

	<b>Excellent (1,0 / 1,3)</b>	<b>Good (1,7 / 2,0 / 2,3)</b>	<b>Acceptable (2,7 / 3,0 / 3,3)</b>	<b>Marginal Pass (maybe Fail) (3,7 / 4,0 / maybe 5,0)</b>	<b>Fail (5,0)</b>
<b>Content</b>					
Focus and Choice of Topic	Clear focus. Topic well-defined	Adequate focus. Topic manageable	Focus somewhat unclear. Topic not fully manageable	Focus unclear. Topic inadequate	No visible focus. Topic not defined
Thesis	Clear and original thesis	Clear thesis with an original component	Thesis not entirely clear and/or not original	Thesis vague	No thesis
Consistency	Thesis always kept in view and consistently argued	Thesis kept in view and well- argued but with minor inconsistencies	Thesis not consistently kept in view but successfully proven in key passages	Thesis gets lost in the paper or is not successfully argued	No reference to the thesis in the paper or inconsistent argument
Terminology	Clear definition of terms	Terms clearly defined but with minor shortcomings	Terms not consistently or not clearly defined but comprehensible	Inadequate use of terms	No reference to critical terminology
Work with Primary Sources	Close and attentive reading of primary sources	Adequate work with primary sources	Lack of reference to primary sources in places	Superficial work with primary sources	Inadequate reading of primary sources
Critical Distance	Critical analysis	Analysis with minor shortcomings	Description instead of analysis in some places	Description outweighs analysis	No analysis, only description
Originality	Development of an original point of view	Point of view well-defined but not entirely original	Point of view not original but good use of secondary sources	No original point of view but acceptable use of secondary sources	Plagiarism
<b>Academic Research</b>					
Use of Bibliographies (Printed and Electronic) and Selection of Secondary Sources	Very good bibliographic re- search leads to a well-selected list of relevant sources	Good bibliographic research. Substantial list of works cited.	Ineffective bibliographic research with discernable shortcomings in the selection of secondary material (e.g. no scholarly articles)	No systematic research. Fragmentary list of works cited. Limited range of secondary sources and/or random selection	No use of databases. List of works cited severely deficient or non- existent.
Use of Secondary Sources	Secondary sources are used effectively and critically	Secondary sources are used to strengthen the argument and a critique of secondary sources is visible in places	Ineffective use of secondary sources in places and lack of critical distance in the use of secondary sources	Secondary sources are not connected to the paper's argument and merely used in a decorative way	Illogical or blatantly wrong use of secondary sources. Only sporadic or no reference to secondary sources.
<b>Structure (and Coherence)</b>	Clear and coherent structure with compelling transitions between chapters / points	Structure mostly clear with visible transitions between chapters / points	Structure generally sound but with logical breaks and/or lack of subdivision. Transitions sometimes missing and/or not always clear	Incoherent structure. Unclear connections between chapters / points	No visible structure. No connection between chapters / points
<b>Language (Correctness and Style)</b>	Correct and idiomatic language. Academic style	Mostly correct and idiomatic language. Stylistically adequate	Still satisfactory use of English. Stylistic shortcomings	Significant language errors. Lack of academic style.	Severe language problems. Inadequate style.
<b>Form</b>	Adheres fully to Departmental Style Sheet.	Mostly adheres to guidelines but with some mistakes	Repeated but no glaring formal errors	Significant formal errors	No adherence to Style Sheet

Additional Remarks:

- *Content* (including *Academic Research* and *Structure*) : Language (and *Form*) = 2 : 1. A paper which is deficient (fail) in either language or content is also an overall fail.
- The mark of a paper should not be the result of a mathematical calculation (although the table above might give that impression) but should weigh strengths and weaknesses according to the individual case. Beginner's mistakes (minor formal mistakes, stylistic insecurities, initial problems with academic research etc.) should not be counted too drastically (especially when the paper is the first a student has written).
- A paper awarded a "marginal pass" (3,7 or 4,0) should also contain "saving graces", i.e. it should include some positive aspects (better than 3,7 / 4,0). A paper accumulating a long list of negative criteria (of the 3,7 / 4,0 column) is a fail (5,0).
- Any of the given characteristics in the "Fail" column is already sufficient to mark a paper as a fail (esp. "Plagiarism" or "No adherence to Style Sheet"!).
- If several negative aspects combine, the paper must be marked as a fail.
- Special emphasis should be given to the adherence to deadlines and the required length of the paper. Failure to meet the required length or failure to hand the paper in by an agreed deadline can be a reason to fail a paper. A paper is automatically a fail if it is drastically overlong or too short or if a deadline is deliberately disregarded.