

	A	B	C	D	E	F	Additional comments
Article commentaries	Engages thoroughly with well-selected secondary sources and puts them in clear analytical relationship to core course materials. Answers prompts with thorough, sustained and even original critical engagement.	Very good evaluation of appropriate scholarly material and an understanding of intellectual relationship between authors in the core and extended literature. Answers prompts with good critical engagement.	Evidence of reading, and being informed by, relevant and fundamentally reliable material, put into relationship with core secondary literature. Answers prompts with evidence of critical engagement, though this may not be sustained throughout.	Secondary sources are used but they lack relevance to core course materials and/or are misinterpreted. Answers prompts with some attempt critical engagement, though there may be occasional deviation from the point.	Minimum grasp of secondary sources, both in selection and interpretation. May include inappropriate sources or make insufficient use of relevant scholarly literature. Engagement is minimal. Responses may not address prompt, and there is minimal critical engagement.	The secondary sources utilized are of extremely poor quality and/or misunderstood. Connections are not drawn to core course literature. Responses do not address prompts. No evidence of critical engagement. LLMs may have been used.	
Primary source analyses	Analysis of the primary source's significance is nuanced and contextualized. Thoroughly discusses specific and well-chosen examples. Engages in meaningful critical assessment through excellent selection of secondary literature, with clear evidence of independence.	Good analysis of the primary source's contextual or interpretive significance. Good selection of specific examples, with well-rounded discussion. Good selection of secondary literature that is used for critical development of ideas.	Analysis of primary source is fundamentally sound. Examples are relevant, though may not always be clearly defined. Reasonable selection of secondary literature that allows for commentary on the source.	Analysis of primary source is broadly relevant, but is underdeveloped. Examples may be vague or only partially developed. Uses secondary literature but is more descriptive than analytical.	Minimal understanding of primary source. Weak selection of core literature, with minimal attempt at analysis.	Primary sources are misunderstood and/or analysis is irrelevant. Does not engage with secondary literature. LLMs may have been used.	
Synthesis paper	Critical and even creative engagement with the topic at all times. Intellectual independence and outstanding historical reasoning are highly evident. Comprehensive understanding of the chosen themes for both Vikings/Knights and outstanding ability to analyse this material in context. An outstanding ability to think comparatively, synthesize a strong selection of sources, and evaluate information to pursue a concrete line of argument.	Critical engagement with the topic, with reasonable independence. Very good understanding of most aspects of the chosen themes for both Vikings/ Knights, and can place this material in context. Good source selection and a well-developed ability to analyse and evaluate historical comparison, with a good attempt at argumentation.	A sound ability to analyse and evaluate historical comparison, with some signs of independence. Sound knowledge of the chosen themes and the most relevant historical sources for both Vikings/ Knights, with some contextualization. Makes some attempt to pursue a concrete line of argument from a comparative angle, though this may not be sustained throughout. May occasionally repeat material from the rest of the portfolio.	A modest ability to think comparatively, but is more descriptive than analytical, without independence. A modest grasp of aspects of the chosen themes and some historical knowledge, though it may not be equally developed in the case of either Vikings or Knights. May overlook key sources and/or uses some inappropriate sources, suggesting gaps in awareness of the scholarly literature related to the chosen themes. May repeat substantial material from the rest of the portfolio.	Weak analysis, minimal evidence of ability to apply historical knowledge to comparative questions. Minimum grasp of the chosen themes and weak historical knowledge in at least one of the Vikings or Knights case areas. Highly descriptive, general, or superficial discussion. Uses irrelevant or inappropriate selection of literature. May repeat most information from the rest of the portfolio.	Little or no evidence of engagement with the topic. Little or no awareness of the relevant historical knowledge for the chosen themes. Omits either the Vikings or Knights or both. Historical comparison is left unexplored, or extremely underdeveloped. LLMs may have been used.	
Overall presentation	Excellent presentation, with consistent and appropriate academic apparatus.	Very good presentation. Consistent and appropriate academic apparatus with only minor errors.	Good presentation. Mostly consistent and appropriate academic apparatus, with some technical errors.	Acceptable presentation with some attempt at an appropriate academic apparatus, but without clarity or consistency.	Substandard presentation, with minimal attempt at an academic apparatus.	No academic apparatus, or citations meaningfully misattributed. LLMs may have been used.	