

# Assessment Criteria and Grading Scale for Seminar Papers, Bachelor and Master Theses

*Last updated: 12 January 2016*

The assessment criteria and grading scale are based on the expected competency acquisition, which comprises the following core skills:

1. (most importantly) *Academic competence*, 2. *Methodological competence*, 3. *Interpretative competence*, 4. *Presentation competence*, 5. *Conceptual competence*.

In order to operationalise this foundation, the assessment criteria and grading scale are based on the following scheme:

	<b>3 points</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>0 points</b>
<b>Language</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reader-friendly; fully in accordance with the rules of the written language</li> <li>- correct and precise use of technical terms</li> <li>- discussion and definition of key terminology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- still reader-friendly; largely in accordance with the rules of the written language</li> <li>- largely correct and appropriate use of technical terms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- incomprehensible in places, with reduced legibility</li> <li>- grammatical and spelling mistakes</li> <li>- incorrect use of technical language</li> <li>- imprecise use of terminology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- incomprehensible passages</li> <li>- numerous grammatical and spelling mistakes</li> <li>- use of non-academic language</li> <li>- thoughtless and inappropriate use of terminology</li> </ul>
<b>Form</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- fully in accordance with formal requirements and rules of citation</li> <li>- assured use of foot-/endnotes</li> <li>- correct and comprehensive research of sources and literature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- largely in accordance with formal requirements</li> <li>- normally uniform and complete citation</li> <li>- generally appropriate use of foot-/endnotes</li> <li>- largely complete research of sources and literature with small gaps</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- only partially in accordance with formal requirements</li> <li>- flawed citation</li> <li>- uncertainty in the use of foot-/endnotes</li> <li>- incomplete but still recognisably systematic research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not meet formal requirements</li> <li>- incomplete and inconsistent citation</li> <li>- inadequate or inappropriate use of foot-/endnotes</li> <li>- insufficient, incomplete, arbitrary research results</li> </ul>
<b>Question</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- independent development of a clear, appropriate question</li> <li>- convincing delimitation and development of the topic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- clear question, which is developed for the most part in an independent and well-founded way; recognisable in its essentials</li> <li>- selection of aspects to expand on is acceptable, though not ideal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the rudiments of the question are recognisable, but very much based on pre-existing templates</li> <li>- little independent argumentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- absence of or inappropriate, generalised or non-historical/analytical question</li> <li>- no clarification or delimitation of the question</li> </ul>
<b>Structure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- clear layout</li> <li>- focused structure</li> <li>- analysis before judgement</li> <li>- observance of difference between factual judgement and value judgement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- largely clear layout</li> <li>- appropriately weighted and focused</li> <li>- extensive observance of the academic thought and argumentation process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- still possible to recognise the structure and follow it logically, but only with difficulty</li> <li>- weighting unbalanced</li> <li>- gaps on the way to answering the question</li> <li>- deficiencies with regard to the academic thought and argumentation process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- illogical structure; does not pursue an answer to the question</li> <li>- judgements before analysis or unrelated to the analysis</li> <li>- thoughtless adoption of judgements from the literature and from public interaction with the topic</li> </ul>
<b>Analysis and methods</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- convincing selection of sources and literature</li> <li>- convincing work with the sources and the literature</li> <li>- observance of multicausality, exemplarity, multiperspectivity and controversy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- appropriate selection of sources and literature</li> <li>- comprehensible work with the sources and the literature</li> <li>- extensive observance of multicausality, exemplarity, multiperspectivity and controversy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- gaps in the selection of sources and literature</li> <li>- not entirely comprehensible work with the sources and the literature</li> <li>- difficulties in observance of multicausality, exemplarity, multiperspectivity and controversy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- arbitrary, unsubstantiated selection of sources and literature</li> <li>- incomprehensible work with the sources and the literature</li> <li>- absence of observance of multicausality, exemplarity, multiperspectivity and controversy</li> </ul>
<b>Independence of thought, strength of judgement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- independent reflection on the topic with regard to the question</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- largely independent reflection on the topic with regard to the question</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- largely based on pre-existing templates</li> <li>- little independent but still well-founded judgement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- arbitrary, poorly founded judgement and/or judgement dependent on public interaction with the topic</li> <li>- absence of reflection on the determinants of the judgement</li> </ul>

## Grading scale:

<b>Points</b>	18 – 16.5	16 – 15.5	15 – 14.5	14 – 13	12.5 – 12	11.5 – 11	10.5 – 9.5	9 – 8.5	8 – 7.5	7 – 6	5.5 – 0
<b>Grade</b>	1	1.3	1.7	2.0	2.3	2.7	3.0	3.3	3.7	4.0	fail

*Zero points in any of the six categories results automatically in an overall grade of 5.0.*