

Appendix 1: Generic grade descriptions for Master's work/ Master's projects

Grade / Level	Description
<p>A</p> <p>Excellent</p>	<p>Outstanding work which demonstrates a clear talent for research and/or originality, seen in a national perspective.</p> <p>The candidate has excellent insight into the scientific theory and methods of the field, and demonstrates expert knowledge at a very high level. The objectives of the work are clearly defined and easy to understand.</p> <p>The candidate is able to select and apply relevant professional methods convincingly, has all the technical skills required for the work, can plan and conduct very advanced experiments or computations without help, and works very independently.</p> <p>The work appears very extensive and/or innovative. The analysis and discussion is very well founded and justified scientifically, and is clearly linked to the problem addressed. The candidate demonstrates very good critical reflection and distinguishes clearly between own and others' contributions.</p> <p>The form, structure and language of the work maintains an extremely high level.</p>
<p>B</p> <p>Very good</p>	<p>Very good work that clearly stands out.</p> <p>The candidate has very good knowledge and insight into the scientific theory and methods of the field. The objectives of the work are clearly defined and easy to understand.</p> <p>The candidate is able to select and apply relevant professional methods soundly, has virtually all the technical skills required for the work, can plan and conduct advanced experiments or computations without help, and works very independently.</p> <p>The work appears fairly extensive and/or innovative. The analysis and discussion is very well founded and justified scientifically, and is clearly linked to the problem addressed. The candidate demonstrates very good critical reflection and distinguishes clearly between own and others' contributions.</p> <p>The form, structure and language of the work maintains a very high level.</p>
<p>C</p> <p>Good</p>	<p>Good work.</p> <p>The candidate has good knowledge and insight into the scientific theory and methods of the field. The objectives of the work are usually clearly defined, but may contain some vague or imprecise formulations.</p> <p>The candidate uses relevant professional methods soundly, has most of the technical skills required for the work, can plan and conduct fairly advanced experiments or computations without help, and works independently.</p> <p>The work appears good with certain innovative elements. The analysis and discussion is well founded and justified scientifically, and is linked to the problem addressed. The candidate demonstrates good critical reflection and usually distinguishes clearly between own and others' contributions.</p> <p>The form, structure and language of the work maintains a good level.</p>

Grade / Level	Description
<p>D</p> <p>Moderately good</p>	<p>Clearly acceptable work.</p> <p>The candidate has fairly good knowledge and insight into the scientific theory and methods of the field. The objectives of the work may be defined somewhat vaguely.</p> <p>The candidate is mostly able to apply relevant professional methods, possesses the main technical skills required for the work, and can plan and conduct experiments or computations without help. The candidate works independently to some extent, but needs fairly close supervision in order to maintain good scientific progression, and may have problems utilizing the research group's expertise in his/her own work.</p> <p>The work appears to be moderately good. The analysis and discussion is founded and justified scientifically, and is linked to the problem addressed, but with scope for improvement. The candidate demonstrates an ability for critical reflection, but may have problems distinguishing clearly between own and others' contributions.</p> <p>The form, structure and language of the work maintains an acceptable level.</p>
<p>E</p> <p>Adequate</p>	<p>Acceptable work that satisfies the minimum criteria.</p> <p>The candidate has adequate scientific knowledge and insight into the scientific theory and methods in the field. The objectives of the thesis are described, but are vague and imprecise.</p> <p>The candidate is able to apply some relevant scientific methods, has a minimum of technical skills required for the work, and can plan and conduct simple experiments or computations without help. The candidate achieves limited scientific progression without close supervision, and has problems utilizing the research group's expertise in his/her own work.</p> <p>The work appears to be limited and somewhat fragmented. The analysis and discussion have an adequate scientific foundation, but should have been better linked to the topic addressed. The candidate demonstrates sufficient critical reflection, but may have problems distinguishing between his/her contributions and the contributions of others.</p> <p>The thesis is basically acceptable, but has definite shortcomings with respect to form, structure and language.</p>
<p>F</p> <p>Fail</p>	<p>Work that fails to meet the minimum requirements.</p> <p>The candidate does not have sufficient scientific knowledge and insight into the scientific theory and methods in his/her field. The objectives of the thesis are lacking or inadequately defined.</p> <p>The candidate demonstrates a lack of competence in the use of scientific methods, does not have the required technical skills and ability to work independently, and has barely utilized the research group's expertise in his/her own work.</p> <p>The thesis is considered very limited and fragmented. The analysis and discussion do not have an adequate scientific foundation, and are loosely linked to the topic addressed. The candidate does not demonstrate sufficient critical reflection, and does not clearly distinguish between his/her contributions and the contributions of others.</p> <p>The thesis has major shortcomings with respect to form, structure and language.</p>