

Grading Guidelines

GUIDELINES FOR GRADING ASSESSMENT

1st January 2005 (Norwegian)

January 2013 (English)

The normal distribution curve is an assessment tool for grading, both at the undergraduate (**Bachelor**) and graduate (**Master**) level.

NATIONAL GRADING SCALE: GENERAL QUALITATIVE DESCRIPTION

(University and College Council Affairs Committee)

Symbol	Designation	General, qualitative description of assessment criteria
A	Outstanding	Outstanding performance clearly distinguishable. The candidate demonstrates an excellent degree of independent judgment.
B	Very good	Very good performance. The candidate demonstrates a very good degree of independent judgment.
C	Good	A good performance which is satisfactory in most areas. The candidate demonstrates a good degree of independent judgment in the most important areas.
D	Satisfactory	A satisfactory performance, but with significant shortcomings. The candidate shows a limited degree of independent judgment.
E	Adequate	The performance meets the minimum criteria, but no more. The candidate displays little independent judgment.
F	Fail	The performance does not meet the minimum academic requirements. The candidate displays an absence of independent judgment and thinking.

**SUBJECT-SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA: UNDERGRADUATE
(Bachelor-level)**

Symbol	Designation	General, qualitative description of assessment criteria	Subject-specific description of evaluation criteria*	ECTS-distribution	Frame values quantitative distribution
A	Outstanding	High level of knowledge. Unusually strong analytical ability and independent use of knowledge.	Empirically and theoretically precise. Clever, pointed and original discussion. High level thematic breadth of knowledge. Especially strong comparative competence.	10 %	8-12%
B	Very good	Very good overview of the field of knowledge. Good analytical ability and independent use of knowledge.	Empirically and theoretically solid. High level thematic breadth of knowledge. Very good comparative competence.	25%	20-30%
C	Good	Good overview of the key elements in the field. Occasional independent use of knowledge.	Empirically and/or theoretically competent. Reasonable thematic breadth of knowledge. Good comparative	30%	24-36%

			skills.		
D	Satisfactory	Overview of the key elements of knowledge missing. Little academic independence.	Empirically and/or theoretically uneven. Some thematic breadth of knowledge and comparative competence.	25%	20-30%
E	Adequate	Meets the minimum requirements, but no more. Cannot use knowledge independently.	Empirically and/or theoretically unconvincing. Thematically uncertain. Little comparative competence.	10%	8-12%
F	Fail	Lacking both detailed knowledge and overview.	Very little empirical and theoretical understanding. Thematically very weak. No comparative competence.	0%	0%

***Note:** The term "thematic" is selected as a generic term for (e.g.) - "general" knowledge of regional ethnography or intellectual history, or more specifically the subject's central themes (gender relations, human ecology, ritual life, multiculturalism etc. – whichever are most relevant for the assessment). If the student scores unevenly in regards to the various criteria, the grade will be determined by the average.

SUBJECT-SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA: SPECIAL TOPICS (COURSES) AT HIGHER LEVEL (Master-level)

Symbol	Designation	General, qualitative description of assessment	Subject-specific description of evaluation criteria*	ECTS-distribution	Frame values quantitative distribution
---------------	--------------------	---	---	--------------------------	---

		criteria			
A	Outstanding	High level of knowledge. Unusually strong analytical ability and independent use of knowledge.	Empirically and theoretically precise. Clever, pointed and original discussion. High level thematic breadth of knowledge. Especially strong comparative competence.	10%	8-12%
B	Very good	Very good overview of the field of knowledge. Good analytical ability and independent use of knowledge.	Empirically and theoretically solid. High level thematic breadth of knowledge. Very good comparative competence.	25%	20-30%
C	Good	Good overview of the key elements in the field. Occasional independent use of knowledge.	Empirically and/or theoretically competent. Reasonable thematic breadth of knowledge. Good comparative skills.	30%	24-36%
D	Satisfactory	Overview of the key elements of knowledge missing. Little academic independence.	Empirically and/or theoretically uneven. Some thematic breadth of knowledge and comparative competence.	25%	20-30%
E	Adequate	Meets the minimum requirements, but no more. Cannot use knowledge independently.	Empirically and/or theoretically unconvincing. Thematically uncertain. Little comparative competence.	10%	8-12%
F	Fail	Lacking both detailed knowledge and	Very little empirical and theoretical understanding.	0%	0%

		overview.	Thematically very weak. No comparative competence.		
--	--	-----------	--	--	--

***Note:** The term "thematic" is selected as a generic term for (e.g.) - "general" knowledge of regional ethnography or intellectual history, or more specifically the subject's central themes (gender relations, human ecology, ritual life, multiculturalism etc. – whichever are most relevant for the assessment). If the student scores unevenly in regards to the various criteria, the grade will be determined by the average.

SUBJECT-SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA: MASTER ASSIGNMENT

Symbol	Designation	General, qualitative description of assessment criteria	Subject-specific description of evaluation criteria*	ECTS-distribution	Frame values quantitative distribution
A	Outstanding	High level of knowledge. Unusually strong analytical ability and independent use of knowledge.	Empirically and theoretically precise. Clever, pointed and original discussion. High level thematic breadth of knowledge. Especially strong comparative competence. Empirical material of very high quality, which is theoretically very well integrated.	10%	8-12%
B	Very good	Very good overview of the field of knowledge. Good analytical ability and independent use of	Empirically and theoretically solid. High level thematic breadth of knowledge. Empirical material of	25%	20-30%

		knowledge.	high quality that is theoretically well integrated. Pointed and insightful discussion.		
C	Good	Good overview of the key elements in the field. Occasional independent use of knowledge.	Empirically and/or theoretically competent. Reasonable thematic breadth of knowledge. Good comparative skills. Empirical material of average quality discussed on an acceptable theoretical level.	30%	24-36%
D	Satisfactory	Overview of the key elements of knowledge missing. Little academic independence.	Empirically and/or theoretically uneven. Some thematic breadth of knowledge and comparative competence. Empirical material of uncertain quality. Cannot carry out a systematic theoretical discussion.	25%	20-30%
E	Adequate	Meets the minimum requirements, but no more.	Empirically and/or theoretically unconvincing.	10%	8-12%

		Cannot use knowledge independently.	Thematically uncertain. Little comparative competence. Weak empirical material. Lack of theoretical discussion.		
F	Fail	Lacking both detailed knowledge and overview.	Very little empirical and theoretical understanding. Thematically very weak. No comparative competence. Major deficiencies in the empirical material. Failed to conduct a theoretical discussion.	0%	0%

***Note:** The term "thematic" is selected as a generic term for (e.g.) - "general" knowledge of regional ethnography or intellectual history, or more specifically the subject's central themes (gender relations, human ecology, ritual life, multiculturalism etc. – whichever are most relevant for the assessment). If the student scores unevenly in regards to the various criteria, the grade will be determined by the average.

SUBJECT-SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA OF GRADING SCALE PASS/FAIL: UNDERGRADUATE (Bachelor-level) AND GRADUATE (Master-level)

At the final evaluation (final grade of final part-grade in a course):		During "progress evaluation" – preliminary tests/assignments during the term – (where the grade or partial-grade is not the final grade for the course):	
Passed	Equivalent criteria for grades A-D	Passed	Equivalent criteria for grades A-D
Failed	Equivalent criteria for grades E-F	Failed	Equivalent criteria for grades E-F