новизна темы и практическая значимость	
3	формулировка цели и задач исследования, определение объекта и предмета исследования	
4	соответствие содержания и структуры исследования поставленной цели и задачам	
5	адекватность выбора методов исследования	
6	достоверность и качество проведенной исследовательской (экспериментальной) работы;	
7	адекватность обработки полученных данных и глубина теоретического анализа	
8	соответствие выводов работы ее основным положениям и поставленным задачам исследования	
9	Формы внедрения: публикации в рецензируемых журналах, КОКСОН выступления на международных конференциях, авторские свидетельства, патенты, методические рекомендации, учебные и учебно-методические пособия, внедрение в учебный процесс (акт) внедрение в практическое здравоохранение (акт)	
10	Степень владения материалом, ответы на поставленные вопросы, качество презентации	
	Итого	

Баллы:

- 1 – критерии не выполнены или выполнены на 10 %;
- 2 – критерии выполнены на 20 %;
- 3 – критерии выполнены на 30 %
- 4- критерии выполнены на 40 %
- 5 – критерии выполнены на 50%

- 6 – критерии выполнены на 60 %;
- 7 – критерии выполнены на 70 %;
- 8 – критерии выполнены на 80 %
- 9- критерии выполнены на 90 %

10 – критерии выполнены на 100%