

	Title, Introduction and Aims (10%)	Policy description (20%)	Analysis of Policy (20%)	Suggested policy (25%)	Student's Conclusions (10%)	Own Contribution (5%)	Structure and Style (5%)	Quality of literature and citations (5%)
9-10	Title describes the paper well. Introduction is concise and to the point. Topic and problem are identified/introduced well, with an understanding of nuances. Aim of paper very clear.	Describes policy properly with much insights. Supported with external literature. All elements policy covered.	Analysis is to the point (focused on the research question - RQ), focused on multiple impact dimensions and covers them in detail. Analysis is very careful and thorough, and approached with great care. Analysis is supported with detailed literature.	Very well formulated. Suggestion is in line with the analysis in the paper. Draws insights from policies elsewhere. Policy rationally rationalized with respect to sustainable development	Student's conclusions are highly appropriate and drawn logically from analysis. Conclusions are presented with an awareness of the limitations of the analysis. Main points clearly summarized and placed in a larger context.	Student presents new insight into the problem, for example by linking together literature in an innovative manner or framing issue in a creative way. Adds something beyond the analysis of the cited literature.	The paper is extremely well structured and sections are logically connected. The paper is highly readable, barely any spelling errors, style and formatting are clear and accessible.	Paper is based on peer-reviewed research/primary literature, reports from respected institutions and/or reliable internet resources. Student demonstrates command of the literature throughout the paper. Citations are impeccable and references listed correctly.
8-8.6	Title describes the paper quite well. Topic is clearly introduced, problem identified well. Aim of paper is clear, research question well stated, focused and fits scope of paper.	Policy described, matter of fact. All elements of policy covered. Not much but some additional insights	Analysis fits the RQ, covers it in most areas. Analysis is quite careful and thorough, and is approached with care. Analysis is supported with relevant literature.	Well formulated. Suggestion is in line with the analysis in the paper. Draws insights from policies elsewhere. Policy rationalized with respect to sustainable development	Conclusions are mostly appropriate and largely drawn logically from the analysis. Student is somewhat aware of the limitations of the analysis. Main points are summarized well and placed in a larger context.	Student presents some innovative insights into the problem. Some new links are made, issues addressed beyond the way in which the cited literature does.	The paper is well structured, sections are interconnected and flow logically from one another. Clear connections between sections. Paper is readable, spelling, style and formatting are clear	Paper is largely based on peer-reviewed research/primary literature, reports from respected institutions and/or reliable internet resources. Student demonstrates knowledge of the literature at most times. Citations and references are well done.
7-7.6	Title is fairly descriptive for the paper. Introduction addresses main themes of topic, problem identification is adequate. Aim of paper and research question are stated but could be clearer.	Policy described, nothing more. No additional insights.	Analysis fits the RQ fairly well and covers it adequately. Analysis is careful and fairly thorough, approached with some care. Analysis is supported by some relevant literature.	Well formulated. Suggestion somewhat is in line with the analysis in the paper. Draws some insights from policies elsewhere. Policy somewhat rationalized with respect to sustainable development, but with some gaps	Conclusions are somewhat appropriate and are logically linked to the analysis. Student hints at awareness of the limits of the analysis, but needs to present them more clearly. Main points are summarized adequately and hints are made at the larger context.	Student places the problem in an adequate perspective, and adds some new insights.	The paper is fairly well structured but needs some improvements. Sections are mostly interconnected, but flow is not always clear. Connections between sections need improvement. Paper is mostly readable, but spelling, style, and/or formatting need improvement.	Paper makes use of peer-reviewed research/primary literature, reports from respected institutions and/or reliable internet resources, but either limited in number or with unreliable sources mixed in. Student demonstrates some knowledge of the literature but tends to cite introductions. Citations and reference list need improvement.
6-6.6	Title describes the paper, but not completely. Topic is introduced but not concisely. Problem identification seems confused. Aim of paper and research question appear but lack focus.	Policy poorly described. Not all elements covered. Too much reliance on external literature.	Analysis touches upon the RQ but goes astray at times. Covers some areas of the RQ. Analysis is at times sloppy and inadequate. Literature supporting analysis is lacking.	Poorly formulated. Suggestion is somewhat in line with the analysis in the paper. Draws no insights from policies elsewhere. Policy rationalized with respect to sustainable development with significant gaps	Conclusions are only somewhat appropriate and lack logical connection with the analysis. Student is overly bold in stating conclusions, mostly lacks insight into the limitations of the analysis. Some main points are mentioned, but summary is vague or wordy. Limited attempts to place topic in a larger context.	Student presents an understanding of the problem, but analysis is largely based on that of the cited literature.	The paper is rather poorly structured. Sections lack connections and flow is mostly absent. Paper is readable at times but spelling, style, and/or formatting need significant improvement.	Paper lacks in use of peer-reviewed research/primary literature. Some reports from institutions and/or reliable internet resources, but reliability is questionable. Sources are limited in number. Student demonstrates limited command of the literature. Citations and references need significant improvement.
5-5.6	Title barely relates to the subject. Topic poorly introduced, problem identification is lacking, aim of paper unclear and research question poorly formulated. Research question inappropriate for scope of paper and unrealistic.	Policy very poorly described.	Analysis only touches upon the RQ at times, and many areas are left untouched. Analysis is mostly sloppy and inadequate. Some literature used for support, but mostly inappropriate.	Barely any suggestion and is not in line with the analysis in the paper. Draws no insights from policies elsewhere. Policy barely rationalized with respect to sustainable development	Conclusions are largely disconnected from the analysis, lacking connections with it. Student is far too bold in stating conclusions, lacks insight into the limitations of the analysis. Some points are mentioned, but not clear what are the main issues. Attempts to place topic in a larger context sorely lacking.	Analysis of the problem is completely dominated by the literature cited, hardly any creative connections made by student.	The paper is very poorly structured. Sections are disjointed, no clear flow between them. Paper is not very readable, spelling, style and formatting need great improvement.	Paper barely uses any peer-reviewed research/primary literature. Reports seem to be largely from unreliable institutions or internet sources. Very limited in number. Poor command of the literature. Citations and references need great improvement.
Under 5.0	The title does not relate to the material. Introduction is too long or convoluted, or entirely unrelated to the subject. Problem is unclear, aim of paper not stated. Research question is vague or too open. Question is not related to the appropriate class theme.	Not really described	Analysis does not touch upon the RQ, and is severely lacking. Analysis largely sloppy and inadequate. Literature inappropriate for support of a analysis.	No new policy	Conclusions are completely disconnected from the analysis, presenting new ideas that lack foundation in the analysis. Student makes bold statements, has no insight into the limitations of the analysis. Summary missing or very lacking. No mention of the larger context of the topic.	Student depends completely on the literature cited for analysis and content, no real added value.	The paper lacks structure. Readability unacceptable.	Paper lacks academic foundation, sources are largely or exclusively unreliable and are few in number. Vague references to material. Citations and references inadequate
EINKUNN		10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Final grade		10.00					FINAL GRADE:	10