Oxford University Department of Computer Science

Undergraduate Supervisory Committee

Examination Conventions for Finals, Part C 2022/23 – version 1.1

Examination conventions are the formal record of the specific assessment standards for the course or courses to which they apply. They set out how examined work will be marked and how the resulting marks will be used to arrive at a final result and classification of an award.

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

Final Honour School, Part C, in Computer Science

Final Honour School, Part C, in Mathematics and Computer Science

Final Honour School, Part C, in Computer Science and Philosophy

Conventions for papers that fall under the responsibility of the Mathematical Institute or the Faculty of Philosophy are as set out in their examinations conventions.

1 Rubrics

Most courses will be assessed by mini-project, with the exception of Combinatorial Optimisation, Computational Game Theory, Probabilistic Model Checking and Probability and Computing. These courses will be assessed by a written (in-person) exam. You will have three hours to complete each exam. The requirements for each exam will be listed on the front of the question booklet. Each question is marked out of 25. If there is some reason why you need to have alternative examination arrangements, please get in touch with your college.

Rubrics for Mini-Projects

There is a total of 100 marks available, and you should attempt all parts. The requirements for each exam will be listed on the front of the question booklet.

Some papers have specific requirements. Please find them below.

Advanced Security:

There are four questions of equal weight. Attempt all questions.

Please answer only the questions asked. No extra credit can be gained by writing any more, giving examples where none was requested, or repeating the same answer in different words.

Computational Learning Theory:

* You have to submit the assignment electronically as a single pdf file and it must be typeset.
Scanned copies of handwritten work are not permitted; only for illustrative figures you may draw by hand and embed the picture in your typed solutions. The font size (except in figures and references) must be at least 11 point. Your assignment should use A4 paper format with all margins at least 2cm. All your work (except for references) should fit in 10 pages. A standard latex template will be posted on the course website and you are encouraged to use this as your starting point. You are advised to spend time revising and simplifying your solutions to make them brief.

* You may use any results in the lecture notes, problem sheets, or the two books, An Introduction to Computational Learning Theory and Foundations of Machine Learning, directly, with citation, but without reproving them. Any statement that is not a direct citation needs to be justified, unless the assignment explicitly says that you may use a result without justification.

* You are not allowed to discuss this exam with anybody. Once you have opened this exam, you are not allowed to search for material related to this assignment online. You are only permitted to use the course materials posted on the course website, the two textbooks mentioned above, and standard texts on probability, linear algebra, etc. if you need to look up basic results. Any suspected violation of the instructions will be taken seriously and promptly reported to the examiners for further investigation.

Concurrent Algorithms and Data Structures

It is recommended that you write no more than about ten pages. You should write enough to explain your implementations and reasoning, but unnecessarily verbose answers will be penalised.

You may make use of classes in the ox.cads packages, or the Java or Scala APIs. If you adapt code from here or elsewhere you should acknowledge the source. Likewise, if you use ideas from elsewhere (other than the lecture notes) you should acknowledge your sources.

Please submit a zip-file containing your write-up as a pdf-file, “cads〈candidate-number〉.pdf and a folder “Code〈candidate-number〉” with the complete code files

for testing purposes. Your pdf-submission should be self-contained, i.e. code sections you refer to in your write-up should be contained in the write-up.

Database Systems Implementation:

The submitted zip file will contain complete code solving the problem in the assignment. During marking, this code will be compiled and the correctness of the solution will be assessed. Students will be penalised accordingly if the code cannot be compiled successfully.

2 Marking

2.1 Marking scheme

For most Computer Science papers, model solutions are provided. Each script is marked by an examiner or assessor and is checked independently to ensure that all parts have been marked and the marks and part-marks have been correctly totaled and recorded. Essay-type questions without a model solution will be double marked.

Individualised consideration based on a candidate's Mitigating Circumstances Notice to Examiners will be taken into consideration at the exam board stage.

For candidates in Computer Science and Philosophy:

≥70	Class I	A very good answer that is structured, innovative and comprehensive
60-69	Class II(i)	A good answer that includes major points and their significance
50-59	Class II(ii)	An answer where good progress has been made but missing some important aspects
40-49	Class III	A weak answer that omits several major points
<40	Fail	A very poor answer that fails to address considerable areas of the question

For Candidates in Computer Science and Mathematics and Computer Science:

70-100	Distinction	A very good answer that is structured, innovative and comprehensive
65-69	Merit	A good answer that includes all major points and their significance
50-64	Pass	An answer where good progress has been made but missing some aspects

<50	Fail	40-49 A weak answer that omits several major points <40 A very poor answer that fails to address considerable areas of the question

2.2 Mini-Projects

Qualitative Descriptors for Mini-Projects

For candidates in Computer Science and Philosophy:

First Class (70–100): The candidate has demonstrated an excellent understanding of almost all of the material covered with a commensurate quality of presentation and has completed almost all of the assignment satisfactorily, further subdivided by: (90–100) The candidate has shown considerable originality and insight going well beyond the straightforward completion of the task set. (80–89) The work submitted shows a near-perfect completion of the task at hand, but does not meet the additional requirements above, or does but has some defects in presentation. (70–79) The work submitted is of a generally high order, but may have minor errors in content and/or deficiencies in presentation.
Upper second class (60-69): (65-69) The candidate has demonstrated a very good understanding of much of the material, and has completed most of the assignment satisfactorily, without showing the level of excellence expected of the above USM range. (60-64) The candidate has demonstrated a good understanding of much of the material, and has completed most of the assignment satisfactorily, without showing the level of excellence expected of the above USM range.
Lower second class (50-59)**:** The candidate has demonstrated an adequate understanding of the material and an adequate ability to apply their understanding, without showing the level of understanding expected of the above USM range.
Third class (40-49): The work submitted, while sufficient in quantity, suffers from sufficient defects to show a lack of adequate understanding or ability to apply results.
Fail: 30–39 The candidate, while attempting a significant part of the mini-project, has displayed a very limited knowledge or understanding at the level required. 0–29 The candidate has either attempted only a fragment of a mini-project or has

shown an inadequate grasp of basic material

For candidates in Computer Science and Mathematics and Computer Science:

Distinction (70–100): The candidate has demonstrated an excellent understanding of almost all of the material covered with a commensurate quality of presentation and has completed almost all of the assignment satisfactorily, further subdivided by: (90–100): The candidate has shown considerable originality and insight going well beyond the straightforward completion of the task set. (80–89): The work submitted shows a near-perfect completion of the task at hand, but does not meet the additional requirements above, or does but has some defects in presentation. (70–79): The work submitted is of a generally high order, but may have minor errors in content and/or deficiencies in presentation.
Merit (65-69): The candidate has demonstrated a very good understanding of much of the material, and has completed most of the assignment satisfactorily, without showing the level of excellence expected of the above USM range.
Pass (60-64): The candidate has demonstrated a good understanding of much of the material, and has completed most of the assignment satisfactorily, without showing the level of excellence expected of the above USM range. (50-59): The candidate has demonstrated an adequate understanding of the material and an adequate ability to apply their understanding, without showing the level of understanding expected of the above USM range.
Fail (below 50): (49-40): The work submitted, while sufficient in quantity, suffers from sufficient defects to show a lack of adequate understanding or ability to apply results. (30–39): The candidate, while attempting a significant part of the mini-project, has displayed a very limited knowledge or understanding at the level required. (0–29): The candidate has either attempted only a fragment of a mini-project or has shown an inadequate grasp of basic material

2.3 Computer Science Project

At least two markers, excluding the supervisor, will blind mark each project report. Each marker will independently write a brief report on the dissertation, giving careful consideration to context, contribution, competence, criticism and clarity. Each marker

will independently suggest an overall mark, in accordance with the standard Computer Science project marking scheme. The markers will then agree on a final mark, and write a brief report on how they arrived at this mark. Where the markers cannot agree on a mark, a third reader should be used to moderate.

Projects are marked on a scale from 0 to 100.

For Candidates in Computer Science and Philosophy:

First Class (90–100): The candidate shows remarkable ability and extraordinary insights. Dissertations in this band will be worthy of publication in a highest-ranking conference or journal. (80–89): The candidate shows outstanding problem-solving skills and outstanding knowledge of the material over a wide range of topics, and is able to use that knowledge innovatively and/or in unfamiliar contexts. (70–79): The candidate shows excellent problem-solving skills and excellent knowledge of the material over a wide range of topics, and is able to use that knowledge innovatively and/or in unfamiliar contexts.
Upper Second Class (65–69): The candidate shows very good problem-solving skills, and very good knowledge of much of the material over a wide range of topics. (60–64): The candidate shows good problem-solving skills, and good knowledge of much of the material over a wide range of topics.
Lower Second Class (50–59): The candidate shows basic problem solving skills and adequate knowledge of most of the material.
Third Class (40–49): The candidate shows reasonable understanding of at least part of the basic material and some problem solving skills. Although there may be a few good answers, the majority of answers will contain errors in calculations and/or show incomplete understanding of the topics.
Fail (30–39): The candidate shows some limited grasp of basic material over a restricted range of topics, but with large gaps in understanding. There need not be any good quality answers, but there will be indications of some competence. (0–29): The candidate shows inadequate grasp of the basic material. The work is likely to show major misunderstanding and confusion, and/or inaccurate calculations; the answers to most of the questions attempted are likely to be fragmentary only.

To arrive at these marks, the examiners and assessors are asked to consider the following factors:

- *Context:* The dissertation should demonstrate, as far as is relevant, a good understanding of the context in which the work was undertaken. It should be evident that the student understood both the problem and the problem domain, and that the choice of approach was informed and intelligent. The examiners would like to be convinced that the student has a good general knowledge of the field.
- *Competence*: The student should demonstrate, in the text of the dissertation that they are able to apply the ideas and the techniques that they have studied. The examiners will look for evidence of understanding, and appropriate application of techniques. They would like to be convinced that the student has shown competence in investigating the chosen topic.
- *Contribution*: The dissertation should have some value in itself. This may arise in different ways: the dissertation may present a fresh application, an extension to a theory, a new solution, or a new approach to a problem. The value will depend upon the extent of achievement: the nature of the application, the utility of the extension, the elegance of the solution, or the coherence of the approach.
- *Critical Evaluation*: The dissertation should provide appropriate critical assessment of the work that has been done and the process of doing it.
- *Presentation*: If the dissertation is to succeed as a demonstration of knowledge and understanding, and if the examiners are to be convinced of the competence of the student, a certain degree of clarity and organisation is required. Part of the value of the dissertation lies in its accessibility: if it is to make a worthwhile contribution, then it must be readable for another member of the cohort that's taken a similar schedule of courses whilst also maintaining sufficient detail to document the work and support assessments made. For these reasons, and because clarity of exposition may in itself reflect a greater degree of effort and understanding, the examiners would like to be convinced that the dissertation is presented in a lucid and scholarly manner.

For candidates in Computer Science and Mathematics and Computer Science:

Projects are marked on a scale from 0 to 100.

Distinction

(90–100): The candidate shows remarkable ability and extraordinary insights. Dissertations in this band will be worthy of publication in a highest-ranking conference or journal.

(80–89): The candidate shows outstanding problem-solving skills and outstanding knowledge of the material over a wide range of topics, and is able to use that knowledge innovatively and/or in unfamiliar contexts.

(70–79): The candidate shows excellent problem-solving skills and excellent knowledge of the material over a wide range of topics, and is able to use that knowledge innovatively

and/or in unfamiliar contexts.
Merit (65–69): The candidate shows very good problem-solving skills, and very good knowledge of much of the material over a wide range of topics.
Pass (60–64): The candidate shows good problem-solving skills, and good knowledge of much of the material over a wide range of topics. (50–59): The candidate shows basic problem solving skills and adequate knowledge of most of the material.
Fail (40–49): The candidate shows some understanding of at least part of the basic material and some problem solving skills. Although there may be a few good answers, the majority of answers will contain errors in calculations and/or show incomplete understanding of the topics. (30–39): The candidate shows some limited grasp of basic material over a restricted range of topics, but with large gaps in understanding. There need not be any good quality answers, but there will be indications of some competence. (0–29): The candidate shows inadequate grasp of the basic material. The work is likely to show major misunderstanding and confusion, and/or inaccurate calculations; the answers to most of the questions attempted are likely to be fragmentary only.

To arrive at these marks, the examiners and assessors are asked to consider the following factors:

- *Context:* The dissertation should demonstrate, as far as is relevant, a good understanding of the context in which the work was undertaken. It should be evident that the student understood both the problem and the problem domain, and that the choice of approach was informed and intelligent. The examiners would like to be convinced that the student has a good general knowledge of the field.
- *Competence*: The student should demonstrate, in the text of the dissertation that they are able to apply the ideas and the techniques that they have studied. The examiners will look for evidence of understanding, and appropriate application of techniques. They would like to be convinced that the student has shown competence in investigating the chosen topic.

- *Contribution*: The dissertation should have some value in itself. This may arise in different ways: the dissertation may present a fresh application, an extension to a theory, a new solution, or a new approach to a problem. The value will depend upon the extent of achievement: the nature of the application, the utility of the extension, the elegance of the solution, or the coherence of the approach.
- *Critical Evaluation*: The dissertation should provide appropriate critical assessment of the work that has been done and the process of doing it.
- *Presentation*: If the dissertation is to succeed as a demonstration of knowledge and understanding, and if the examiners are to be convinced of the competence of the student, a certain degree of clarity and organisation is required. Part of the value of the dissertation lies in its accessibility: if it is to make a worthwhile contribution, then it must be readable for another member of the cohort that's taken a similar schedule of courses whilst also maintaining sufficient detail to document the work and support assessments made. For these reasons, and because clarity of exposition may in itself reflect a greater degree of effort and understanding, the examiners would like to be convinced that the dissertation is presented in a lucid and scholarly manner.

The report must not exceed 10,000 words plus 40 pages of additional material. The word count may exclude any table of contents, all mathematical equations and symbols, diagrams, tables, bibliography and the texts of computer programs. However, any preface, footnotes, and appendices must be included. The certificate of authorship must also include a statement as to the word length, and of the method by which the figure was reached. Project markers may deduct marks for any failure to meet these conditions.

2.4 Mathematics Dissertation

Please consult the Mathematics Examination Conventions on the website of the Mathematical Institute.

2.5 Philosophy Thesis

Please see Appendix A below.

3 Moderation and classification

The Examiners translate the raw marks on each paper into University Standardised Marks (USMs) out of 100.

Agreed final marks for individual papers will be expressed using the following scale:

For candidates in Computer Science and Philosophy:

70-100	First Class
60-69	Upper second class

50-59	Lower second class
40-49	Third Class
0-39	Fail

For Part C examinations (Computer Science and Philosophy), there is no Pass degree.

For candidates in Computer Science and Mathematics and Computer Science:

70-100	Distinction
65-69	Merit
50-64	Pass
0-49	Fail

4 Scaling

For written examination papers, the Examiners may choose to scale marks where in their academic judgement:

a) a paper was more difficult or easy than in previous years, and/or
b) an optional paper was more or less difficult than other optional papers taken by students in a particular year, and/or
c) a paper has generated a spread of marks which are not a fair reflection of student performance on the University's standard scale for the expression of agreed final marks, i.e. the marks do not reflect the qualitative marks descriptors.

Such scaling is used to ensure that candidates are not advantaged or disadvantaged by any of these situations. In each case, examiners will establish if they have sufficient evidence for scaling. Scaling will only be considered and undertaken after moderation of a paper has been completed, and a complete run of marks for all papers is available.

If it is decided that it is appropriate to use scaling, the examiners will review a sample of papers either side of the classification borderlines to ensure that the outcome of scaling is consistent with academic views of what constitutes an appropriate performance within in each class.

Detailed information about why scaling was necessary and how it was applied will be included in the Examiners' report and the algorithms used will be published for the information of all examiners and students.

5 Penalties

5.1 Short-weight convention and departure from rubric

The maximum deduction that can be made for short weight should be equivalent to the proportion of the answer that is missing.

Where a candidate has failed to answer a compulsory question, or failed to answer the required number of questions in different sections, the complete script will be marked and the issue flagged. The board of examiners will consider all such cases so that consistent penalties are applied.

Where a candidate fails to comply with the relevant rubric, the examiners, if they agree to proceed with the examination of the work, may reduce the mark by up to 10 marks.

5.2 Penalties for non-attendance

Failure to attend an examination, except when prevented by illness or other urgent cause and approved by the Proctors, will result in the failure of the whole Part C.

5.3 Penalties for non-submission

Failure to submit a mini-project or project, except when prevented by illness or other urgent cause and approved by the Proctors, will result in the failure of the whole Part C.

5.4 Penalties for late or non-submission of mini-projects and project reports

The scale of penalties agreed by the board of examiners in relation to late submission of Mini-Projects or Project reports is set out below. Details of the circumstances in which such penalties might apply can be found in the *Examination Regulations* (Regulations for the Conduct of University Examinations, Part 14.)

Lateness	Cumulative penalty
Up to 12 hours	10 marks
12 – 48 hours	20 marks
48 – 72 hours	30 marks
72 – 96 hours	40 marks
96 hours – 14 days	50 marks
More than 14 calendar days after the notice of non-submission	Fail

Penalties will only be applied after the work has been marked and the Exam Board has checked whether there are any valid reasons for late submission. All deducted marks are USMs.

Failure to submit a required element of assessment will result in the failure of the whole Part C.

5.5 Penalties for over-length work

Where a candidate submits a piece of written coursework which exceeds the word or page limit prescribed by the relevant regulation, or, for mini-projects, indicated in the relevant rubric, the examiners, if they agree to proceed with the examination of the work, may reduce the mark by up to one class (i.e. from a 1st to a 2:1, or its equivalent).

5.6 Penalties for plagiarism

Candidates must avoid plagiarism in all submitted work. Plagiarism includes the deliberate or inadvertent lack of acknowledgement of the words or ideas of others, paraphrasing, collusion, inaccurate citation, failure to acknowledge assistance, or use of material written by professional agencies or other persons. Candidates are advised to consult Appendix A of the General Course Handbook, the University's online guide and complete the online course in avoiding plagiarism. It is permissible to include material from a source such as a textbook, an academic paper or the Internet provided a clear reference to the source is included. There is no need to give a reference to material taken from lecture notes.

Assessors should mark work on its academic merit. Depending on their severity, cases of suspected plagiarism may be referred to the Proctors for investigation or may be dealt with by the board of examiners. If dealt with by the board of examiners (i.e. if material under review is less than 10% of the whole) as a case of poor academic practice, the examiners may deduct up to 10% of the marks available for the assessment. Where the consequence of the marks deduction would result in failure of the assessment and of the programme the case must be referred to the Proctors.

If a student has previously had marks deducted for poor academic practice or has been referred to the Proctors for suspected plagiarism the case must always be referred to the Proctors.

In addition, the most serious cases of poor academic practice should also always be referred to the Proctors.

While it is not permissible to submit work which has been submitted, either partially or in full, either for your current Honour School or qualification, or for another Honour School or qualification of this University, or for a qualification at any other institution, it is permissible to use work that has been written during the course of your studies (e.g. collections, tutorial essays)..

6 Treatment of practicals

Practicals play no part in the classification, provided that candidates achieve a pass mark for their practical work. Candidates who do not achieve a pass mark for their practical work may, at the discretion of the Examiners, be deemed to have failed the examination.

Reports on practicals are marked by the demonstrating staff as each practical has been completed, and the Examiners receive these marks, together with the practical reports themselves. The demonstrating staff are not appointed as Assessors for the purpose of marking practicals, and it is therefore Examiners' responsibility to determine what credit is given for each piece of practical work. The marks given by the demonstrating staff will serve as a guide, using the table below.

The Examiners will give no credit for practical work that was not submitted for marking by the deadline and signed by a demonstrator, unless there are extenuating circumstances.

The following numerical procedure is suggested for processing the marks. Each practical is marked on a scale S+, S, S- that is explained in the Course Handbook. These marks will be converted to numbers using the following scale:

S+	100
S	60
S-	20

The borderlines for passing the practicals are 40 for a Pass and 70 for a Distinction.

7 Progression Rules and classification conventions

7.1 Qualitative descriptors of classification bands for Candidates in Computer Science, or Mathematics and Computer Science

Distinction	70-100 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 that innovatively in unfamiliar contexts.
Merit	65-69 The candidate shows very good skills in reasoning, deductive logic and problem-solving. He/she demonstrates a good or very good knowledge of much of the material.
Pass	50-64 The candidate shows adequate or good basic skills in reasoning, deductive logic and problem-solving. He/she demonstrates a sound knowledge of much of the material.
Fail	40-49 the candidate shows reasonable understanding of at least part of the basic material and some skills in reasoning, deductive logic and problem-solving. 30-39 The candidate shows some limited grasp of at least part of the material 0-29 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.

7.2 Qualitative descriptors of classification bands for Candidates in Computer Science and Philosophy

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	60-69 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	50-59 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	40-49 The candidate shows reasonable understanding of at least part of the basic material and some skills in reasoning, deductive logic and problem-solving.
Fail	30-39 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. 0-29 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.

7.3 Progression and Resits

A candidate who fails to satisfy the examiners in Part C may retake Part C on at most one subsequent occasion, within a year.

8 Final outcome rules

The average USM is rounded to the nearest integer, with fractions of exactly half a mark being rounded up.

Candidates who have initially failed any element of the examination will not be eligible for the award of a Distinction.

8.1 Computer Science or Mathematics and Computer Science

Part C Options (Mathematics or Computer Science)	Weight 6
Mathematics Dissertation	Weight 12
Computer Science Project	Weight 18

In Computer Science, each candidate takes five Computer Science option courses (weight 30) and a project (weight 18). This makes a total weight of 48, 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, then dividing the total by 48.

In Mathematics and Computer Science, each candidate takes either six option courses (weight 36) and a mathematics dissertation (weight 12) or five option courses (weight 30) and a Computer Science project (weight 18). This makes a total weight of 48, 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, then dividing the total by 48.

8.2 Computer Science and Philosophy

In Computer Science and Philosophy, Part C, each Philosophy paper or thesis is worth 8 units each, each Computer Science taught course is worth 3 units; and a Computer Science project is worth 9 units.

Part C Options Computer Science	Weight 3
Part C Options Philosophy	Weight 8
Philosophy Thesis	Weight 8
Computer Science Project	Weight 9

Candidates complete between 24 and 26 units subject to the following constraints:

- No more than six Computer Science taught courses may be taken;
- Candidates may not take both a Philosophy thesis and a Computer Science project.

The following combinations are therefore permitted:

- Three Philosophy papers (maybe including a thesis) (24 units);
- Two Philosophy papers (maybe including a thesis) and either three Computer Science courses or a Computer Science project (25 units);
- One Philosophy paper (or thesis), and six Computer Science courses (26 units);

- One Philosophy paper, three Computer Science courses and a Computer Science project (26 units);
- Five Computer Science courses and a Computer Science project (24 units).

The average USM is calculated by multiplying each paper mark by its weight, summing, and dividing by 24, 25, 26 or 24, depending on whether the candidate has taken 3, 2, 1 or 0 Philosophy papers.

The Examiners will also calculate an adjusted average USM using a weight of 12 for each Philosophy paper so that the weighted mean of the marks is computed by multiplying the marks for individual papers, summing, and then dividing the total by either 36, 33, 30 or 24 depending on whether the candidate has taken 3, 2, 1 or 0 Philosophy papers respectively. For candidates taking 3 or 0 Philosophy papers, this adjusted average will be the same as the average USM.

9 Mitigating circumstances notices to examiners

A candidate's final outcome will first be considered using the classification rules/final outcome rules as described above in section 6. The exam board will then consider any further information they have on individual circumstances.

Where a candidate or candidates have made a submission, under Part 13 of the Regulations for Conduct of University Examinations, that unforeseen circumstances may have had an impact on their performance in an examination, a subset of the board (the 'Mitigating Circumstances Panel') will meet to discuss the individual applications and band the seriousness of each application on a scale of 1-3 with 1 indicating minor impact, 2 indicating moderate impact, and 3 indicating very serious impact. The Panel will evaluate, on the basis of the information provided to it, the relevance of the circumstances to examinations and assessment, and the strength of the evidence provided in support. Examiners will also note whether all or a subset of papers were affected, being aware that it is possible for circumstances to have different levels of impact on different papers. The banding information will be used at the final board of examiners meeting to decide whether and how to adjust a candidate's results. Further information on the procedure is provided in the *Examination and Assessment Framework, Annex E* and information for students is provided at https://www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/exams/problems-completing-your-assessment.

10 Details of Examiners and rules on communication with examiners

Prof. Alex Rogers (Chair)
Prof. Sadie Creese
Prof. Tom Melham

Prof. Prudence Wong (External Examiner)

Candidates should not under any circumstances seek to make contact with individual internal or external examiners.

11 Appendix A:

Philosophy Marking Conventions

Submitted work (theses/extended essays)

1st: 100 to 70 Upper: 84+	Exceptional work 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, critical understanding of a wide range of relevant material, transparent organisation and presentation, lucid and precise expression.
Lower: 75, 72	Strong work displaying a high standard of analysis and argument, critical insight, and a thorough command of the relevant material; transparent organisation and presentation; clear and precise expression.
2i: 69-60 Upper: 69 to 65	+ Effective analysis and argumentation, demonstrating thorough command of relevant material; transparent organisation and presentation of material; clarity of expression. - Occasional imprecision in argumentation or expression; or lack of depth; or minor omissions; or lapses in focus
Lower: 60-64	**+** Clearly structured and generally coherent discussion, offering a mostly accurate analysis of central arguments and themes, and a justified conclusion. - Occasional lapses in argumentation; writing may be somewhat pedestrian or showing unclarity or imprecision of expression; some omissions or infelicity in organisation of material and/or presentation (e.g. missing or incomplete references, misquotations or misattributions).
2ii: 59-50 Upper: 59 to 55	+ Adequate, if somewhat basic, analysis and understanding of key concepts and arguments; generally cogent and well-structured treatment of topic. - Lacking in scope, depth or precision; pat or pedestrian representation of thoughts and arguments; important inaccuracies or omissions; some lapses in argumentation and/or presentation.
Lower: 54-50	**+** Discussion showing a reasonable grasp of basic material and arguments, and a fair attempt to arrive at a reasoned conclusion.

	- Significant inaccuracies or omissions; major lapses in argumentation (e.g. nonsequiturs, misuse of concepts or evidence affecting overall conclusions); failure to digest material; minor irrelevance; sloppy presentation.
3rd: 49-40 Upper: 49 to 45	**+** Limited treatment of topic showing some familiarity with relevant material and arguments; recognisable structure. - Superficial or incomplete treatment; gaps or mistakes in understanding of key concepts and arguments; poor focus and organisation; some irrelevance; poor presentation.
Lower: 44-40	**+** Significant elements of a basic and relevant answer showing some structure. **-** Muddled argumentation, very superficial discussion with poor focus, significant misunderstanding of key concepts and arguments; considerable irrelevance; incomplete answer; substandard presentation.
Pass: 39 to 30	+ Limited attempt to address question showing a basic grasp of some relevant material. - Seriously incomplete answer; fundamental misunderstanding of key arguments or ideas; significant portions of discussion irrelevant or tangential; basic failures of organisation and presentation.
Fail: 29-0 Upper: 29-15	+ Very limited attempt to answer question; some use of relevant material. - Wholly inadequate answer, discussion largely irrelevant; unacceptably poor organisation and/or presentation.
Lower 14-0:	- Completely or almost completely irrelevant or ignorant answer. A very short piece of work, providing no or negligible evidence of study.

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 key concepts and arguments; poor focus and organisation; some irrelevance.
Lower: 44-40	+ 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.