

Evaluation Criteria for Term Papers with Examples

The grade is determined based on six sub-evaluations in the following categories:

Conceptual Work	Argumentation	Originality and Ambition	Use of Research Literature	Formal Requirements	Style

The average of all sub-evaluations is calculated and rounded to the possible grade levels. The sub-evaluations are adjusted to the designated seminar level (introductory courses, WM I, II, III).

As feedback, you will receive not only the grade but also the sub-evaluations and an explanatory text. Additionally, I may include specific aspects that I took into consideration during the evaluation.

The average of term papers I grade has remained relatively consistent over the past years, just below 2.0. In the following, you will find anonymized examples from previous years illustrating the feedback corresponding to different grade levels.

Example 1: Very Good Term Paper

Name, Enrollment No	Grade	Average
	1	1

Conceptual Work	Argumentation	Originality and Ambition	Use of Research Literature	Formal Requirements	Style
1	1	1	1	1	1

Specific aspects	Evaluation
Detailed reconstruction of a complex Husserl text based on a clear thesis and within the research context.	<p>The paper engages in a detailed analysis of Husserl's Krisis - given the complexity of the text, this is a challenging task. The paper goes significantly beyond what was discussed in the seminar and has a clear and independent thesis. The argumentative structure and organization of the paper are consistently developed from the thesis. Furthermore, demanding concepts and positions are convincingly reconstructed using extensive references to relevant research literature. The style is impeccable, and the formalities are very well executed, except for the fact that the paper was not submitted as a single PDF (which shall not diminish the excellent impression).</p> <p>Overall: An outstanding paper with an independent thesis, addressing a demanding seminar text and incorporating a broad reception of relevant research literature.</p>

Example 2: Good Term Paper

Name, Enrollment No	Grade	Average
	1.7	1.5

Conceptual Work	Argumentation	Originality and Ambition	Use of Research Literature	Formal Requirements	Style
1	2	1	2	2	1

Specific aspects	Evaluation
Comparison of Blumenberg's and Heidegger's understanding of technology.	<p>The paper presents, in an impeccable style, a comparison of Blumenberg's and Heidegger's understanding of technology. It is an independent analysis of the differences in the concept of technology/technization. The inclusion of an author who was not specifically discussed in the seminar demonstrates a high level of ambition and extends beyond the seminar topic. The argumentation is mostly convincing; however, a few points, particularly the (valid) observation that Blumenberg has a more affirmative concept of technology compared to Heidegger, are stated as assertions without evidence or further argumentation. The research reception is appropriate, given the focus on the two authors. The formalities are mostly correct, with the exception of a typographical mixture of quotation marks.</p> <p>Overall: A good paper with a highly demanding topic and a very well-executed presentation, but with some minor flaws that hardly detract from the argumentation itself.</p>

Example 3: Satisfactory Term Paper

Name, Enrollment No	Grade	Average
	2.7	2.7

Conceptual Work	Argumentation	Originality and Ambition	Use of Research Literature	Formal Requirements	Style
2	3	4	3	2	2

Specific aspects	Evaluation
	<p>The paper presents a formally well-executed discussion of the doctrine of mesotes in good scientific style (with a few exceptions, which can, however, be expected considering the semester level) and with a satisfactory reception of research texts to support the author's interpretation of the original text. However, the paper lacks originality and remains somewhat superficial, hardly going beyond a summary of the text. It would benefit from further problematizing certain aspects or addressing research issues. The paper lacks a thesis, and although a research question is formulated, it does not really guide the argumentation and is not explicitly addressed again in the conclusion. Terms are mentioned and defined, but not discussed beyond the original text.</p> <p>Overall: A satisfactory paper that is somewhat superficial but decently executed.</p>

Example 4: Failed Term Paper

Name, Enrollment No	Grade	Average
	F	4

Conceptual Work	Argumentation	Originality and Ambition	Use of Research Literature	Formal Requirements	Style
3	4	2	5	5	5

Specific aspects	Evaluation
Too generalizing, too polemic, and lacking in problematization.	<p>Die Arbeit rezipiert die Forschungsliteratur, belegt aber Aussagen nur sehr selten (→ nicht beabsichtigtes Plagiat). Fachbegriffe werden nicht übernommen, sondern durch eigene Begriffe ersetzt (Disziplin vs. Verhaltensoptimierung). Argumentativ trägt das im ersten Teil vorbereitete Hauptargument nicht: Die Kontrolle über potentielles Beobachtetsein (Panopticon) ist auch nach eigener Aussage bei der modernen Überwachung gerade abwesend. Die Fragestellung ist originell und passt sich gut in den Forschungskontext der Arbeit ein. Der Stil der Arbeit ist eher politisierend, polemisch und oft pauschalisierend, kaum problematisierend.</p> <p>Insgesamt: Mangelhafte Arbeit aufgrund von philosophischen Schwächen und großen Defiziten im wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten. 2 / 2</p> <p>The paper engages with research literature but rarely provides evidence for statements (unintentional plagiarism). Technical terms are not adopted but replaced with the author's own terms (discipline vs. behavior optimization). The main argument developed in the first part does not hold up: exertion of control through the potential for constant observation (panopticon) is explicitly stated to be <i>absent</i> in modern surveillance. The research question is original and fits well within the research context of the paper. The style of the paper tends to be politicizing, polemic, and often generalizing, with little problematization.</p> <p>Overall: A paper with considerable philosophical weaknesses and significant deficiencies in scholarly work.</p>

Version: 12 July 2023