

GRADING PRACTICES: WHAT ADMISSIONS OFFICERS NEED TO KNOW

Pat Parker

Iowa State University

Emily Tse

International Education Research Foundation

2011

NAFSA Conference, Vancouver

Topics

- **History and Philosophy**
- **Types of Grading Systems (e.g., Criterion vs Norm-Referenced)**
- **Types of Educational Systems (Vertical vs. Pyramidal)**
- **Things to Keep in Mind When Converting Grades**

Objectives

- **Understand variations in grading practices**
- **Understand variations in grading cultures**
- **Understand the subjectivity of grading and converting grades**

***Slides will be posted afterwards.**

www.ierf.org → institutions → presentations

*** Questions and comments are encouraged (if you are good, there may be treats!).**

Historical Overview



- **Religious texts**
- **Civil service / professional exams**
- **Oral assessments**
- **Written examinations (18th century)**
- **China: national and written examinations**

Philosophies




- **Instructional Diagnosis**
- **Gatekeeping**
 - ▣ **Next grade or level (China, France, Japan)**
 - ▣ **Sought-after subjects (India, Germany)**
- **Accountability**
 - ▣ **School and teacher performance (England, British Columbia)**
 - ▣ **Allocation of resources (China, Ontario)**

Types of Grading Systems

- Criterion-Referenced (Absolute) Grading System
- Norm-Referenced (Relative) Grading System
- Pass-Fail System
- Non-Graded System

Criterion-Referenced Grading System

- Based on a fixed numeric scale.
- Grades are based on the individual performance of each student.
- The scale does not change regardless of the quality, or lack thereof, of the students.



Example: Indonesia

[Logo]

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL (SMP) OF SANTA MARIA

CENTRAL JAKARTA

STUDENT'S ACADEMIC REPORT

Academic Year 2006/2007 - 2nd (Even)

Full Name

Grade/ID. No. : IX C-19 /

NO.	SUBJECTS	EVALUATION ASPECTS	KKM	RESULTS	
				Score	In Letters
01	Religious Education	Mastery of Concept & Values	70	75	Seventy five
		Application	70	78	Seventy eight
02	Civics	Mastery of Concept & Values	65	75	Seventy five
		Application	65	78	Seventy eight
03	Indonesian Language	Listening	65	72	Seventy two
		Speaking	65	72	Seventy two
		Reading	65	74	Seventy four
		Writing	65	78	Seventy eight
04	English	Listening	65	82	Eighty two
		Speaking	65	68	Sixty eight
		Reading	65	77	Seventy seven

Notice the KKM column (Criteria for Minimum Completion). These are minimum scores set for competency.

Example: International Baccalaureate


The IB Diploma Programme · Le Programme du diplôme de l'IB · El Programa del Diploma del IB

International Baccalaureate · Baccalauréat International · Bachillerato Internacional · International Baccalaureate · Baccalauréat International · Bachillerato Internacional



International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

We certify that · Nous certifions que · Certificamos que



entered by · présenté(e) par l'établissement scolaire dénommé · presentado/a por el colegio denominado

Garden International School

has obtained the following results · a obtenu les résultats suivants · ha obtenido los resultados siguientes

Subjects taken at higher level	Grades	Subjects taken at standard level	Grades
Matières présentées au niveau supérieur	Notes	Matières présentées au niveau moyen	Notes
Asignaturas del Nivel Superior	Calificaciones	Asignaturas del Nivel Medio	Calificaciones
M08 ENGLISH A1	5	M08 MANDARIN AB.	3
M08 CHEMISTRY (ENG)	4	M08 GEOGRAPHY (ENG)	5
M08 MATHEMATICS (ENG)	3	M08 BUS. & MAN. (ENG)	6

Additional requirements · Compléments requis · Requisitos adicionales

Total 27

EXTENDED ESSAY GEOGRAPHY (ENG)
 THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE
 Points

SATISFACTORY
 GOOD
 1

All CAS (Creativity-Action-Service) requirements have been fully satisfied.

has been awarded the

Diploma
 of the International Baccalaureate

a obtenu le

Diplôme
 du Baccalauréat International

ha obtenido el

Diploma
 del Bachillerato Internacional

Jeffrey Beard Director General - Geneva ·
 Directeur général - Genève · Director general - Ginebra

08 August 2008

Original certificates have one holographic strip embedded in the paper and a secure watermark · Les certificats authentiques comportent une bande holographique et un filigrane de sécurité · Los certificados auténticos llevan una banda holográfica embebida en el papel y una filigrana de seguridad.

Do You Agree?

(Source:
Teachers of
French
American
International
School, San
Francisco)

Grade	US	French	IB	Descriptor	
A+	4.35	15-20	7	Excellent	An outstanding/excellent performance that is an increment above the expectations of a routine Grade A in the US system.
A	4.00	13-14	6	Very Good	A solid Grade A performance in the US system producing a classic 4.00 GPA.
B+	3.50	12	5	Good	Not quite a Grade A performance but commendable work that is a distinct increment above the basic college recommending level and the minimum passing requirements for either baccalaureate.
B	3.00	10-11	4	Satisfactory	A "college recommending" performance representing solid grade B work. This is an important benchmark. For the IB Grade 4 scores in all six subjects provides the 24 points necessary to pass the full Diploma.
C	2.00	7-9	3	Mediocre	Although this level of performance merits passing the course, a Grade C is not viewed as a "college recommending" grade.
D	1.00	4-6	2	Poor	The absolute bare minimum performance that permits passing the course for International graduation. This very low level of achievement merits only the lowest numerical value on the GPA scale. A single grade D on a transcript effectively eliminates a student from the University of California admissions process.
F	0.00	0-3	1	Very Poor	Outright failure.

Example: New Zealand



This is to certify that in April 2009



was awarded

NATIONAL CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

Level 2 achieved with merit



newzealand.govt.nz

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Poutasi'.

Dr Karen Poutasi
Chief Executive
New Zealand Qualifications Authority
Issued: 8 April 2009
NSN: 122807545 NQF Ref: 0973/5



NSN: 122807545
Issued: 19th May 2009

Qualifications and Achievements Summary

National Qualifications Framework Registered Qualifications

National Certificate of Educational Achievement (Level 1) achieved with excellence
National Certificate of Educational Achievement (Level 2) achieved with merit

Date Achieved

12/2007

12/2008

Standards Achieved



			Credits	Result	Date
Accounting - Generic					
Level 2	90224	Prepare financial statements and related accounting entries for sole proprietors	5	E	12/2008
	90223	Demonstrate understanding of accounting processes for accounting subsystems	5	M	12/2008
	90225	Analyse and interpret information and make recommendation(s) for a sole proprietor	4	E	12/2008
	90220	Describe the conceptual basis of accounting for a sole proprietor	3	E	12/2008
	90226	Use computer software to process financial transactions for a sole proprietor	3	E	09/2008
Level 1	90028	Analyse and interpret information for a sole proprietor(s)	4	M	12/2007
	90026	Prepare financial statements for sole proprietors	4	E	12/2007
	90022	Demonstrate an understanding of the conceptual basis of accounting	3	E	12/2007
	90027	Report financial information for an individual or household, and community organisations	3	E	12/2007
	90023	Describe a method of processing financial information and analyse transactions	3	E	12/2007
	90025	Demonstrate an understanding of accounting systems for entities	3	E	09/2007
	90024	Process financial information for a sole proprietor	4	E	05/2007
Algebra					
Level 2	90284	Manipulate algebraic expressions and solve equations	4	E	12/2008
	90285	Draw straightforward non-linear graphs	3	M	12/2008
Level 1	90147	Use straightforward algebraic methods and solve equations	4	E	12/2007
	90148	Sketch and interpret graphs	3	E	12/2007
Calculus					
Level 2	90286	Find and use straightforward derivatives and integrals	4	M	12/2008
	5260	Find and use derivatives to solve problems involving rate of change	2	A	10/2008
	5244	Demonstrate calculus skills	2	A	10/2008
Economics					
Level 1	90196	Describe producers, resources and production	5	A	12/2008
	90198	Describe the market and market equilibrium	5	E	12/2008
	90197	Describe the concept of supply	3	E	12/2008
	90195	Describe concepts related to consumer choice and demand	4	E	12/2008
	90199	Describe major sectors of the economy and the relationships between them	2	A	12/2008
	90201	Carry out an economic investigation	3	E	10/2008
	90200	Understand and use the consumer decision-making model	2	M	06/2008
English For Speakers Of Other Languages					
Level 3	17359	Talk about self in a formal interview, using ESOL	5	A	11/2008
	17144	Write information texts, using ESOL	5	A	10/2008
	17363	Read independently information texts, using ESOL	5	A	10/2008
	15009	Understand spoken information in a range of contexts, using ESOL	5	A	10/2008
	17361	Read independently narrative texts, using ESOL	5	A	08/2008

Grading Scale for New Zealand

Official Name	Common Name	Abbreviation	Definition
Achievement with Excellence	Excellence	E	The candidate has demonstrated in depth understanding of the material tested
Achievement with Merit	Merit	M	The candidate has met the criteria of the standard which demonstrates substantial knowledge of the material tested
Achievement	Achieved	A	The candidate met the criteria of the standard to a level which demonstrates adequate understanding of the material tested
Not Achieved	Not Achieved	N / NA	Fail

Case Study: Criterion-Referenced

Grade	%
A	90-100%
B	80-89%
C	70-79%
D	60-69%
F	0-59%

Let's look at the grades of two students in a specific class.

Billy: 72

Jane: 67

You're probably thinking, "won't be admitting those students!"


But what if the course was Quantum Physics and was taught by Stephen Hawking, and these were the top grades in the class; the rest of the class earned scores lower than 65%?

On the other hand, let's say the course was Music Appreciation, and students only had to turn in their notes once a week, and take an open book test at the end. The average grade in the class was an 89%. Totally different story, eh?

Criterion referenced grades do not tell you the whole story either.

Norm-Referenced Grading System

- Based on a pre-established formula regarding the percentage or ratio of students within a whole class who will be assigned each grade or mark.
- The students are actually in competition.




Grading on a Curve

- In the “bell-shaped curve” of normal distribution, the same percentage of students receiving the highest grade will receive the lowest grade.



Bell-Shaped Curve



Grade	% of Class
A (Excellent)	Top 10%
B (Good)	Next 20%
C (Average)	Next 40%
D (Poor)	Next 20%
F (Failure)	Bottom 10%


Example: ECTS Credits

D I P L O M A



UNIVERSITÉ
DE GENÈVE

ON BEHALF OF THE UNIVERSITY, WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, ATTEST THAT



HAS SUCCESSFULLY PASSED THE EXAMINATIONS REQUIRED UNDER THE UNIVERSITY ACT
AND PURSUANT TO THE RULES AND REGULATIONS OF

The Faculty of Economic and Social Sciences

AND HEREBY CONFER UPON HIM THE DEGREE OF

Bachelor of Science in Business Administration



TOGETHER WITH ALL THE RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES APPERTAINING THERETO

The Rector

Handwritten signature of the Rector.

The Dean

Handwritten signature of the Dean.

The Secretary-General

Handwritten signature of the Secretary-General.



OFFICIAL REPORT ESTABLISHED IN GENEVA, ON 8 SEPTEMBER 2008 N° 59574213161105

validated by the seal of the University


ECTS Grading Scheme

- A best 10%
- B next 25%
- C next 30%
- D next 25%
- E next 10%

Failing grades have the designations FX and F.



No d'immatriculation:
03815958



BACCALURÉAT UNIVERSITAIRE EN GESTION D'ENTREPRISE (HEC) - 1ÈRE PARTIE
Année de règlement : 2005

Codes	Intitulés	Séances			Résultat	Qualité Ects	Crédits ECTS
		Hiver	Été	Autn.			
Année académique 2005-2006							
4101006CR	Applications comptables		5.00		5.00	C	3
4101010CS	Droit des obligations I	5.50			5.50	B	6
4101002CR	Economie d'entreprise		5.25		5.25	B	6
4102003CR	Economie politique A	6.00			6.00	A	6
4101011CR	Gestion d'entreprise	5.00			5.00	C	3
4101008CR	Introduction à la comptabilité financière	5.50			5.50	B	6
4103005CR	Mathématiques I	6.00			6.00	A	6
4103009CR	Statistique et probabilités I	5.00			5.00	C	6
4104001CR	Outils informatiques		5.00		5.00	C	6
4106001CR	Introduction à la géographie	5.00			5.00	C	6
4108002CR	Histoire économique générale		4.50		4.50	D	6

Nombre total de crédits obtenus à la Faculté: 60
Moyenne générale: 5.25
Délai d'obtention du grade postulé: Octobre 2009
Décision: Réussite de la première partie


Echelle de notation Université de Genève		Echelle de notation ECTS		Abréviations	
6 à > 5,5	= Excellent	= A		NAT	: note en attente
5,5 à > 5	= Très bien	= B		RET	: retrait
5 à > 4,5	= Bien	= C		ABS	: absence non justifiée
4,5 à > 4	= Satisfaisant	= D		FRD	: fraude
4	= Suffisant	= E		EXC	: absence justifiée
< 4	= Insuffisant	= F		EQUV	: équivalence

GENÈVE, LE 17 JUILLET 2006
S.E.O.

SIGNATURE DU DOYEN
Rene Alami

Délai d'opposition, sans effet suspensif, 30 jours, auprès du Doyen de la Faculté (Art. 4 et 5 RIOR), au moyen du formulaire ad hoc à disposition au secrétariat SES. Le document original remis à l'étudiant-e est établi sur papier filigrané. Il est unique et à conserver. Le secrétariat de la Faculté certifie des photocopies présentées avec l'original. L'élimination de la Faculté entraîne l'exmatriculation de l'Université dans un délai de 3 mois, sauf si l'étudiant-e a été admis-e entre-temps dans une autre subdivision. La Division administrative et sociale des étudiant-e-s notifie cette décision d'exmatriculation.

Skewed Curves



- ❑ If admission is not competitive, the proportion of lower grades might exceed that of higher grades, and you get a negative curve.
- ❑ If admission is competitive, the proportion of higher grades might exceed that of lower grades, and you get a positive curve.

Activity

Name the national capitals of the following countries:

1. United States
2. Mexico
3. France
4. Nigeria
5. India
6. Italy
7. China
8. South Korea
9. Egypt
10. Afghanistan

Answers

National capitals of the following countries:

1. United States (**Washington DC**)
2. Mexico (**Mexico City**)
3. France (**Paris**)
4. Nigeria (**Abuja**) (was Lagos until 1991)
5. India (**New Delhi**)
6. Italy (**Rome**)
7. China (**Beijing**)
8. South Korea (**Seoul**)
9. Egypt (**Cairo**)
10. Afghanistan (**Kabul**)

Our Grading Scale

Each question is worth 10 points. Count up your number of correct answers and write down that number. Using the scale below, assign a letter grade.

A = 90-100

B = 80-89

C = 70-79

D = 60-69

F = 50-59

How does ours compare?

- Our standard bell-shaped curve would have 10% with As, 20% with Bs, 40% with Cs, 20% with Ds, and 10% with Fs.
- How many had exams with the following grades?

A _____

B _____

C _____

D _____

F _____

Using Criterion-Referenced Grading

Using the criterion-referenced grading scale below, what letter grade does an 85% earn?

A = 90-100

B = 80-89

C = 70-79

D = 60-69

F = 50-59

Curving for More Low Grades

Adjust the curve to account for the fact that this was a pop quiz, and you had no time to study. Using the standard that the top 10% get an A, let's say our distribution looked like this:


Top 10% = 85-100

Next 20% = 75-84

Next 40% = 60-74

Next 20% = 50-59

Bottom 10% = 0-49



What grade would the 85% earn on this negative curve?

Curving for More High Grades

Adjust the curve as follows to account for the fact that you are a select group of highly qualified geographic experts.


Top 10% = 95-100

Next 20% = 88-94

Next 40% = 80-87

Next 20% = 70-79

Bottom 10% = 0-69



What grade would the 85% earn on this positive curve?

Same Test, Same Score . . .

Different Grade!

Using a criterion-referenced grading scale,
you earned a **B**.

Using norm-referencing on a negative curve,
you earned an **A**.

Using norm-referencing on a positive curve,
you earned a **C**.

Example: Korea

- All Korean Secondary Schools traditionally used to have a five-scale grading system, which is converted from the student's raw score in midterms and finals (out of 100).

Su	수	(Outstanding)	90-100%
Wu	우	(Satisfactory)	80-90%
Mi	미	(Average)	70-80%
Yang	양	(Poor)	60-70%
Ga	가	(Very Poor)	Below 60%

- Students are generally not held back in Korean schools. Thus a grade of 'GA' is still a passing grade.

Example: Korea

In October 2004, the Ministry of Education changed the academic grading system of high School from an **absolute** evaluation system to a **relative** evaluation system.

The revised grading system grades students by 9 ranks based on his/her relative position among all students taking same class at same semester. (Rank 9 is a passing grade.)

Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Percentage	4%	7%	12%	17%	20%	17%	12%	7%	4%
Accumulate Percentage	4%	11%	23%	40%	60%	77%	89%	96%	100%
Est. Iowa HS GPA	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	1.5	1.0

Kyunggi High School

Address : #74, SamSung-Dong, Gangnam-Gu, Seoul, KOREA
Phone: 82-2- 3496-7314 Fax: 82-2-3496-7497

TRANSCRIPT

Name
Date of entrance : March 2, 1996
Date of issue : February 5, 2010

Date of birth : September 19, 1980
Date of graduation : February 11, 1999

Subject	1st School Year (1996)			2nd School Year (1997)			3rd School Year (1998)		
	1st Term	2nd Term	Rank	1st Term	2nd Term	Rank	1st Term	2nd Term	Rank
	Units	Units		Units	Units		Units	Units	
	Grade	Grade		Grade	Grade		Grade	Grade	
Ethics	2 Ga	2 Ga	769/865	1 Ga	1 Ga	328/378			
Korean Language	3 Ga	3 Ga	767(2)/865	2 Yang	2 Ga	291/378			
Common Mathematics	4 Ga	4 Ga	841/865						
Common Social Studies	4 Ga	4 Ga	759/865						
Common Science	4 Ga	4 Ga	813/865						
Physical Education I	2 Yang	2 Mi	835/865	2 Mi	2 Wu	231(3)/378			
Music I	1 Ga	1 Mi	757/865	1 Yang	1 Mi	307(2)/378			
Fine Arts I	1 Mi	1 Mi	769/865	1 Wu	1 Mi	282/378			
Technology	3 Ga	3 Yang	746/865						
Common English	4 Ga	4 Yang	708(2)/865						
German I	2 Ga	2 Ga	516/606	2 Ga	2 Ga	235/260			
Logic	2 Pass	2 Pass							
Composition				3 Mi	3 Mi	206/378			
Chinese Characters and Classics I				2 Yang	2 Yang	226(2)/378			
Mathematics I				3 Ga	3 Ga	328/378	3 Ga	3 Ga	346/406
Economics				2 Ga	2 Ga	316/378			
World History				3 Ga	3 Ga	349/378			
Chemistry I				2 Ga	2 Yang	308/378			
Military Training				2 Yang	2 Yang	297/378			
Industry				3 Ga	3 Yang	279/378			
English I				4 Ga	4 Yang	273/378			
Literature							5 Ga	5 Ga	351/406
Grammar							2 Ga	2 Yang	318/406
Reading							2 Ga	2 Ga	360/406
Chinese Characters and Classics II							2 Mi	2 Mi	253/406
Korean History							3 Ga	3 Ga	367/406
Politics							2 Ga	2 Mi	293(2)/406
World Geography							3 Ga	3 Ga	355/406
Earth Science I							2 Ga	2 Yang	323/406
Physical Education II							2 Mi	2 Yang	346(2)/406
English II							4 Ga	4 Ga	311(2)/406
English Conversation							2 Ga	2 Ga	347(3)/406
German II							2 Ga	2 Ga	228(2)/280
Total Of Units	32	32		33	33		34	34	

LEGEND

- "Units" means the credit units or hours per week.
- Grade : Korean high schools have a five-level grading system; therefore, Su is generally equivalent to the score 90-100, Wu 80-89, Mi 70-79, Yang 60-69, and Ga below 59.
- Rank: The number in the "rank" cell refers to the rank of the student in each subject out of the total number registered; the number in parentheses refers to the number of the students who are placed at the same rank

This is to certify that the above-mentioned information is true and correct.



Lee, Ki Seong

Principal of Kyunggi High School




Despite the prevalence of "Ga" grades, a student is generally not held back in school.

Case Study: US State University

%					
90-99					
80-89					
70-79					
60-69					
50-59					
40-49	X				
30-39		X			
20-29			X		
10-19					
0-9				X	X
	A	B	C	D	F

Here are the percentage of grades actually given annually in a US university. Looks like the previous conversion looks close (even a little tough).

Apples to Apples?



- But what if we told you that you were comparing grades from an engineering class where most students are from the top 10% of their high school classes to students in a vocational school working toward an electrician certificate for which completion of high school is the only entry requirement?
- Norm-referenced systems don't tell you the whole story. Context is important.

Types of Educational Systems

- Vertical
- Pyramidal

Pyramidal vs. Vertical Systems

- Education has competitive entrance to one or more levels of education, and are pyramidal in shape



- Education in both the university and non-university sectors include selective **and** non-selective institutions.




Vertical Educational Systems

- Large % of secondary graduates qualify for higher education.
- Lowest passing grade in scale is usually the equivalent of “D” on U.S. A-F scale.



Pyramidal Educational Systems

- Tertiary institutions in university sector are highly selective.
- Relatively small proportion of secondary graduate population qualifies for university admission.
- Lowest passing grade in scale is usually the equivalent of “C” on U.S. A-F scale.



Examples of Systems

□ Vertical

- Canada
- Iran
- Japan
- Korea
- Philippines
- Taiwan
- Thailand

□ Pyramidal

- England
- France (*Grand Ecoles*)
- India (IITs)



Converting Grades from Vertical & Pyramidal Systems

- Most grading scales have one failing grade and one, two, three or four passing grades.
- In a few cases, there are two or more failing grades, and occasionally there are more than four passing grades.



Vertical Educational System

For those that have a **Vertical Educational System**, the following conversion table can be used to determine the U.S. equivalent of each grade:

US Equivalent Grade	One Passing Grade	Two passing Grades	Three passing Grades	Four passing Grades
A		HIGHER	HIGHEST	HIGHEST
B				SECOND
B/C			MIDDLE	
C		LOWER		THIRD
D			LOWEST	FOURTH
P	P			
F	F	FAIL	FAIL	FAIL

Source: "Grading Practices in the United States, and Suggestions for Determining U.S. Grade Equivalents for Grading Systems Used in Other Countries," by James S. Frey, Educational Credential Evaluators, Inc., 2003

Pyramidal Educational System

For those that have a **Pyramidal Educational System**, the following conversion table can be used to determine the U.S. equivalent of each grade:



US Equivalent Grade	One Passing Grade	Two Passing Grades	Three Passing Grades	Four Passing Grades
A		HIGHER	HIGHEST	HIGHEST
B			MIDDLE	SECOND
B				THIRD
C		LOWER	LOWEST	FOURTH
D				
P	P			
F	F	FAIL	FAIL	FAIL

Source: "Grading Practices in the United States, and Suggestions for Determining U.S. Grade Equivalents for Grading Systems Used in Other Countries," by James S. Frey, Educational Credential Evaluators, Inc., 2003

Case Study: China

Pyramidal or vertical?



Suggested Conversion Scale for China

US Equivalent Grade	4 Passing Grades	China	Descriptors for China
A	Highest	90 – 100	Excellent
B	Second	80 – 89	Good
B/C			
C	Third	70 – 79	Fair
D	Fourth	60 – 69	Marginal
P			
F	Fail	0 – 59	Fail

Things to Keep in Mind When Interpreting Grades

- Distributions can be skewed.
- Grading systems can be non-continuous.
- Subjectivity
- Variations

Distributions Can Be Skewed

<u>France</u>				
16.0	-	20.0	Très Bien	Very Good
14.0	-	15.9	Bien	Good
12.0	-	13.9	Assez Bien	Quite Good
10.0	-	11.9	Passable	Satisfactory
00.0	-	09.9*		

In Morocco...

- “Grades of 20 are rarely, if ever, awarded. It is said that only Allah gets a 20, only the King gets a 19; therefore, the highest grade usually awarded is 18.”

**Kathleen Freeman's e-publication on Morocco (2010)*

Things to Keep in Mind When Interpreting Grades

- Grading scales can be non-continuous.
- Example: degree classifications vs cumulative GPAs

US Cumulative GPA (Each Year Counted)

Course Title	Credits	Grades
History of Espionage	15.0	B+
Weaponry: Theory	9.0	A
Weaponry: Practical	4.5	B
Art of Deception	7.5	C

US Cumulative GPA = 3.17

Grades	Grade Points		Credits	Total Grade Points
B+	3.30	x	15.0	49.5
A	4.00	x	9.0	36.0
B	3.00	x	4.5	13.5
C	2.00	x	7.5	15.0
			36.0	114.0

Degree Classification at Swansea University

Class of Degree	Weighted Average
First Class Honours	70%+
Second Class Honours - Division I	60-69 %
Second Class Honours - Division II	50-59%
Third Class Honours	40-49%
Pass Degree	35-39%



Please reply to
Jo Davis, Transcripts & Archiving Assistant
Academic Services, School of Health Science
Glyndwr Building, Swansea University
Swansea, SA2 8PP Wales UK
Tel: 01792 513355 Fax: 01792 295487
Email: j.m.davis@swansea.ac.uk

Jo Davis, Transcripts & Archiving Assistant
Gwasanaethau Academaidd, Ysgol Gwyddor Iechyd
Adellad Glyndwr, Prifysgol Abertawe
Abertawe, SA2 8PP Cymru UK
Ffôn: 01792 513355 Fac: 01792 295487
E-bost: j.m.davis@swansea.ac.uk

8 December 2009

Our Ref: HOPKINS/158113

RECEIVED BY INSTITUTION
12/08/09
INITIALS:

Student Name:
Date of Birth:
Student Number:
Candidate Number:
Course Title:
Start Date:
End Date:



BSc (Hons) Nursing – Nurse Practitioner Pathway
14 September 1999
30 June 2002

UK Studies

Level 1 = yr 1

Level 2 = yr 2

Level 3 = yr 3

Each yr = 120 cr

Degree
classification based
on last 2 yrs

RESULTS



Code	Module Title	Final Mark	Result	Level	Credits
SHN344	Role of the Nurse Practitioner / Health Assessment I	45	Credit	3	20
SHN342	Interpersonal Psychology	40	Credit	3	20
SHN341	Pathophysiology & Pharmacology	59	Credit	3	30
SHN345	Health Assessment II	48	Credit	3	20
SHN343	Research & Evidence Based Practice	45	Credit	3	20
SHG304	Clinical Supervisory Skills	50	Credit	3	10
				TOTAL	120

TOTAL CREDITS ACHIEVED AT LEVEL 3 = 120
OVERALL RESULT = PASS
DEGREE CLASSIFICATION = THIRD

SWANSEA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF HEALTH SCIENCE



Calculation of Degree Classification for 3-year programs

- **Weighting of 3:** best marks achieved in 80 credits pursued at Level 3
- **Weighting of 2:** remaining 40 credits pursued at Level 3 and the best marks achieved in 40 credits pursued at Level 2
- **Weighting of 1:** remaining 80 marks pursued at Level 2
- A formula is then applied to calculate the degree classification average.

Subjectivity and Variations

People's Republic of China

5	90	-	100%	Excellent
4	80	-	89%	Good
3	70	-	79%	Fair
2	60	-	69%	Marginal
1	0	-	59%	Fail

People's Republic of China

5	85	-	100%	Excellent
4	75	-	84%	Good
3	60	-	74%	Fair
2				Marginal
1	0	-	59%	Fail

US Grading Practices



Typical U.S. Secondary Scale

	“Normal” Courses		AP Courses	
Grade	Percentage	GPA	Percentage	GPA
A	90-100	3.5-4.0	90-100	4.5-5.0
B	80-89	2.5-3.49	80-89	3.5-4.49
C	70-79	1.5-2.49	75-79	2.5-3.49
D	60-69	1.0-1.49	70-74	2.0-2.49
F	0-59	0.0	0-69	0.0-1.99

Typical U.S. University Scale

Grade	Description	Grade Points	
A	Excellent, outstanding, superior, distinction	4.0	4.0
A-			3.7
B+	Above average, good, better than average, very good		3.3
B		3.0	3.0
B-			2.7
C+	Average, adequate, satisfactory, fair		2.3
C		2.0	2.0
C-			1.7
D+	Barely passing, below average, inferior, lowest passing, marginal, poor, inadequate		1.3
D		1.0	1.0
D-			0.7
F	Failing, unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0

D Grades / Marginal Passes

- Passing grade in an individual course
- But unacceptable in the overall average at the university level
- Requirement in the major?

France: Conceded Passes

MINISTÈRE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR ET DE LA RECHERCHE

ACADEMIE DE PARIS

BREVET DE TECHNICIEN SUPÉRIEUR

INFORMATIQUE DE GESTION OPTION ADMINISTRATEUR DE RESEAUX LOCAUX D'ENTREPRISE

Délivré à



né(e) le 30 Septembre 1984, à NEUILLY SUR SEINE (092)

Conformément au procès-verbal de l'examen établi le 04 JUILLET 2007
par le président du jury

Le Directeur du Service interacadémique
des examens et concours

Eric VERHAEGHE



signature du titulaire :

N° 071137509420

**BREVET DE TECHNICIEN SUPÉRIEUR
RELEVÉ DE NOTES**

ACADÉMIE DE GESTION CRETEIL-PARIS-VERSAIL.
ACADÉMIE D'INSCRIPTION CRETEIL-PARIS-VERSAIL.
SESSION Juin 2006

Nom de naissance [REDACTED]
Prénoms [REDACTED]
Né(e) le 30/09/1984
à NEUILLY SUR SEINE (092)

Arrdt Pays [REDACTED]
Établissement 0751708Z LYCEE LOUIS ARMAND
75015 PARIS
Numero candidat : 1137509420
Numero matricule : M326071202

SPÉCIALITÉ INFO GESTION:ADMINISTR. RESEAUX (32)
FORME DE PASSAGE GLOBALE CATÉGORIE CANDIDAT SCOLAIRE (110)



Unités	Épreuves	Coefficient	Note	Points	Observations
	CULTURE ET EXPRESSION	05.00	09.10	45.50	
U1.1	FRANCAIS	(02.00)	07.00		
U1.2	ANGLAIS	(03.00)	10.50		BENEFICE EN 2006
	ANGLAIS INFO.GESTION ECRIT	(02.00)	09.00		
	ANGLAIS INFO.GESTION ORAL	(01.00)	12.50		
U2	MATHEMATIQUES 1	02.00	02.00	4.00	
U3	ECONOMIE-DROIT	03.00	11.00	33.00	BENEFICE EN 2006
U4R	ETUDE DE CAS	05.00	06.50	32.50	
U5R	PRATIQUE DES TECHNIQUES INFORM	03.00	07.00	21.00	
U6R	SOUTENANCE DE PROJET	04.00	11.00	44.00	BENEFICE EN 2006
TOTAL		22.00		180.00	
MOYENNE SUR 20				8.18	

DÉCISION DU JURY : REFUSE

Le Directeur du Service Interacadémique
des Examens et Concours

[Signature]
Eric V...
Eric V...

Pour le candidat déclaré admissible, ce que de droit, jusqu'à la délivrance du diplôme.

NOTA: Il vous est recommandé de conserver précieusement ce document et d'en faire autant de photocopies que nécessaire.

The overall average is below 10, so the year is not passed.

The overall average is above 10, so the year is passed, despite having some individual grades below 10.

BREVET DE TECHNICIEN SUPÉRIEUR
RELEVÉ DE NOTES

ACADÉMIE DE GESTION CRETEIL-PARIS-VERSAIL.
ACADÉMIE D'INSCRIPTION CRETEIL-PARIS-VERSAIL.
SESSION Juin 2007

Nom de naissance [redacted]
Prénoms [redacted]
Né(e) le 30/09/1984
à NEUILLY SUR SEINE

(092)

Ardt Pays
Établissement



Numero candidat : 1137509420
Numero matricule : M326071063

SPÉCIALITÉ INFO GESTION:ADMINISTR. RESEAUX (3202)
FORME DE PASSAGE GLOBALE CATÉGORIE CANDIDAT SCOLAIRE (110)



Unités	Épreuves	Coefficient	Note	Points	Observations
	CULTURE ET EXPRESSION	05.00	08.70	43.50	
U1.1	CULTURE GENERALE ET EXPRESSION	(02.00)	06.00		
U1.2	ANGLAIS	(03.00)	10.50		BENEFICE EN 2006
U2	MATHEMATIQUES 1	02.00	08.50	17.00	
U3	ECONOMIE-DROIT	03.00	11.00	33.00	BENEFICE EN 2006
U4R	ETUDE DE CAS	05.00	09.00	45.00	
U5R	PRATIQUE DES TECHNIQUES INFORM	03.00	12.50	37.50	
U6R	SOUTENANCE DE PROJET	04.00	11.00	44.00	BENEFICE EN 2006
TOTAL		22.00		220.00	
MOYENNE SUR 20				10.00	

Le Directeur du Service Interacadémique des Examens et Concours

Eric Verbeke

DÉCISION DU JURY **ADMIS**

Pour le candidat déclaré admis, ce que de droit, jusqu'à la délivrance du diplôme.

NOTA : Il vous est recommandé de conserver précieusement ce document et d'en faire autant de photocopies que nécessaire.

Interpreting Grades

- Get as much information as possible (often transcripts have information listed at the bottom or the back).
- Identify the lowest passing and failing grades.
- Determine the distribution and range of grades.

Take Away's



- We grade for reasons that may have nothing to do with student performance.
- Students can take the same test, perform the same, yet be assessed in entirely different ways.
- It is imperative for the admission officer to understand the context in which the grading occurs.
- Grading conversion cannot be reduced to a mathematical formula.

Bibliography



- Center for Teaching and Learning (1991). “Grading Systems,” *For Your Consideration: Suggestions and Reflections on Teaching and Learning*, No. 10. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Jim Frey (2003). *Grading Practices in the United States, and Suggestions for Determining US Grade Equivalents for Grading Systems Used in Other Countries*. ECE Insights.
- Guy Haug (1997). “Capturing the Message Conveyed by Grades: Interpreting Foreign Grades,” *World Education News and Reviews*, Vol. 10, No. 2.
- Philip Nagy (2000). “The 3 Roles of Assessment: Gatekeeping, Accountability and Instructional Diagnosis,” *Canadian Journal of Education* 25, 4: 262-279.
- Ben Willbrink (1997). “Assessment in Historical Perspective,” *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 23: 31-48.