

Evaluation criteria for the academic discipline “Human rights standards of the European Court of Human Rights” for students of the first (bachelor’s) level of higher education in the field of knowledge 29 “International Relations” of the speciality 293 “International Law” of the specialization “International Law” of the Faculty of International Law (elaborated by Ass. Prof. Kristina Trykhlil)

1. General criteria for assessing the level of knowledge and skills of students are:

- a) accuracy, integrity, depth and thoroughness of the answer to the question;
- b) the ability to argue own point of view, validity and persuasiveness of the arguments;
- c) the use of basic and additional literature;
- d) references to the norms of national and international law, as well as to judicial and law enforcement practice.

Key criteria for essay assessment:

- compliance with formal requirements (number of pages – 1 – 1.5 pp. of printed text in A4 format. Formal requirements: font Times New Roman, size 14, line spacing – 1.5 cm, indentation – 1.25 cm, all margins (top, bottom, left, right) – 2 cm);
- independence and creativity in disclosing the topic;
- the level of proper and convincing justification (on professional examples) of the author’s opinion;
- consistency of legal reasoning of one’s own position, its completeness, presentation of possible counterarguments and different approaches to the analysis of the issue.

Key criteria for presentation assessment:

- compliance with formal requirements (number of slides – 10 – 12 slides);
- creative approach (usage of crosswords, puzzles, tables, schemes, charts, illustrations, audio and video files, *etc.*);
- author’s contribution and added value of the created presentation, uniqueness of the work;
- the appropriate level of independent synthesis and analysis of professional legal literature, including domestic and international experience, case law and statistics (depending on the topic);
- fullness and comprehensiveness of the research, consistency and integrity of the presented material, the appropriate level of justification of the author’s position.

Key criteria for the assessment of practical tasks:

- the level of critical thinking and thorough analysis of various scientific sources (legal doctrine), as well, as applied, practical materials (legislation, national and international law enforcement judicial practice, *etc.*);

- level of research of empirical data;
- the level of systemic general theoretical and practical, as well as comparative legal analysis of the issue;
- correctness, accuracy and completeness of the answer to the questions, their comprehensive argumentation (with reference to specific examples);
- proper level of convincing and comprehensive argumentation of own conclusions.

2. Final control of students' knowledge (exam)

Fund of assessment tools and scale for assessing student learning outcomes:

0 points. – Assessment criteria: 1. Lack of knowledge of a significant part of the basic material provided by the curriculum.

2. Impossibility to continue studies or carry out professional activities without taking a repeat course in this discipline.

30 points. – Assessment criteria: 1. Gaps in knowledge of certain parts of the basic material provided by the curriculum.

2. The presence of significant errors in the answer during the exam.

3. Impossibility to continue studies or carry out professional activities without additional work in this discipline.

35 points. – Assessment criteria: 1. Knowledge of the basic material provided by the program of the discipline, to the extent sufficient for further study and future work in the profession.

2. Acquaintance with the basic literature recommended by the department.

3. Errors in answering in the examination with the knowledge to eliminate the most significant mistakes with the help of the lecturer.

40 points. – Assessment criteria: 1. Knowledge of the basic material provided by the program of the discipline, to the extent sufficient for further study and future work in the profession.

2. Knowledge of basic literature recommended by the department.

3. Errors and significant inaccuracies in answering in the examination with the knowledge to eliminate the most significant mistakes independently or with the help of the lecturer.

45 points. – Assessment criteria: 1. Knowledge of the basic material provided by the program of the discipline, in the absence of significant inaccuracies in the answer.

2. Knowledge of the basic literature recommended by the program of the discipline and the lecturer.

3. Ability to independently replenish knowledge of the discipline, understanding of its importance for practical work.

50 points. – Assessment criteria: 1. Full knowledge of the material provided by the program of the discipline.

2. Knowledge of basic literature.

3. Ability to independently replenish knowledge of the discipline, understanding of its importance for practice.

55 points. – Assessment criteria: 1. Full knowledge of the material provided by the program of the discipline.

2. Knowledge of basic literature and acquaintance with additional literature.

3. Ability to independently replenish knowledge of the discipline, understanding of its importance for practice.

60 points. – Assessment criteria: 1. Comprehensive, systemic and in-depth knowledge of the material provided by the curriculum of the discipline, including orientation in the main scientific doctrines and concepts of the discipline.

2. Knowledge of basic and additional literature recommended by the program.

3. Ability to independently replenish knowledge of the discipline and use the acquired knowledge in practical work.

The final grade in the academic discipline “Human rights standards of the European Court of Human Rights” is put in the record book in accordance with the following scale:

Rating scale ECTS	Definition	Rating a national scale	Rating in scores, on a 100-point scale applied in NLU
A	Excellent – outstanding performance with small number errors	5	90 – 100
B	Very good – above the average standard but with minor errors	4	80 – 89
C	Good – generally sound work with some errors		75 – 79
D	Satisfactory – not bad, but with significant shortcomings	3	70 – 74
E	Sufficient – performance meets the minimum criteria		60 – 69
FX	Fail (Unsatisfactory) – some more work required before the credit can be awarded	2	35 – 59
F	Fail – considerable further work is required, obligatory repeated course		0 – 34