Oxford University Department of Computer Science

Undergraduate Supervisory Committee

Examination Conventions: Finals, Parts A and B, 2017

This document establishes the examining conventions to be used in the following public examinations:

Final Honour School of Computer Science and Philosophy, Parts A and B

Nothing contained in this document supersedes the University's regulations and policy set out in the current *Examination Regulations* and the *Notes for the Guidance of Examiners and Chairmen of Examiners* and the *Notes of Guidance on Examinations and Assessment.*

The Examination Conventions are reviewed by the Supervisory Committee for Computer Science and Philosophy, and approved by the Mathematical, Physical and Life Sciences Division, following consideration by the Computer Science Undergraduate Supervisory Committee and the Board of the Faculty of Philosophy.

The Board of Examiners may make minor deviations from these conventions in exceptional circumstances, ideally after reference to the Computer Science Undergraduate Supervisory Committee or to the Proctors.

1 Documentation

Examiners will have access to the following documents. The Chairman of Examiners will ensure that, where appropriate, External Examiners have access to these documents.

1. The current *Examination Regulations*.

2. The booklet, *Notes for the Guidance of Examiners and Chairmen of Examiners*, published by the Proctors' Office.

3. The Educational Policy and Standards Committee's *Notes of Guidance on Examinations and Assessment*.

4. The *Course Handbook*, including the syllabus for each lecture course.

5. The current *Examination Conventions* for Parts A and B in Computer Science.

6. The *examination papers* from the preceding two years.

7. The *Examiners' Reports* on these examinations, including the published tables of *Class Percentage Figures*.

8. The *External Examiners' reports* for the previous two years, together with the responses to these reports made by the Undergraduate Supervisory Committee.

2 Setting the papers

Computer Science papers

Computer Science papers will be set following the standard practice in Computer Science which is detailed in the Examination Conventions: Finals, Parts A and B, 2017 for Computer Science.

Philosophy papers

Philosophy questions are set following the standard practice of the Philosophy Faculty.

3 Marking and checking scripts

Computer Science

Computer Science scripts will be marked and checked following the standard practice in Computer Science as described in the Examination Conventions: Finals, Parts A and B, 2017 for Computer Science.

Computers in Society will be examined via take-home assignment to be completed over the Easter vacation and a presentation to be conducted during Hilary term 2017, week 7.

Philosophy

All Philosophy scripts are marked independently by two examiners and a third examiner in any case where the two examiners cannot resolve a discrepancy between their marks.

In Philosophy the standard of work for the various classes is specified in Annexe A.

4 Moderation and classification

Translation of raw marks into USMs, treatment of medical evidence, and treatment of practicals are as described in the Examination Conventions: Finals, Parts A and B, 2017 for Computer Science.

The Finals examination is based on the aggregate marks from second and third year examinations. The final classification will be based on a weighted mean of the USMs. Computer Science options attract the same weight whether they are taken in the second year or the third year.

The weights to be assigned to each unit of assessment are as follows:

CS course	2 hours	weight 10
Philosophy course	3 hours	weight 20

Part A
Each candidate takes four Computer Science courses (to include *Models of Computation*) (total weight 40)

Part B
Each candidate takes two, four or six Computer Science subjects and five, four or three Philosophy courses, respectively (total weight 120).

This makes a total weight of 160, so that the weighted mean of the marks is computed by multiplying the marks for individual courses by the weights shown above, adding them all up, and then dividing the total by 160.

The examiners should also calculate an adjusted average USM using a weight of 30 for each Philosophy course so that the weighted mean of the marks is computed by multiplying the marks for individual courses, adding them all up, and then dividing the total by either 210, 200 or 190 depending on whether the candidate has taken five, four or three Philosophy courses, respectively.

The average USM is then rounded to the nearest integer, with fractions of exactly half a mark being rounded up, and a degree class assigned according to the following table:

First class	Average USM at least 70, or adjusted average USM of 70 and an average USM on Computer Science papers of 60.
	The candidate shows excellent skills in reasoning, deductive logic and problem-solving. He/she demonstrates an excellent knowledge of the material, and is able to use it innovatively in unfamiliar contexts.
Upper second class	Average USM at least 60
	The candidate shows good or very good skills in reasoning, deductive logic and problem-solving. He/she demonstrates a good or very good knowledge of much of the material.
Lower second class	Average USM at least 50
	The candidate shows adequate basic skills in reasoning, deductive logic and problem-solving. He/she demonstrates a sound knowledge of much of the material.
Third class	Average USM at least 40
	The candidate shows reasonable understanding of at least part of the basic material and some skills in reasoning, deductive logic and problem-solving.
Pass degree	Average USM at least 30
	The candidate shows some limited grasp of basic material demonstrated by the equivalent of an average of one meaningful attempt at a question on each unit of study. A stronger performance on some papers may compensate for a weaker performance on others.
Fail	Average USM less than 30
	The candidate shows little evidence of competence in the topics examined; the work is likely to show major misunderstanding and confusion, coupled with inaccurate calculations; the answers to questions attempted are likely to be fragmentary only.

Students who do not obtain at least an upper second will not be allowed to progress to the fourth year.

Treatment of practicals

Computer Science practicals will be treated in accordance with standard practice in Computer Science which is detailed in the Examination Conventions: Finals, Parts A and B, 2017 for Computer Science.

Late submission or failure to submit coursework

Under the provisions permitted by the regulations, late submission of coursework (i.e. project reports) where there are no extenuating circumstances may result in the following penalties:

Lateness (where the deadline is Monday at 12 noon)	Cumulative penalty
Up to 4 hours i.e. up to Monday 4pm	1%
4 - 24 hours i.e. up to Tues 12 noon	10%
24 – 48 hours i.e. up to Weds 12 noon	20%
48 – 72 hours i.e. up to Thurs 12 noon	30%
72 – 96 hours i.e. up to Fri 12 noon	40%
96 – 101 hours i.e. up to Fri 5pm	50%

Where permission for late submission has been granted by the Proctors, no penalty will be imposed.

5 Communication with candidates

The Chairman of Examiners should write to candidates, reminding them of the general form and procedure for the examination. Notices to candidates from recent years are commended as examples to follow.

6 After the examination

It will be helpful if Examiners will ensure that:

- Full Marking Schemes are deposited (after the examination is complete) in the Examiners' files, kept in the Departmental Office.
- LaTeX source files for the papers (incorporating any corrections) are kept for the electronic archive.

7 External Examiner

The External Examiner for the following degree, for 2016-17, will be Professor Frank Wolter, Professor of Logic and Computation, University of Liverpool, UK:

Final Honour School of Computer Science and Philosophy, Parts A and B

Annexe A:

Philosophy Marking Conventions

Examination performance

1st: 100 to 70 Upper: 84+	Exceptional answer displaying originality, outstanding analytical and argumentative skills, superior command of a wide range of facts and arguments relevant to the question, excellent organisation and presentation, lucid and precise expression
Middle: 81, 78	Excellent work offering high-level analysis, independent and rigorous argument, skilled handling of the facts and arguments relevant to the question, transparent organisation and presentation, lucid and precise expression.
Lower: 75, 72	Strong work displaying a high standard of analysis and argument, a thorough command of the facts/figures relevant to the question; transparent organisation and clear language.
2i: 69-60 Upper: 69 to 65	+ Effective analysis and argumentation, through command of evidence, clarity of expression, transparent organisation of material. - Occasional imprecision in argumentation or expression; or lack of depth; or minor omissions; or lapses in focus
Lower: 64-60	+ Well-structured answer offering a generally accurate analysis of central arguments and themes, and well-reasoned conclusion. - Occasional lapses in argumentation; writing may be somewhat pedestrian or unclear or imprecise; some omissions or infelicity in organisation of material.
2ii: 59-50 Upper: 59 to 55	+ Adequate, if somewhat basic, analysis and understanding of key concepts and arguments. - Significantly lacking in scope, depth or precision; pat or pedestrian representation of thoughts and arguments; important inaccuracies or omissions; some lapses in argumentation.
Lower: 54-50	+ Answer showing a basic grasp of relevant material and arguments, and a fair attempt to arrive at a reasoned conclusion. - Serious inaccuracies or omissions; significant lapses in argumentation (e.g. nonsequiturs, misuse of concepts or evidence); failure to digest material; minor irrelevance.
3ʳᵈ: 49-40 Upper: 49 to 45	+ Limited answer to the question; constructs a rudimentary argument; some evidence of relevant study. - Superficial or incomplete treatment; gaps or mistakes in understanding of

Lower: 44-40	key concepts and arguments; poor focus and organisation; some irrelevance. + Significant elements of a basic and relevant answer. - Muddled argumentation, very superficial discussion with poor focus, significant misunderstanding of key concepts and arguments; considerable irrelevance; seriously incomplete answer.
Fail: 39-0 Upper: 39-30	+ Limited attempt to address question showing a rudimentary grasp of some relevant information. - Very incomplete, brief, or poorly organised answer; fundamental misunderstanding of key arguments or ideas, large portions of discussion irrelevant or tangential.
Middle: 29-15	+ Some slight evidence of a proper attempt to answer question; glimpse of relevant material. - Extremely limited and inadequate answer, for instance in note form; discussion mostly irrelevant.
Lower: 14-0	- Completely or almost completely irrelevant or ignorant answer. Nothing or almost nothing written.

The class boundaries and class descriptors for all classes remain the same across all Honour School involving Philosophy.