

Grading Rubric Bachelor Thesis			
Student name(incl. study model)	S1 VN / FN	S1 NN / LN	
Type of assignment	Bachelor Thesis		
Title of assignment	[Titel / Title]		
Confidentiality level	öffentlich / public		
Programme, model and location	Bitte Studiengang wählen / Please select program	Bitte Studienmodell wählen / Please select model	Bitte Standort wählen / Please select location
Faculty / Supervisor	[Vorname / Firstname]	[Nachname / Lastname]	
Client organization	[Name der Organisation / Name of organization]		
Client representative	[Vorname / Firstname]	[Nachname / Lastname]	
Location, date	[Ort / Location]	[Datum / Date]	
		Weight	Achieved Points
		Written Assignment 80%	0.00
		Oral Assignment 20%	0.00
		Achieved points Total	0.00
		– Point deduction	- 0.00
		Given points	0.00
Calculated grade	1.0		
Grade, rounded to a half grade	1.0		
Feedback on written assignment			
I. Research (conceptual/theoretical) Framework (Weight: 15%)			Subtotal
Evaluation & Remarks 'Research (conceptual/theoretical) Framework'		0% of total points of section	Points Subtotal 0
II. Procedure & analysis (Weight: 15%)			Subtotal
Evaluation & Remarks 'Procedure & analysis'		0% of total points of section	Points Subtotal 0
III. Interpretation & reflection (Weight: 20%)			Subtotal
Evaluation & Remarks 'Interpretation & reflection'		0% of total points of section	Points Subtotal 0
IV. Solution recommendation (Live Project, Practical Project and Bachelor Thesis only) (Weight: 20%)			Subtotal
Evaluation & Remarks 'Solution recommendation (Live Project, Practical Project and Bachelor Thesis only)'		0% of total points of section	Points Subtotal 0
V. Achievement of objectives & Critical appraisal (Weight: 20%)			Subtotal
Evaluation & Remarks 'Achievement of objectives & Critical appraisal'		0% of total points of section	Points Subtotal 0
VI. Documentation & formal criteria (Weight: 10%)			Subtotal
Evaluation & Remarks 'Documentation & formal criteria'		0% of total points of section	Points Subtotal 0
		Total written part (of max. 100)	0.00

Fields marked in yellow MUST be filled in

Fields marked in red indicate MISSING evaluations in the written part.

[illegible]

Grading Rubric Bachelor Thesis

written

Title of assignment

[Titel / Title]

Assessment criteria	Exceeds expectations A	Meets expectations B	Partially meets expectations C	Does not meet expectations D	Evaluation	Remarks
I. Research (conceptual/theoretical) Framework					Section weighted: 15%	
Objectives and delimitation	The objectives / research questions are excellently delimited with regard to the scope of the paper; they are precise, verifiable, and well formulated.	The objectives / research questions are adequately delimited with regard to the scope of the paper; they are precise and verifiable.□	The objectives/research questions are only somewhat delimited with regard to the scope of the paper and/or are insufficiently precise and verifiable.	The objectives/research questions are not delimited; they are imprecise and not verifiable.		
Identification of field / context	The field / context to which the paper relates is clearly defined; the relevance of the topic is convincingly described.□	The field / context to which the paper relates is sufficiently identified, and the relevance of the topic is described.	The field / context to which the paper relates is mentioned, but the paper is not sufficiently contextualized; the relevance of the present topic is only partially described.	The field/context to which the paper relates is mentioned, but the paper is not contextualized; the relevance of the present topic is not described.		
Selection of sources	A wide range of highly relevant and trustworthy literature is identified and critically reviewed.	A sufficient range of relevant and trustworthy literature is identified and discussed.□	A low range of relevant and trustworthy technical literature is identified and partially discussed.	Relevant technical literature and sources are not sufficiently identified and discussed.		
Selection of theories, models, concepts	Relevant, recognized theories, models, or concepts are described in detail, and their selection is critically reflected upon.	Generally relevant, recognized theories, models, or concepts are identified and described.□	Relevant theories, models, or concepts are partially identified but not adequately described.	Relevant theories, models or concepts are not considered / described. Or appropriate theories, models, or concepts are not applied.		
Evaluation & Remarks				max. points unweighted 16.67	points unweighted 0	
Evaluation & Remarks 'Research (conceptual/theoretical) Framework'				max. points weighted 15	Points Subtotal 0	

AoL Evaluation	AoL Objective BA (BÖK)
----------------	------------------------

0	1.1
0	1.1
0	1.1
0	1.1

II. Procedure & analysis					Section weighted:	15%	
Choice of methods for problem solving	The selected method(s) is (are) justified and explained in an easily understandable way; the rationale for the choice of research approach/methods is presented; the selected method(s) is (are) well suited to the objectives and the discipline.	Three of the following four criteria are met: (1) the description of the method(s) is complete; (2) the selected method(s) is/are justified; (3) the rationale for the choice of research approach/methods is presented; (4) the selected method(s) is/are appropriate for the objectives and the discipline.	Two of the following three criteria are met: (1) the selected method(s) is (are) described; (2) the rationale for the choice of research approach/methods is (are) outlined; (3) the selected method(s) is (are) appropriate for the objectives and the discipline. □	Fewer than two of the following three criteria are met: (1) the selected method(s) is (are) described; (2) the rationale for the choice of research approach/methods is (are) outlined; (3) the selected method(s) is (are) appropriate for the objectives and the discipline.			
Research strategy (key words, databases, platforms)	The research strategy is described precisely, completely, and comprehensibly.	The research strategy is essentially described completely and comprehensibly.	The research strategy is described only partially and is not always comprehensible.	The research strategy is described only fragmentarily or not at all. It is incomprehensible.			
Application of selected method(s)	The selected methods are applied systematically and consistently to the data / context / practice case. □	The selected methods are generally applied systematically to the data / context / practice case. □	The selected methods are partially applied to the data / context / practice case, but the application could be more systematic. □	The selected methods are applied unsystematically or not at all to the data / context / practice case.			
Quality of the analysis	All aspects of the research question(s)/objective(s), sources (and data, if applicable) are systematically analyzed; the analyses demonstrate expertise and understanding.	Most aspects of the research question(s)/objective(s), sources (and data, if applicable) are analyzed; the analyses demonstrate some expertise and understanding.	Only some aspects of the research question(s)/objective(s), sources (and data, if applicable) are analyzed; little expertise and understanding are evident.	Significant aspects of the research question(s)/objective(s), sources (and data, if applicable) are overlooked; expertise and understanding are insufficient.			
Collaboration and communication	Students took ownership and completed the project/paper independently while also accepting meaningful and necessary support. Communication was excellent to meet the needs of all involved (e.g., targeted, frequency, etc.).	Students took some responsibility to complete the project/paper independently while also accepting meaningful and necessary support. Communication was generally tailored to the needs of those involved.	In some cases, students had difficulty completing the project/paper independently or failed to accept useful and necessary support. Communication was not consistently tailored to the needs of the participants.	Throughout the project, students had difficulty working independently or frequently failed to accept useful and necessary assistance. Communication was not sufficiently tailored to the needs of the participants.			
Incorporation of feedback	The (supervisor's/client's) feedback was further developed and implemented by the students in a reflective manner.	The (supervisor's / client's) feedback was for the most part correctly implemented by the students.	The (supervisor's / client's) feedback was not sufficiently reflected by the students and therefore only incorrectly implemented.	The (supervisor's / client's) feedback was not sufficiently implemented by the students.			
Evaluation & Remarks					max. points unweighted 25	points unweighted 0	
Evaluation & Remarks 'Procedure & analysis'					max. points weighted 15	Points Subtotal 0	

0	1.1
0	1.1
0	1.1
0	2.1
0	
0	

III. Interpretation & reflection					Section weighted: 20%	
Logical linking of source content with own thoughts / critical reflection.	The significance of the findings (i.e., the results of the analysis) is discussed in detail in relation to sources and / or the operational context.□	The significance of key findings (i.e., the results of the analysis) is discussed in relation to sources and / or the operational context.□	The significance of some key findings (i.e., the results of the analysis) is discussed, but insufficient reference is made to sources and / or the operational context.□	The significance of the findings (i.e., results of the analysis) is discussed insufficiently; sources and/or operational context are insufficiently referenced.		
Consideration of context	The specific and relevant dimensions of the (international and/or business) context are explicitly presented and clearly explained, demonstrating a sound expertise and understanding of the (cultural) context.□	The most relevant dimensions of the (international and/or business) context are identified and explained, showing some awareness of the (cultural) context.□	Only some relevant dimensions of the (international and/or business) context are identified and explained, showing little awareness of the (cultural) context.□	Relevant dimensions of the (international and/or business) context are missing or not explained, indicating a lack of awareness of the (cultural) context.		
Interpretation of findings	The interpretation of the findings is clearly and explicitly based on sources and / or the business context.□	The interpretation of the findings is generally based on sources and / or the business context.□	The interpretation of the findings is only partially based on sources and / or the business context.□	The interpretation of the findings is insufficiently based on sources and / or the business context.		
Management summary (abstract)	The management summary provides a concise and meaningful outline of the objectives, procedure and results, which is reader friendly and generates interest in the topic.	The management summary provides a generally concise and meaningful outline of the objectives, procedure and results.	The management summary provides a somewhat meaningful outline of the objectives, procedure and results; some aspects are lacking.	The management summary fails to provide a meaningful outline of the objectives, procedure or results.		
Evaluation & Remarks				max. points unweighted 16.67	points unweighted 0	
Evaluation & Remarks 'Interpretation & reflection'				max. points weighted 20	Points Subtotal 0	

0	2.1
0	4.1
0	4.1
0	3.1

IV. Solution recommendation (Live Project, Practical Project and Bachelor Thesis only)					Section weighted:	20%	
Recommendations for solutions (reference to literature and theory)	The recommendation / solution is innovative / insightful; it is relevant and meaningful for the specific context; it is based on the presented findings (incl. the results of the literature research / theory, the context, and the results of the analysis and discussion).□	The recommendation / solution is based on the presented findings (incl. the results of the literature research / theory, the context, and the results of the analysis and discussion).□	The recommendation / solution is not sufficiently based on the presented findings (incl. the results of the literature research / theory, the context, and the results of the analysis and discussion).□	A recommendation / solution is missing and/or it is not based on the presented findings (incl. the results of the literature research / theory, the context, and the results of the analysis and discussion).□			
Practicability	The results and recommendation can directly be put into practice; restrictions and limitations are critically discussed.	The results and recommendation can be put into practice with little modification; restrictions and limitations are discussed.	The results and recommendation can only be put into practice after modification; restrictions and limitations are discussed.	The results and recommendation can not be put into practice without major modifications; restrictions and limitations are overlooked.			
Business Context	Adept awareness of the business context is displayed; potential implications and impact of the context on business decisions is presented clearly.	Awareness of the business context is generally displayed; potential implications and impact of the context on business decisions is presented.	Little awareness of the business context is displayed; potential implications and impact of the context on business decisions is only partially addressed.	Insufficient awareness of the business context is displayed; potential implications and impact of the context on business decisions is to a large extent overlooked.			
Evaluation & Remarks					max. points unweighted 12.5	points unweighted	0
Evaluation & Remarks 'Solution recommendation (Live Project, Practical Project and Bachelor Thesis only)'					max. points weighted 20	Points Subtotal	0

0	2.1
0	2.1
0	4.1

V. Achievement of objectives & Critical appraisal					Section weighted:	20%	
Answering the research question(s)/achieving the objective(s). □	All aspects of the research question(s)/objective(s) are fully answered/achieved along the requirements and provide important insights to stakeholders. □	Most aspects of the research question(s)/objective(s) are answered/achieved along the requirements. □	The research question(s)/objective(s) are only partially answered/achieved along the requirements. □	The research question(s)/objective(s) are inadequately answered along the requirements.			
Critical appraisal of findings	Specific and unavoidable limitations and weaknesses of the research (e.g., method, data) are identified and explained in a comprehensible manner and demonstrate strong critical thinking skills. □	Some specific and unavoidable limitations and weaknesses of the research (e.g., method, data) are identified and explained and demonstrate strong critical thinking skills. □	Several limitations and weaknesses of the research (e.g., method, data) are overlooked; critical thinking skills are not clearly evident. □	Limitations and weaknesses of the research (e.g. method, data) are largely overlooked.			
Outlook	Potential approaches or further questions in the subject area / in the industry are specified. □	Potential approaches or further questions in the subject area / in industry are identified and provide relevant insights. □	Potential approaches or further questions in the subject area / in the industry are overlooked or not sufficiently identified. □	Potential approaches or further questions in the subject area / industry are insufficient.			
Achievement of objectives	All agreed upon objectives are achieved.	Agreed upon objectives are generally achieved.	Agreed upon objectives are only partially achieved.	Agreed upon objectives are not sufficiently achieved.			
Evaluation & Remarks					max. points unweighted 16.67	points unweighted 0	
Evaluation & Remarks 'Achievement of objectives & Critical appraisal'					max. points weighted 20	Points Subtotal 0	

0	2.1
0	2.1
0	4.1
0	2.1

VI. Documentation & formal criteria					Section weighted:	10%	
Structure of text	The structure is logical, comprehensible, and optimally matched to the content. It is in line with the specifications of the "Scientific Writing" platform of the School of Business (HSW).	The structure is predominantly logical, comprehensible, and well matched to the content. It is largely in line with the specifications of the "Scientific Writing" platform of the School of Business (HSW).	The structure is only partially logical, comprehensible, and well matched to the content. It is only partially in line with the specifications of the "Scientific Writing" platform of the School of Business (HSW).	The structure is unclear or illogical and not sufficiently aligned with the content. It is not in line with the specifications of the "Scientific Writing" platform of the School of Business (HSW).			
Text layout	The layout is visually appealing and supports the message of the content.	The layout supports the message of the content.	The layout only partially supports the message of the content.	The layout is unclear and/or insufficiently supports the message of the content.			
Writing style and comprehensibility	The writing style is optimally tailored to the target audience. Subject-specific terminology is used consistently and excellently. Language is eloquent, precise/ concise, and clear. Language use is diversity-sensitive and factual.	The writing style is tailored to the target audience. Good use of subject-specific terminology. Language is largely eloquent, precise/ concise, and clear. Language use is largely diversity-sensitive and factual.	The writing style is not consistently tailored to the target audience. Only partial use of subject-specific terminology. Some of the language is imprecise and unclear. The use of language is often not diversity-sensitive and/or partly unobjective.	The writing style is not sufficiently tailored to the target group. Too little subject-specific terminology is used. Language is imprecise and unclear. The use of language is neither diversity-sensitive nor factual.			
Evaluation & Remarks					max. points unweighted 12.5	points unweighted	0
Evaluation & Remarks 'Documentation & formal criteria'					max. points weighted 10	Points Subtotal	0
Written Assignment					Achieved points Total	0.00	

0	3.1
0	3.1
0	3.1

Grading Rubric Bachelor Thesis						oral
Title of assignment [Titel / Title]		Presentation Setting vor Ort / on Site		Location and Date of Presentation: [Location], [Date]		
Assessment criteria	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Partially meets expectations	Does not meet expectations	Evaluation	Remarks
	A	B	C	D		
I. Content					Section weighted: 70%	
Structure ("red thread")	The structure and layout of the presentation are <ul style="list-style-type: none">• logical• coherent• and clear.	The structure and layout of the presentation are for the most part <ul style="list-style-type: none">• logical• coherent• and clear.	The structure and layout of the presentation are only partly <ul style="list-style-type: none">• logical• coherent• and clear.	The structure and layout of the presentation are not sufficiently <ul style="list-style-type: none">• logical• coherent• and clear.		
Priorization & time management	The weighting of the contents (introduction, main part, conclusion) is optimally managed within the agreed time window.	The weighting of the content (introduction, main part, conclusion) is for the most part managed well within the agreed time window.	The weighting of the content is only partly managed well, or the agreed time window has been undercut/exceeded.	The weighting of the contents (introduction, main part, conclusion) is not balanced enough, and the agreed time window has clearly been undercut/exceeded.		
Presentation of results	The results of the analysis are technically correct, and conscientiously substantiated/supported (evidence-based). They are clearly related to the research question. Key points are clearly highlighted and comprehensible.	The results of the analysis are for the most part technically correct, and conscientiously substantiated/supported (evidence-based). They are mostly clearly related to the research question. Key points are presented and are largely comprehensible.	The results of the analysis are only partly technically correct, and conscientiously substantiated/supported (evidence-based). And/or the reference to the research question could be clearer. Key points are only partially recognizable and comprehensible.	The results of the analysis are not sufficiently technically correct, and conscientiously substantiated/supported (evidence-based). And/or they have too little relation to the research question. Key points are only partially recognizable and comprehensible.		
Conclusion	The key points are summarized in a concise, compelling conclusion (take-home message).	The key points are well summarized in a solid conclusion (take-home message).	Some points are summarized in a conclusion (take-home message), but this could be more convincing.	A conclusion (take-home message) is missing.		
Discussion & Q&A	At the end of the presentation, a discussion is actively initiated (e.g., by the presenter asking the audience further questions). Questions are answered in a targeted and well-founded manner.	A discussion takes place, but without active engagement of the students. Questions are mostly answered in a targeted and well-founded manner.	A discussion takes place, but without active engagement of the students. Questions are only partly answered in a targeted and well-founded manner.	No discussion is initiated or takes place. Questions are answered inadequately.		
Evaluation & Remarks				max. points unweighted 55.56	points unweighted 0	
Evaluation & Remarks 'Content'				max. points weighted 70	Points Subtotal 0	

AoL
Evaluation

0
0
0
0
0

II. Delivery					Section weighted:	30%	
Presentation & use of voice (verbal communication)	Verbal communication is always • tailored to the target audience • clearly understandable • and motivated • and optimally supports the transport of the contents.	Verbal communication is mostly/with a few exceptions • tailored to the target audience • clearly understandable • and motivated • and supports the transport of the contents well. (3/4 have to be fulfilled)	Verbal communication is only partly • tailored to the target audience • and clearly understandable • and supports the transport of the contents. (2/3 have to be fulfilled).	Verbal communication is not sufficiently • tailored to the target audience • and understandable • and does not support the transport of the contents enough.			
Appearance & style, body language (non-verbal communication)	Appearance and style are always • professional • and adapted to audience and context. Body language expresses an enthusiastic/engaged attitude.	Appearance and style are, with a few exceptions • professional • and adapted to audience and context. Body language expresses an enthusiastic/engaged attitude most of the time.	Appearance and style are only partly • professional • and adapted to audience and context. Body language occasionally expresses an enthusiastic/engaged attitude.	Appearance and style are not sufficiently • professional • and adapted to audience and context. Body language does not express an enthusiastic/engaged attitude.			
Audience engagement (addressing the audience, eye contact)	The audience is actively involved during the presentation, and enthusiasm about the topic is conveyed.	The audience is involved during the presentation.	There is little audience involvement during the presentation.	The audience is not sufficiently involved during the presentation.			
Visualisation & use of media (storytelling)	The content is tailored to the target audience, and the message is excellently supported by the use of media.	The content is tailored to the target audience, and the message is well supported by the use of media.	Some of the content is tailored to the target audience, and the message is supported by the use of media.	The content is not sufficiently tailored to the target group, and the message is hardly supported by the use of media.			
Evaluation & Remarks					max. points unweighted 44.44	points unweighted	0
Evaluation & Remarks 'Delivery'					max. points weighted 30	Points Subtotal	0
Oral Assignment					Achieved points Total	0.00	

0
0
0
0