Project:		Status:	
Guidelines for degree project		Confirmed	
Issued by:	Date:	Document no:	Issue:
Camilla Lindmark, Gunilla Enquist	2010-01-15	2545-09	3

Guidelines for degree project

Guidelines for degree project

These guidelines are developed jointly by the Boards at Luleå University of Technology (LTU). In addition, all departments have been involved in the design through a consultative process. The guidelines will show students and the (external) supervisor what LTU expects for a degree project and is comprised of four parts: compulsory elements, workflow, report/essay sections as well as a checklist for the public discussion and examination. The guidelines are based on a written independent work assignment and need to be further developed in order to comply with the examination forms for programmes in fine, applied and performing arts, this includes performance to the degree project.

Note *that these are only guidelines, which means that the sequence and description may be varied.*

★ Mandatory elements of the degree project:

1. Project plan (planning report, essay PM, documentation for approval)

2. Written report/essay (degree project)

3. Oral presentation (to act as author of the degree project)

4. The public discussion/examination of another degree project

5. Attendance at a prescribed number of seminars

The work process recommended (★ mandatory elements):

- Contact with the course coordinator or equivalent (see course syllabus)
- Choice of degree project and any contact with businesses/the municipality/interested persons
- Development of project plan★
- Approval of the project plan/the commencement of the work ,
- Allocation of supervisors and examiners and planning of the first supervisor meeting
- Planning of any work at a company/municipality/with those concerned
- Possible start-up seminar with collected information prior to project implementation
- Supervisor seminar/meetings
- Possible reconciliation
- Production of written report/essay ★
  http://www.ltu.se/ltu/lib/Skriva?l=en
- Presentation of report/essay for analysis
- Analysis and correction of report/essay
- Text-matching of report/essay
- Approval prior to presentation with selected examiner/reviewer
- Presentation and examination/review ★
- Attendance at other seminars
- Revision and approval of written report/essay
- Publishing and (grade) registration
  http://www.ltu.se/edu/studentwebben/Examination-Tentamen-VFU-Praktik/Examensarbeten-uppsatser?l=en
 - Evaluation of the work process via survey or meeting

The report's/essay's constituent parts
The following should be included, but are not necessarily to be used as headings:

√ Cover with the title (produced by the printing company)

√ Possible foreword

√ Summary (English and Swedish)

√ List of contents

√ Introduction with background and problem
(assignment of responsibilities should be clear if more than one student has done the work)

√ Research topic and purpose

√ Theory

√ Method

√ Results

√ Analysis, discussion and conclusions

√ Further work/research/recommendations

√ References

√ Appendices

Example of checklist for public discussion/examination and assessment

This checklist can be used for public discussion and examination purposes, but can also be used by students in assessing their own work. From the checklist, you can clearly see the requirements that the student is expected to meet. See also another variation of a checklist in Backman, J. (2008). *Rapporter och uppsatser (Reports and essays)*. Studentlitteratur.

Checklist

1. The oral presentation
   Is there a common thread?
   Is the presentation engaging?
   Do they succeed in conveying their message?
   Does the presentation focus on the most important aspect covered by the report/the essay?

2. Subject, problem area
   Is the chosen topic/problem area relevant and interesting to study?
   Is it related to earlier research?

3. Problem discussion/purpose
   Do the writers succeed in interesting the reader/justifying the subject chosen?
   Is it clear what issues the writers had at the start of their work/has anything been overlooked?
   Are the questions relevant to the objective/problem?
   Does the objective present a specification of the problem/discussion?
   Is the objective clearly described/achievable?

4. Delimitations
   Does the work have reasonable delimitations and are they motivated?

5. Theory extension/choice of frame of reference
   Have theories been selected and are they consistent with the problem discussion and objective?
   Has previous research been taken into account and is it relevant?
   Are there any relevant theories not included or is any particular theory superfluous?
   How are selected theories dealt with?

6. Method
   What research approach was chosen by the authors and how is it motivated?
   Was the choice of method a conscious one? Were alternatives discussed?
   How is reliability and validity dealt with and discussed?

7. Empiricism
   How has data collection been carried out and is this consistent with the procedure description?
   Is the report well-argued and logical with regard to its objective?
   Is the scope of the empirical description appropriate?

8. Analysis
   How has the empirical material been used?
   With regard to the theories that have been described, have they been used to interpret the empirical data?
   What method of analysis has been used? How does the analysis of the work agree with other elements of the content?

9. Conclusion/results/solution proposals
   Are the findings and conclusions sustainable/are they based on the analysis of empirical data?
   Have any suggestions or recommendations been presented?
   Has it achieved its objective?

10. Discussion
    Are the conclusions linked together with the objective, questions at issue, theory,
    previous research and results?
    Are the chosen methods valued?
    Have limitations been discussed?
    Are there any suggestions for continued work?

11. References
    What references have been selected and are they presented in a consistent manner?

12. Disposition and logic
    Does the title provide information about the actual content?
    Are the various chapters linked to each other in a logical manner?
    Have any of the sections been given too much or too little attention?
    Anything missing/lacking?

13. Language and execution
    Are there spelling mistakes, punctuation errors or similar shortcomings?
    Is there a logical division into paragraphs?
    Are the table of contents, headings and references consistent and accurate?
    Are tables, figures, and their texts presented correctly?

14. Ethical approach and critical distance
    Can you see what is taken from literature/other sources and what are the authors' own opinions?
    Is there a critical distance to the sources on the Internet?
    Do the authors present a critical distance to theories and conclusions?

15. Overall impression
    Does the work have a clear analytical approach and well-presented conclusions?
    What is the value of the degree project for the principal/do the writers contribute with
    something new?
    Does the work show proof of an independent and critical approach?

Clarifications regarding the degree project
- Uniform entry requirements prior to starting the degree project may exist
- The examiner and the supervisor should not be the same person
- Mandatory elements must be graded
- The degree project is to be completed within 15 months of registered start; unless otherwise agreed
- A text-matching tool is used on all degree projects for tracing plagiarism, and teachers are obliged to report any suspicion of cheating to the Vice Chancellor.
- If two or more students carry out an independent project together
  - each individual's effort should be as comprehensive as if the students had worked separately
  - an individual assessment should be carried out

These guidelines are established through decisions of the
Boards TFN no. 9-09 and FFN-o no. 10-10. Revised 2011-09-07 and 2013-08-21.