

**Oral presentation (max 10 points)**

*It is up to you if one of the pair presents or both of you. The presentation will be evaluated as one whole.*

Content of case study (4 points): <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Actors, interests, grievances</li><li>• International society/ position in international law</li><li>• Argument for/against intervention</li></ul>	Included, well integrated	Included	Not sufficiently included
Sources (2 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Varied sources</li><li>• Validated and evaluated – research articles, good book sources from trustworthy authors</li></ul>	Sources varied, high quality	Sufficient sources, good quality	Not varied sources, lower quality
Communication (2 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Clarity – ideas well explained, integrated with slides, good transitions, responds well to questions</li></ul>	Very good	Sufficient	Not sufficient
Formal requirements (2 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Delivery in allotted time (15 minutes)</li><li>• Presentation sufficiently structured and laid out</li></ul>	Very good	Sufficient	Not sufficient

**Research paper (max 20 points)**

*Your paper is a delivery of a stance for and against humanitarian intervention in particular case. The most efficient way how to write the paper is to do a research together and then decide who will take stance for and who will take stance against intervention and then coordinate the arguments accordingly. The complementarity of the papers is going to be evaluated, but do not use the same text for the first part of the paper (description of the crisis), write your own.*

Content			
Description of the crisis (max 2 pages; max 3 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actors and their motives</li> <li>International society – actors and their motives</li> </ul>	Well described, <b>pertinent</b> actors well-chosen and described.	Adequately described.	Not sufficient. Actors missing. Their motivations missing. International actors missing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Argumentation For/against intervention based on theory/international law/ interests of countries (6 points)</li> <li>Reacting to the partner’s paper (4 points)</li> </ul>	Arguments well laid out, structured, coherent, cohesive, responds to objections of the Opposing view laid out by the second partner in the pair.	Arguments basically there, adequate, but maybe some parts missing. Only minimally responding to objections of the partner.	Not coherent. Not well structured.  Does not respond to objections. There seems to not have been any communication between partners.
Formal requirements			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Referencing sources (2 points)</li> <li>Layout and spelling 2 points</li> </ul>	All sources properly referenced using consistently one of the citation styles, correct citations or paraphrases; minor grammar and spelling mistakes that do not impede comprehension.	All sources cited, with minor problems; Some problems with paragraphs, layout, grammar and spelling that only minimally hinder comprehension.	Sources badly referenced. Grammar and spelling mistakes hindering comprehension.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resources (3 points)</li> <li>Correct use of them</li> </ul>	Varied and strong sources – various research articles from databases and quality book sources. Their efficient use (not using them for “stuffing” the text but for support of the argument.)	Small range of sources, but sufficient.	Sources not sufficient.