

### COOPERATIVE STATE UNIVERSITY Baden-Württemberg School of Business

## APPRAISAL

| Type of<br>academic paper | Project thesis I | Project thesis II | Bachelor's thesis |
|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Subject of thesis:        |                  |                   |                   |
| Author:                   |                  |                   |                   |
| Degree program:           |                  |                   |                   |
| Academic advisor          |                  |                   |                   |

#### Aims and purpose of the following assessment:

This template is to be used for the **assessment of academic papers** required as part of a Bachelor's degree program at the Baden-Württemberg Cooperative State University School of Business. The academic papers required are:

- project theses: The purpose of project theses is to document transfer of the fundamental academic knowledge and skills conveyed in the
  classroom and their application in on-the-job training. The knowledge and skills acquired in the respective specialism should be applied to
  address a specific practical problem. The project thesis must meet the criteria of an academic paper.
- Bachelor's theses: The Bachelor's thesis should demonstrate the student's ability to apply practical and theoretical knowledge and skills
  independently to address a practical problem within a defined time period.

Project and Bachelor's theses are therefore assessed in very much the same way. The standard set by the assessment criteria, however, must reflect the level of theoretical and practical knowledge and skills expected of students in the respective year of study.

A maximum of 100 points can be awarded in total for the four assessment categories.

| Summary assessment | (for details, | see items 1 | - 4 below): |
|--------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
|--------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|

| Total points out of 100: 0 | Grade awarded: |
|----------------------------|----------------|
| Date:                      |                |
| Signature:                 |                |

#### Assessment notes:

Extremely poor performance in any one of the four assessment categories usually results in the rejection of the entire thesis (if amply justified).

Guide to assigning grades (to determine the decimal place value in the respective range of points, see the attached points-to-grade conversion table).

| 1.0 to 1.5 | = | very good    | 100 to 90 points              | = outstanding in all respects                              |
|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------------|--|
| 1.6 to 2.5 | = | good         | 89 to 74 points               | = considerably above average                               |
| 2.6 to 3.5 | = | satisfactory | 73 to 58 points               | = meets the average requirements expected                  |
| 3.6 to 4.0 | = | adequate     | 57 to 50 points               | = meets the requirements but with shortcomings             |
| 4.1 to 5.0 | = | poor         | 49 to 34 points / < 34 points | = does not meet the requirements due to major shortcomings |

In the case of project thesis I, a total of 50 points or more is to be assessed as a "pass" and a total below 50 points as a "fail".

| 1. Subject coverage and structure  |  |                     |
|--|--|---------------------|
| Assessment criteria of the appraiser/advisor   | General ass<br>(only one X for e<br>———— o | <br>not<br>relevant |
| subject and aim of the thesis formulated clearly and unambiguously                   |  |                     |
| subject covered correctly with no omissions  |  |                     |
| Iogically and coherently structured and of a depth appropriate to the subject matter |  |                     |
| topical subject of practical relevance   |  |                     |
| Comments:  |  |                     |
| Maximum number of points: 20 Points awarded:   |  |                     |

| 2. Subject development   |                      |      |                        |                     |                 |
|--|----------------------|------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Assessment criteria of the appraiser/advisor   |                      | <br> | <br>essm<br>ach o<br>+ | ent<br>ption)<br>++ | not<br>relevant |
| <ul> <li>appropriate, well-defined terms applied consistently in the treatmen<br/>matter; correct use of specialist terminology</li> </ul> | nt of the subject    |      |                        |                     |                 |
| <ul> <li>justification and selection of investigative methods appropriate to the addressed</li> </ul>                                      | ne problem being     |      |                        |                     |                 |
| <ul> <li>coherent and well-structured treatment of the subject matter; logica<br/>arguments</li> </ul>                                     | ally consistent      |      |                        |                     |                 |
| analysis and critical assessment of existing model solutions in the  | ory and practice     |      |                        |                     |                 |
| development of independent approaches/ideas with the potential to<br>in practice   | o provide a solution |      |                        |                     |                 |
| <ul> <li>critical self-assessment of the results and estimation of likely future<br/>developments</li> </ul>                               | ;                    |      |                        |                     |                 |
| Comments:  |                      |      |                        |                     |                 |
| Maximum number of points: 40 Poi   | nts awarded:         |      |                        |                     |                 |

| 3. Selection and evaluation of sources   |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Assessment criteria of the appraiser/advisor   | General assessment<br>(only one X for each option)<br>o + ++ |  |
| <ul> <li>consideration of subject-appropriate academic and scientific sources (e.g.<br/>graphs, anthologies, academic and scientific journals, working papers, etc.<br/>appropriate scope</li> </ul> |  |  |
| ► consideration of practice-based, e.g. company- or sector-specific information  | on 🗆 🗆 🗆 🗆   |  |
| <ul> <li>critical distance in selecting and evaluating sources</li> </ul>  |  |  |
| Comments:  |  |  |
| Maximum number of points: 30 Points awa  | rded:  |  |

| 4. Formal aspects   |                         |                            |      |                     |                 |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Assessment criteria of the appraiser/advi   | sor                     | <br>neral<br>one X<br>-  — | <br> | ent<br>ption)<br>++ | not<br>relevant |
| <ul> <li>correct external form (e.g. cover page, declaration of own work</li> </ul>   | , print layout)         |                            |      |                     |                 |
| <ul> <li>formally correct creation of all required indexes (table of conter<br/>illustrations, tables and abbreviations, as applicable, as well as</li> </ul> |                         |                            |      |                     |                 |
| <ul> <li>correct spelling, grammar and punctuation; appropriate style and</li> </ul>  | nd register             |                            |      |                     |                 |
| <ul> <li>of the required length for project theses (20 - 30 pages) and E 80 pages);</li> <li>deviations require the advisor's consent</li> </ul>              | achelor's theses (60 —  |                            |      |                     |                 |
| accurate identification of all quotes using a correct and consistent  | ent method of quotation |                            |      |                     |                 |
| Comments:   |                         |                            |      |                     |                 |
| Maximum number of points: 10  | Points awarded:         |                            |      |                     |                 |

|              | 100 | 1.0 |
|--------------|-----|-----|
|              | 99  | 1.0 |
|              | 98  | 1.0 |
|              | 97  | 1.1 |
|              | 96  | 1.1 |
|              | 95  | 1.2 |
| _            | 94  | 1.2 |
| very good    | 93  | 1.3 |
|              | 92  | 1.4 |
|              | 91  | 1.4 |
|              | 90  | 1.5 |
|              | 89  | 1.6 |
|              | 88  | 1.6 |
|              | 87  | 1.7 |
|              | 86  | 1.8 |
|              | 85  | 1.8 |
|              | 84  | 1.9 |
|              | 83  | 1.9 |
| good         | 82  | 2.0 |
|              | 81  | 2.1 |
|              | 80  | 2.1 |
|              | 79  | 2.2 |
|              | 78  | 2.2 |
|              | 77  | 2.3 |
|              | 76  | 2.4 |
|              | 75  | 2.4 |
|              | 74  | 2.5 |
|              | 73  | 2.6 |
|              | 72  | 2.6 |
|              | 71  | 2.7 |
|              | 70  | 2.8 |
| satisfactory | 69  | 2.8 |
|              | 68  | 2.9 |
|              | 67  | 2.9 |
|              | 66  | 3.0 |
|              | 65  | 3.1 |

# Points-to-grade conversion table

|              | 64     | 3.1 |
|--------------|--------|-----|
| satisfactory | 63     | 3.2 |
|              | 62     | 3.2 |
|              | 61     | 3.3 |
| ·            | 60     | 3.4 |
|              | 59     | 3.4 |
|              | 58     | 3.5 |
|              | 57     | 3.6 |
|              | 56     | 3.6 |
| adequate     | 55     | 3.7 |
| aucquate     | 54     | 3.8 |
|              | 53     | 3.8 |
|              | 52     | 3.9 |
|              | 51     | 3.9 |
|              | 50     | 4.0 |
|              | 49     | 4.1 |
|              | 48     | 4.1 |
|              | 47     | 4.2 |
|              | 46     | 4.2 |
|              | 45     | 4.3 |
|              | 44     | 4.4 |
|              | 43     | 4.4 |
| poor         | 42     | 4.5 |
| 1            | 41     | 4.6 |
|              | 40     | 4.6 |
|              | 39     | 4.7 |
|              | 38     | 4.8 |
|              | 37     | 4.8 |
|              | 36     | 4.9 |
|              | 35     | 4.9 |
|              | 34 and |     |
|              | below  | 5.0 |
|              |        |     |