



Descriptions of Grades for Bachelor's Theses in Engineering

Descriptions of Grades and Assessment Criteria for Bachelor's Theses in Engineering is prepared by the National Council for Technological Education (NRT). The descriptions are completed according to the Norwegian National Qualifications Framework for higher education and the National Curriculum Regulations for Engineering Education laid down by the Ministry of Education and Research on 3 February 2011. The descriptions are used for all bachelor's theses in engineering in accordance with this curriculum, starting spring 2014. The term work refers to the written thesis and any products, if relevant, as well as the oral presentation, if relevant.

Grade / level	Description
A Excellent	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Excellent work which is clearly outstanding and is characterized by:2. The candidate has extremely good insight into engineering and demonstrates engineering expertise at an outstanding level.3. The candidate is able to select and apply relevant scientific theories and methods at an outstanding level.4. The candidate is able to produce an outstandingly relevant and clear approach to the issue addressed and has planned and executed an extremely high quality piece of engineering work.5. This is an advanced and/or innovative contribution. The analysis and discussion have an outstandingly good scientific foundation and justification and are very relevant to the issue that is addressed. The candidate demonstrates extremely good critical reflection and distinguishes clearly between his/her contribution and the contributions from others.6. The form, dissemination, structure and language are at an extremely high level.
B Very good	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Very good work that is characterized by:2. The candidate has very good insight into engineering and demonstrates a very good level of engineering expertise.3. The candidate is able to select and apply relevant scientific theories and methods at a very good level.4. The candidate is able to produce a very relevant and clear approach to the issue addressed and has planned and executed a high quality piece of engineering work.5. This is a very good and/or innovative contribution. The analysis and discussion have a very good scientific foundation and justification and are clearly relevant to the issue that is addressed. The candidate demonstrates very good critical reflection and distinguishes clearly between his/her contribution and the contributions from others.6. The form, dissemination, structure and language are at a very high level.
C Good	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Good work that is characterized by:2. The candidate has good insight into engineering and demonstrates a good level of engineering expertise.3. The candidate is able to select and apply relevant scientific theories and methods at a good level.4. The candidate is able to produce a relevant and generally clear approach to the issue addressed and has planned and executed a good quality piece of engineering work.5. This is a good contribution with some creative elements. The analysis and discussion have a good scientific foundation and are relevant to the issue that is addressed. The candidate demonstrates good critical reflection and generally distinguishes between his/her contribution and the contributions from others.6. The form, dissemination, structure and language are at a good level.



<p>D Satisfactory</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clearly acceptable work that is characterized by:2. The candidate has satisfactory insight into engineering and demonstrates a satisfactory level of engineering expertise.3. The candidate is generally able to apply relevant scientific theories and methods.4. The candidate is able to produce a fairly relevant and clear approach to the issue addressed. However, the objectives could have been defined more clearly. The planning and execution result in a piece of engineering work at a satisfactory level.5. This is a satisfactory contribution. The analysis and discussion have a good scientific foundation and are relevant to the issue addressed but there is potential for improvement. The candidate demonstrates critical reflection and has some problems distinguishing between his/her contribution and the contributions from others.6. The form, dissemination, structure and language are at an acceptable level.
<p>E Sufficient</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Work that is acceptable as it satisfies the minimum criteria and is characterized by:2. The candidate has sufficient insight into engineering and demonstrates a sufficient level of engineering expertise.3. The candidate is only just about able to apply relevant scientific theories and methods.4. The candidate has an adequate approach to the issue addressed. The objectives are described, but are unclear. The planning and execution result in a piece of engineering work at an acceptable level. However the candidate shows limited scientific progress and requires close supervision.5. This is a limited and fragmentary contribution. The analysis and discussion have adequate scientific foundation but should have more closely tied to the issue addressed. The candidate demonstrates a sufficient level of critical reflection but has problems distinguishing between his/her contribution and the contributions from others.6. The presentation is generally acceptable but has clear deficiencies in terms of form, dissemination, structure and language.
<p>F Fail</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Work that does not meet the minimum criteria and is characterized by:2. The candidate does not have the necessary insight into engineering and has an inadequate level of engineering expertise.3. The candidate lacks the competence to apply relevant scientific theories and methods.4. The candidate does not have the ability to adequately address the issue. The objectives are neither clearly defined nor described. The planning and execution of the work is not acceptable.5. This is a very limited and fragmentary contribution. The analysis and discussion have an inadequate scientific foundation and are loosely tied to the issue addressed. The candidate demonstrates an insufficient ability for critical reflection and fails to distinguish between his/her contribution and the contributions from others.6. The presentation has significant deficiencies in terms of form, structure and language.