**Briefing paper**

You have been assigned a particular topic and are to deliver a briefing paper - i.e., an expert, theory and data supported, short document for a policy maker. While the goal is not forecasting the future, the briefing paper allows the implementation of your expert knowledge and techniques to be tested against the expert opinions of your colleagues and lecturer in the subsequent discussion.

* Targeted to a specific audience, namely a policy or decision maker (depending on topic)
* Short and to the point description of a current situation vis-a-vis angle asked for by the assignment
* Only relevant background
  + Historic issues informing the issue
  + Geographic and international connections
  + Stakeholder relations (e.g. map)
  + Cultural background
* Apply analytical lens based on approaches, concepts, or theories to
  + Introduce possible scenarios (with detailed reasoning/theory)
  + Rank the scenarios and argue for your top choice
  + Comment on differences for short and longer term

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Paper** | 5-4 | 3-2 | 1-0 |
| Focus | A clear focus on the indicated issue and targeted towards the intended audience. The author explains the importance of the point in question well. | The focus of the paper is understandable but slightly fuzzy. The author takes the intended audience into considerations, but the content is a bit general. He explains the importance of the issue. | The paper lacks focus. The author is circling the topic. He leaves out the importance of the issue or indicates it only vaguely. |
| Content | Relevant background data. There is a coherent argument about future development expressed and supported by evidence. | Background data. Argument not expressed but obvious within the paper and supported by some evidence. | Background all over the place. The argument of the piece is unclear. Evidence unclear. |
| Organization | The paper is well structured. There is a suitable introduction and conclusion, which cohere together and communicate with the content. The layout is logical. The paragraphs and pacing of the piece are well managed. | The structure of the paper is present. There is an introduction and conclusion, which communicates with the content. There are some paragraph or pacing issues. | Paper not structured well. Introduction and conclusion do not communicate well and do not touch on the rest of the content much. |
| Style | Well written. Concise. Fluent and engaging. Minimum spelling and grammar mistakes. | The author conveys thoughts correctly, but the academic style needs a bit of polishing. Spelling and grammar do not hinder understanding, but there are noticeable mistakes. | The whole paper needs proofreading, and the author might need to work on her academic writing style. There is bad spelling and grammar. |
| Citation | The author uses a wide range of high-quality sources. They use a citation style correctly and consistently both within the text and bibliography. | The author uses a sufficient range of sources of manily high-quality ones. But he needs more discrimination. The use of citations is correct and consistent. | Few resources. Lacks diversity of sources. There are low quality or unreliable sources. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation** | 5 - 4 | 3 - 2 | 1 - 0 |
| Content | Well-chosen for the time offered. It communicates well to the targeted audience. Relevant information. Solid prediction based on well-communicated evidence. | Relevant topics mentioned some parts were maybe omitted. Prediction delivered though some connections missing but still makes logical sense. | Not well chosen for the time offered. Too much background or little analysis. Little evidence. |
| Presentation | Presentation of data well done. Logical connections between argument and evidence. The presentation supports the delivery. | Presentation supports the delivery with minor issues of logic and data. | Careless presentation. Data presented badly. |
| Overall impression | Presentation delivered within the allocated time. The presenter well-spoken and using good English. | Presentation with little time issues. Understandable though some English-related problems. | Presentation too short or too long. The audience had problem understanding. |