

INTER2000 – Examination guidelines (*generisk sensorveiledning*)

The course aims to improve students' ability to develop, substantiate, reflect on, and evaluate advisory memos directed to national or international decision makers in international politics. The grade is to be based on two written lead-author memos (accounting for 40% each, a total of 80% of the grade) and two written comments on memos written by others (a total of 20% of the grade).

Each memo contains an advisory part and a reflective part. The advisory part is the most important of the two, responding to a specific advisory assignment within the larger case. The reflective part is to address what more generic phenomenon the decision is a case of, and to what extent and how theory (general or specific) from the field of international relations have been particularly helpful in supporting the development of the advice.

The word limit for each memo is 2500 in total; the expected length of its reflective part is 500–700 words. The word limit for each comment is 500.

Because the memo format is new to these students, the evaluator is to take into consideration that lead authors submitting a memo on one of the first few cases/seminar events are less experienced with memo writing than those submitting later.

The generic norms for setting marks in this course are the following:

A <i>Excellent</i>	B <i>Very good</i>	C <i>Good</i>	D <i>Satisfactory</i>	E <i>Sufficient</i>	F <i>Fail</i>
Advanced understanding of the topic, including key concepts and perspectives, very high scholarly independence, and excellent analytical skills	Very good understanding of the topic, including key concepts and perspectives, high scholarly independence and very good analytical skills	Good understanding of the topic, including key concepts and perspectives, scholarly independence and good analytical skills	Some understanding of the topic, including key concepts and perspectives, some scholarly independence and analytical skills	Uneven understanding of the topic, including key concepts and perspectives, limited scholarly independence and analytical skills	Insufficient knowledge of the curriculum. Does not satisfy minimum requirements to learning outcome