

Oxford University Department of Computer Science
Undergraduate Supervisory Committee

Examination Conventions: Finals, Part C, 2018

This document establishes the examining conventions to be used in Part C of the FHS of Computer Science. It also establishes the conventions to be used in those parts of the FHS of Mathematics & Computer Science Part C that fall under the responsibility of the Examiners in Computer Science.

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

The Undergraduate Supervisory Committee of the Department of Computer Science directs that examinations for which it is responsible are conducted in accordance with these conventions. The Board of Examiners may make minor deviations from these conventions in exceptional circumstances, ideally after reference to the Undergraduate Supervisory or to the Proctors.

1. Documentation

Examiners should have access to the following documents. The Chair of Examiners should 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 Chair 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 *examination papers* from the preceding two years.
6. The *Examiners' Reports* on these examinations, including the published tables of *Class Percentage Figures*.
7. 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

In setting the papers, Examiners should be guided by the style of papers set in previous years, together with the Examiners' Reports and any Specimen Questions issued by the Undergraduate Supervisory Committee.

Questions on each subject within a paper will normally be set and marked by the member of staff who gave the lectures on that subject in the year immediately preceding the examination, who should be appointed as Assessor.

Some courses are examined by mini-project (also known as “take-home assignment”); this will normally be prescribed in the Course Handbook (including the Lecture Synopses). Each of these assignments should be designed to take a typical student about three days. Candidates are not permitted to withdraw from being examined on a topic once they have submitted their assignment to the Examination Schools.

Examiners and Assessors should attempt to set papers and assignments that do not require too much rescaling, by setting questions with an appropriate level of difficulty, and ensuring that each question has easier parts that enable middle-ranking candidates to distinguish themselves from lower-ranking candidates, as well as more demanding parts that allow high-ranking candidates to distinguish themselves in their turn.

Protocol

The following protocol should be followed for the setting of each paper:

1. Questions will be set by the Assessor.
2. The paper will be checked by an Examiner, who may consult another suitably competent member of academic staff.
3. An Examiner will produce the final draft paper.
4. The paper will be reviewed and approved by the whole examining board.

A checklist that may be given to Assessors is attached as Annexe A.

The relevant External Examiner should be consulted as soon as there is a stable draft paper; they should be provided with full, annotated solutions indicating what is considered bookwork, and with the proposed Marking Scheme. The Examiners should not finalise any paper without taking into account the comments of the External Examiners.

Model solutions and marking scheme

Assessors must be asked to provide complete model solutions, annotated so as to indicate what is considered bookwork, what has been seen before on problem sheets and what is considered to be new and unseen. Assessors must also include with a draft marking scheme for the approval of the examiners. The solution, with additional comments, should also make clear how much of the question is accessible to less strong candidates.

On take-home exams, about 60% of the assignment should cover straightforward material to ensure that weaker candidates can gain marks, about 30% should be harder to allow stronger candidates to show the depth of their understanding, and about 10% should be very difficult, to distinguish the outstanding students from the merely excellent.

On sit-down exams, approximately 60% of each question should be of a straightforward nature, maybe containing a small amount of bookwork, and about 40% should be harder.

The marking schemes should be approved by the examining board alongside the papers. Examiners should check that questions are of a consistent difficulty within each paper and between papers, bearing in mind the following standard criteria, expressed in percentage points:

≥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)	A less than satisfactory answer that includes some major points
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

A mark of zero shall be awarded for any part or parts of questions that have not been answered by a candidate, but which should have been answered.

Examiners should ensure that the checklist of Annexe A is followed.

3. Marking and checking scripts

Marking

The marker for each subject will normally be the Assessor appointed to set questions on that subject. Where questions do not have detailed marking scheme, for example, essay-style questions, the students' answers should be independently double marked. The Examiners should provide each marker with the approved marking scheme for the paper. Markers should be instructed to follow the approved marking scheme, and to carry out procedures for avoiding errors in transcription of the marks. A suitable checklist is attached as Annexe B.

Where a topic is assessed by take-home assignment, the anonymised assignments are marked by the Assessor and moderated by the Examiners. Moderation is intended to ensure consistency and fairness across courses, and the Examiners may adjust marks, or take any other necessary steps, to achieve this goal.

The Chair must ensure that those appointed as Assessors are informed of the Examiners' timetables, and are made aware that they must be available for consultation by the Examiners until the signing of the Class/Pass Lists, and in particular during the input and checking of the marks.

Processing of marks

The Department of Computer Science provides a database system for checking and processing marks. Examiners should use this system and reports from it to ensure that the following checks are carried out:

- an independent arithmetic check of the correctness of the addition of the partial marks for each question;
- an independent check of the marks entered into the database for each candidate;

A central log is kept of the whereabouts of all scripts.

4. Moderation and classification

The critical task for examiners will be to translate the raw marks on each paper into University Standardised Marks (USMs) out of 100. In joint schools, the marks from the two sets of examiners are transmitted and combined using USMs.

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' marks 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

In producing USMs, Examiners are advised to follow advice given in the Examiners' Report from the previous year, along with their own judgment. Examiners may use scaling to ensure that comparable performance in different papers leads to numerical marks that are consistent between papers, but they should avoid penalizing candidates who have performed well on papers that are perceived to have been easier than others. A quantitative description of the procedure, for each paper, for translating raw marks into USMs should be included in the Examiners' Report.

Examiners will try to ensure that the rescaling is fair to all students. They may perform an initial mechanical rescaling, but will then consider whether this obtains fair results. The suggested rescaling method is to use a piece-wise linear function, with up to four control points corresponding to (1) the top candidate, (2) a USM of 70, (3) a USM of 50, and (4) the bottom candidate.

Examiners will apply a series of sanity checks to the proposed USMs for each paper:

- Compare the proportion of students in each class with MPLS averages;
- Consider the mean and standard deviations for each paper: a mean in the mid to high 60s, and a standard deviation of about 10 is probably appropriate;
- For each paper, compare the marks for each students taking this paper with that student's average marks across all papers; this will help to identify papers that tend to be taken by above or below average students.

The Examiners should pay careful attention to what candidates have been told in the *Examination Regulations* and the *Course Handbook*, and should have regard to the percentages of candidates in each class in previous years, both in the same examination and across the University.

Evidence of recent medical problems, etc., should be considered at this stage, and USMs adjusted if appropriate.

Practicals play no part in the classification, provided that candidates achieve a pass mark. However, candidates whose overall performance on practical work is not satisfactory may be deemed to have failed the examination or may have their overall classification reduced.

The class list must be compiled from the USMs without the exercise of further discretion on the part of Examiners.

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.

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 at least 70 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.
Upper second class	Average 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 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 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.
Fail	Average less than 40 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.

NB: There is no “Pass” classification available in Part C.

Projects

Each project dissertation should be read by at least two assessors, including at least one examiner, but excluding the supervisor. Each assessor should independently write a brief report on the dissertation, giving careful consideration to context, contribution, competence, criticism and clarity. Each assessor should independently suggest an overall mark, in accordance with the standard Computer Science project marking scheme. Where the initial marks differ by more than 10, a third reader should be used to obtain another independent mark.

The examiners will then set a final USM for each project based on the information received from all assessors. This mark may be moderated in the light of the report from the project supervisor; if appropriate. The procedure used to arrive at the final USM for each project should be carefully documented by the examiners, and made available to the external examiner.

Projects are marked on a scale from 0 to 100. However, in practice, very few projects are given a mark that is higher than 80 or lower than 50, so that the marks can be combined with marks for written papers without excessive scaling.

First class (70-80):	A complete project that addresses a well-rounded collection of relevant <i>concerns</i> , using appropriate <i>technology</i> , shows some aspects of <i>originality</i> , involves a significant amount of <i>analysis</i> or <i>assessment</i> of results, and is written up in a <i>clear report</i> .
Upper second class (60-70):	A basically complete project that achieves most of its aims, but does not address some of the appropriate concerns, or follows an obvious implementation path, or has not been thoroughly tested or assessed, or is written up in a less clear report.
Lower second class (50-60):	An incomplete project that may represent a start on a feasible plan, but leaves substantial parts still to be completed. Alternatively, a project that fails to address many of the appropriate concerns, or is far too unambitious, lacks any analysis, or is very unclear.

Third class (40-50):	A very incomplete project, perhaps with fragments only of a program, and a plan that remains vague. Alternatively, a project that shows poor understanding of the relevant area, or contains serious errors.
Marks below 40:	Marks below 40 may be awarded for very insubstantial reports indicating little serious engagement with the material.

To arrive at these marks, the assessors are asked to consider the following questions:

- **Context:** does the report show a good appreciation of the context to the work, giving suitable motivation, relevant background and appropriate references?
- **Competence:** does the report demonstrate competence in the use of appropriate techniques, tools or technology at a suitable level of expertise?
- **Contribution:** does the report show that the student has made some original contribution to the topic, designing and implementing an appropriate system?
- **Criticism:** does the report provide appropriate critical assessment and evaluation of the work that has been done, and the process of doing it?
- **Clarity:** is the report written in a way that is readable and clear for the non-specialist, but with appropriate level of detail to document the work done?

Treatment of practicals

Practicals play no part in the classification, provided that candidates achieve a pass mark. However, candidates whose overall performance on practical work is not satisfactory may, at the discretion of the examiners, be deemed to have failed the examination or may have their classification reduced.

It is therefore necessary for the examiners to determine which candidates have passed the practical course. In addition, a Distinction can be awarded for practical work

Reports on practicals are marked by the demonstrating staff as each practical is 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 up to the examiners to determine what credit is given for each piece of practical work. The marks given by the demonstrating staff may be used as a guide to identify those candidates whose practical work requires close scrutiny by the examiners.

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. Likewise, the demonstrators will not mark work that is late, unless there are extenuating circumstances. Work submitted late for a good reason, such as illness, may be submitted through the student's tutor.

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. Convert these marks to numbers using the following scale:

S+	100
S	60
S-	20

Next, take a mean of the practical marks for each paper or option. The weights given to papers may be adjusted to take into account variations in the amount and difficulty of practical work. The borderlines of 40 for a Pass and 70 for a Distinction should be used.

Examiners will want to make their own assessment of the amount and quality of practical work submitted by a candidate before taking the drastic step of failing the candidate solely because of inadequate practical work. Different candidates will have chosen different options, and consequently will have submitted differing amounts of practical work. In awarding distinctions, the examiners may take into account the number of courses for which a candidate has completed practical work.

A practical mark (Pass/Fail/Distinction) should be assigned and reported in the results.

5. 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 12pm, 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.

6. Penalties for over-length work and departure from approved titles

Where a candidate submits a dissertation (or other piece of written coursework) which exceeds the word limit prescribed by the relevant regulation, 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).

7. Plagiarism

Candidates are reminded of the importance of avoiding any suspicion of plagiarism. Please see <http://www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/guidance/skills/plagiarism> for further guidance. 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 as a case of poor academic practice, the Examiners may deduct marks (for lack of adequate referencing, poor use of citation conventions etc.) of up to 10% of the marks available for the assessment. When the consequence of the marks deduction would result in the failure of the assessment and of the programme, the case must be referred to the Proctors.

8. Alternative examination arrangements and Factors Affecting Performance

A candidate in any University Examination with specific learning difficulties or disability/illness may apply through the Senior Tutor of his or her college for alternative examination arrangements relating to his or her condition. Please see <http://www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/exams/arrangements> for further information on the process.

Candidates who would like the Examiners to be aware of any factors that may have affected their performance before or during an examination are advised to discuss their circumstances with their college and consult the Examination Regulations (Part 13). Candidates should complete the form entitled Factors Affecting Performance in Examinations and send this to their college with appropriate supporting material. The candidate's college will submit the application for forwarding to the relevant Chair of Examiners. Candidates should ensure that, wherever possible, applications are submitted before the date of the final Examination Board meeting. Final meeting dates for each Examination Board will be published in the Trinity term Notice to Candidates.

Where a candidate or candidates have made a submission, under Part 13 of the Regulations for Conduct of University Examinations, that unforeseen factors may have had an impact on their performance in an examination, a subset of the board 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. When reaching this decision, examiners will take into consideration the severity and relevance of the circumstances, and the strength of the evidence. 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 adjudicate on the merits of candidates. Further information on the procedure is provided in the *Policy and Guidance for examiners, Annex C* and information for students is provided at <http://www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/exams/guidance>.

9. Communication with candidates

The Chair 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.

10. 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.

11. External Examiner

The External Examiner for the following degrees, for 2017-18, will be Prof. Alexandra Silva, Senior Lecturer in Computer Science, University College London, UK.

Final Honour School of Computer Science, Part C

Final Honour School of Mathematics and Computer Science, Part C

Final Honour School of Computer Science and Philosophy, Part C

Annexe A: Checklist for setting papers.

1. Is the question on the syllabus, as defined by the course webpage?
2. Is the question technically correct?
3. Is the notation and terminology standard or obvious? If not, is it defined within the question? Is it unambiguous?
4. Is it clear what may be assumed, what detail is required, and what would constitute a complete answer, particularly in longer questions?
5. For Prelims, is the question of a straightforward character? For Finals, does it avoid unnecessary complexity?
6. Will the form of presentation be familiar to candidates?
7. Has an easy start been provided?
8. Could a second-class or third-class candidate gain marks by doing the easy part of the exam question, even if he or she could not finish it?
9. Can the question be done by stronger candidates in the appropriate time? (Finals questions are expected to be slightly longer than Prelims questions.)
10. Has a reasonably detailed marking scheme been provided, giving an indication as to the allocation of the marks for different aspects and indicating which parts are to be bookwork, which are similar to class exercises, and which are new?
11. Does the question avoid using over-complicated language and making cultural assumptions?
12. Are the questions as a whole fairly spread across the syllabus?
13. Are the questions as a whole of comparable standard to other questions this year and in recent years (taking into account comments in the Examiners' reports)?
14. Are the questions as a whole of a similar general nature to questions in previous years (taking into account comments in the Examiners' reports)?

Annexe B: Checklist for marking

1. The Examiners have seen and approved the marking schemes, and markers must use these consistently. However, it may become clear while marking that the allocation of marks should be changed. In this case, the marker should ensure that the modified scheme is applied consistently to all candidates' scripts, and the examiners should be informed.
2. Each script is checked for the completeness of marking, and the Examiners review at least some of the scripts during the classification process. Markers are therefore asked to make it clear on each script how many marks have been awarded for each part of a question, and to circle the total mark for each question on the script. They are also asked to indicate with some mark that they have read each page of the script.
3. Markers may, if they wish, write remarks about the quality of the answers, and note for the examiners any defect in the argument. However, please note that any comments (i.e. single words or collections of words) on scripts are disclosable under the Data Protection Act. Markers may record part marks, ticks and crosses (for example to denote objective correctness or otherwise), and lines to indicate that portions of a script have been read, on the script itself. However, this must only be done in the left-hand margin of the script so that the record can be covered up if remarking is required. This non-verbal information is not disclosable. In subjects where single-marking is allowed, it is important that on every page of a script is drawn a line in the left-hand margin to indicate that the examiner has read it even if no marks are accumulated.
4. The marks awarded for each question should be shown on the cover sheet and entered on the pre-printed mark sheet supplied. Markers should distinguish on the mark sheet between an attempt that is awarded no marks ('0') and a question that is not attempted ('—'). A check-sum should be computed for each line according to the instructions provided.
5. The supplied mark sheets should tally exactly with the scripts from the examination, taking into account blank cover sheets from candidates who have attempted no questions. Misdirected scripts should be returned immediately, and extra scripts should be marked and drawn to the attention of the Examiners.
6. Markers should keep a copy of the completed mark sheet.
7. Markers should send to the Examiners a brief report on the performance of candidates on each question and on the subject overall. This report will be used in the classification process and in compiling the Examiners' report.