

Evaluation sheet for the peer review task

Criteria (school grades →)	insufficient (5)	(barely) sufficient (4)	satisfactory (3)	good (2)	excellent (1)
Societal and regional relevance	Relevance does not exist or is not made clear	A societal and/or regional relevance is noticeable yet needs to be presented more clearly	Relevance is outlined and understandable	The portrayed project is aligned to present grand societal challenges	The portrayed project is aligned to present grand challenges and offers a feasible solution
Research question, Theory, Methodology	A RQ is not developed, there are no hints on theory or methodology given	There are hints to RQ, theory and methodology given but the connection does not become clear	The presentation is attempting a connection between RQ, theory and methodology but the logic is not followed through	The presented approach is on a par with recent research approaches from scientific literature	The approach recombines existing research concepts to a new approach and advances the knowledge base
Argumentation, train of thought	A concept of argumentation is not visible	Argumentation and train of thought show many fallacies	Argumentation and train of thought are comprehensible for most aspects	Argumentation and train of thought only show minor flaws	Argumentation and train of thought are flawless throughout
Structure & outline	No structure, chaotic outline	incomprehensible structure, inconsequent outline	Structure and outline leave room for improvement	Structure and outline only show slight flaws	Perfectly comprehensible throughout
Language & style of writing	Deficient verbal expression, choice of words inadequate	Remarkable amount of mistakes in language and choice of words	In summary, verbal Expression and choice of words is satisfactory	Verbal Expression and choice of words show slight flaws	Use of words is completely adequate and there are no mistakes
Figures, Tables and Table of Contents, References	No figures, tables, table of contents and references given	Few and/or error-ridden figures, tables, table of contents and references	Necessary and mainly correct figures, tables, table of contents and references given	Important and necessary figures, tables, table of contents and references given, only slight flaws	Profound and meaningful use of figures, tables, table of contents and references
Format/Layout/Design	Considerably low quality of layout and design, incomplete and confusing use of design elements	The layout serves basic needs of the presentation, still many flaws	Satisfactory use of design elements, comprehensibly structured layout	Solid presentation sheets that serve the purpose of the presentation	Extraordinary and surprising yet substantiated approach to back the presentation with a tailor-fit layout
Presentation and discussion	Presenters are unintelligible	Presenters speak too quiet or far too loud, avoid eye contact with the audience	Presenters are able to convey most contents of the presentation in a reasonable way	Presenters do a solid, unagitated job on conveying the presentation	Presenters speak loud and clear, show the right amount of gesture and mimics, charismatic, "entertainment qualities"
Literature (quantity and quality of sources)	No literature or sources used	Low quantity and quality of source work, no journal articles	Satisfactory work on sources, accurate citation, citation of scientific publications	Well done research on sources within journal articles, monographies and internet sources	Usage of most recent, important literature of this field of studies, mostly citing journal articles and high quality data repositories like Eurostat
Overall impression:					