

## **Assessment guide (sensorveileding)**

### **Criteria of evaluation**

- Demonstration of knowledge of and ability to discuss the syllabus and lecture material;
- Demonstration of ability to use relevant concepts and ideas;
- Clear structure and coherence of the paper;
- Quality of the argument, richness of insights, and strength of argumentation;
- Demonstration of independent thinking and judgement;
- Style and grammar: the ability to formulate thoughts in an intelligible way, as well as correct presentation (use of quotes, references, bibliography etc.)

### **Specific aspects to be considered (consistent with learning objectives)**

- To critically discuss the importance of consumption in everyday life in countries of the North and/or the South
- To convey and interpret the theories of consumption on which sustainable consumption policies are founded
- To interpret and compare new theoretical perspectives on the social, economic and technological contributions to consumption

### **Letter grades**

The grading scale with letter values is a descending scale where A is the best grade, E the lowest pass grade and F is fail. The assessment is based on defined, qualitative criteria for each grade in the grading scale.

**A – Excellent** An excellent performance, clearly outstanding. The candidate demonstrates excellent judgement and a high degree of independent thinking.

**B – Very good** A very good performance. The candidate demonstrates sound judgement and a very good degree of independent thinking.

**C – Good** A good performance in most areas. The candidate demonstrates a reasonable degree of judgement and independent thinking in the most important areas.

**D – Satisfactory** A satisfactory performance, but with significant shortcomings. The candidate demonstrates a limited degree of judgement and independent thinking.

**E – Sufficient** A performance that meets the minimum criteria, but no more. The candidate demonstrates a very limited degree of judgement and independent thinking.

**F – Fail** A performance that does not meet the minimum academic criteria. The candidate demonstrates an absence of both judgement and independent thinking