

**Oxford University Department of Computer Science**  
**Undergraduate Supervisory Committee**

**Examination Conventions for Preliminary Examinations 2018**

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

- Preliminary Examination in Computer Science
- Preliminary Examination in Computer Science and Philosophy
- Preliminary Examination in Mathematics and Computer Science

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.

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 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 Committee or the Proctors.

## **1 Documentation**

Examiners should have access to the following documents. The Chairman 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 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 *examination papers* from the preceding two years.
6. The *Examiners' Reports* on these examinations, including the published tables of the percentage of candidates passing and getting distinctions.

## 2 Rubric

### Computer Science

The four papers for Computer Science Preliminary Examinations are:

- CS1 Functional Programming and Design & Analysis of Algorithms
- CS2 Imperative Programming
- CS3 Discrete Mathematics, Continuous Mathematics and Probability
- CS4 Digital Systems, Linear Algebra and Introduction to Formal Proof

Papers CS1 is of 3 hours' duration and contains eight questions (four on each constituent course); candidates may answer up to five questions, with no more than three questions from either half of the paper.

CS2 is of 3 hours' duration and contains eight questions (two on Part 1, three on each of Parts 2 and 3); candidates may answer up to five questions, with no more than two questions from each part of the paper

Paper CS3 is of 3 hours' duration and contains nine questions (three on each constituent course); candidates may answer up to five questions with at most two from each subject.

Paper CS4 is of 3 hours' duration and contains eight questions (three on Digital Systems, three on Linear Algebra and two on Introduction to Formal Proof); candidates may answer up to five questions with at most two from each subject.

### Mathematics and Computer Science

Mathematics & Computer Science candidates take five papers; CS1 and CS2 as described above, and also

- M1 Algebra
- M2 Analysis
- MCS3 Continuous Mathematics and Probability

Paper M1 is of 2.5 hours' duration and contains seven questions (four on Part A and three on Part B); candidates may answer up to five questions (three from Part A and two from Part B).

Paper M2 is of 2.5 hours' duration and contains seven questions (three on Part A, three on Part B and one on Part C); candidates may answer up to five questions (two from Part A, two from Part B and one from Part C).

Paper MCS3 will be of 2.5 hours' duration and contain six questions (3 on each constituent course); candidates should answer up to four questions.

### Computer Science and Philosophy

Computer Science and Philosophy candidates take five papers; CS1 and CS2 as described above, and also:

- CSP3 Discrete Mathematics and Probability

P1 Introduction to Philosophy

P2 Elements of Deductive Logic

Paper CSP3 is of 2.5 hours' duration and contains six questions (3 on each constituent course); candidates may answer up to four questions.

Paper P1 is of 3 hours' duration and contains twelve questions (six on Part A and six on Part B); candidates may answer up to four questions (at most three from part A and at most three from Part B).

Paper P2 will be of 3 hours' duration and contain typically seven or eight questions; candidates should answer up to four questions.

### **3 Setting the papers**

In setting the papers, Examiners should be guided by published syllabus and synopsis and the style of papers set in previous years, together with the Examiners' Reports and any specimen questions issued by the Faculty.

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.

Examiners and Assessors should attempt to set papers that do not require too much rescaling. Any rescaling function with a steep gradient has the effect of magnifying imperfections in the marking scheme. Experience has shown that often the raw marks spread the candidates out too much: this suggests that the easy parts should be made easier, and the harder parts made harder.

#### ***Protocol***

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

1. Questions on each subject within the paper 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.

#### ***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 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. As a guide, approximately 60% of each question should be of a straightforward nature, maybe containing a small amount of bookwork.

The marking scheme for each question should aim to ensure that weaker candidates can gain marks by answering the initial parts of the question, and stronger candidates can show the depth of their understanding in answering the later parts. All questions in Computer Science prelims

are marked out of 20. In Final Honour Schools that share papers with Computer Science prelims, questions are also marked out of 20.

The marking schemes should be approved by the Board of Examiners 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 qualitative criteria:

Distinction 14-20 marks	a completely or almost completely correct answer to the whole question.
Pass 8-13 marks	standard material substantially correct plus substantial progress on the other parts of the question.  or standard material substantially correct and some minor progress on the other parts of the question.
Fail 0-7 marks	Very poor and very limited answer.

Table 1: qualitative descriptors for questions.

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 in Annexe A is followed.

## 4 Marking and checking scripts

### *Marking*

The marker for each subject will normally be the Assessor appointed to set questions on that subject. 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.

The Chairman 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 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.

## 5 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.

Education Committee guidance is that scaling should be carried out so that:

- (i) The percentage of candidates awarded a distinction is not substantially out of line with those in other subjects across the divisions.
- (ii) The outcome in terms of bands of marks is consistent with the Examiners' evaluation of the performance of the candidates in relation to qualitative descriptors shown below in Table 2.

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.
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.
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.
Average at least 40 (minimum pass) The candidate shows reasonable understanding of at least part of the basic material and some skills in reasoning, deductive logic and problem-solving.
Average 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.
Average 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.

Table 2: Qualitative descriptors for classification

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 should inspect a sample of scripts. 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 40, 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;

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 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 for their practical work. Candidates who do not achieve a pass mark for their practical work may be deemed to have failed the examination.

<p><b>For Computer Science</b> Average-USM =</p>	<p>5 x USM for CS1 + 5 x USM for CS2 + 5 x USM for CS3 + 5 x USM for CS4) / 20</p>
<p><b>For Mathematics and Computer Science</b> Average-USM =</p>	<p>5 x USM for CS1 + 5 x USM for CS2 + 4 x USM for MCS3 + 5 x USM for M1 + 5 x USM for M2) / 24</p>



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. These marks should first be converted to numbers using the following scale:

S+	100
S	60
S-	20

Next, take a mean of the practical marks for each course (i.e. half paper). Finally, take a weighted mean of the practical marks for each course. 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.

### ***Late submission or failure to submit coursework***

Under the provisions permitted by the regulations, late submission of coursework (i.e. practical or 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%
More than 14 calendar days after the notice of non-submission	Fail

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

## **6 Progression**

Candidates who achieves at least a Pass in the Preliminary Examination may progress to the second year. Candidates who fail to achieve a Pass may resit the examination during the Long Vacation.



Candidates who fail one or two written papers may retake just those papers. Candidates who fail three or more written papers will be required to retake all written papers. The Preliminary Examination may be retaken on at most one occasion.

A student who does not pass the Preliminary Examination on the first or second attempt may not normally proceed to the second year.

## **7 Communication with candidates**

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

## **8 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 by Leanne Carveth.
- LaTeX source files for the papers (incorporating any corrections) are kept for the electronic archive.

## **Annexe A: Checklist for setting papers.**

1. Is the question on the syllabus, as defined by the Course Handbook?
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 weaker 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 ('—').
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.

## Appendix C: Faculty of Philosophy: marking conventions for Prelims / Mods

These marking conventions will be used by Philosophy examiners and assessors in marking work in philosophy for the First Public Examination. They apply for use in the academic year 2017-18 and will be reviewed each subsequent year.

### ***Conventions for essay work***

The following conventions will be used for marking essay work. The conventions use positive criteria (marked by “+”) and negative criteria (marked by “-”) in order to assign marks.

#### **Distinction (100-70)**

*100-80*

+ Answer displaying rigorous and independent thinking, a keen critical understanding of relevant material, transparent organisation and presentation, clear and precise expression, effective use of examples.

*79-70*

+ Answer demonstrating critical understanding of relevant material, transparent organisation and presentation, clear and precise expression, effective use of examples.

#### **Pass (69-40):**

*69-65*

+ Generally effective analysis and argumentation, demonstrating a good grasp of relevant material;

transparent organisation and presentation of material; general clarity of expression.

- Some infelicity in argumentation; analysis slightly lacking in depth or focus; or minor shortcomings

in choice, organisation or presentation of material.

*64-60*

+ Well-structured and generally satisfactory discussion, offering a mostly correct analysis of the

central arguments and themes.

- Some lapses in argumentation; somewhat pedestrian, unclear or imprecise writing; or deficiencies

in choice or organisation of material.

*59-50*

+ A structured answer offering analysis of some key aspects of the question; evidence of a good basic knowledge of relevant material.

- Incomplete answer to the question; significant lapses in argumentation or structure; poor presentation; significant gaps in knowledge of relevant material; and/or minor irrelevance.

49-40

+ Some evidence of knowledge of material relevant to question and of analytical or argumentative ability.

- Very limited answer; muddled argumentation; significant degree of irrelevance; and/or seriously flawed presentation.

**Fail (39-0)**

Generally, very poor quality work, showing little, if any, evidence of effective study or of analytical or argumentative skills; mostly, or wholly, irrelevant answer.

39-30

+ Some attempt to answer question; occasionally relevant material.

- Extremely limited and inadequate answer, for instance in note form; discussion largely (but not entirely) irrelevant.

29-0

Completely or almost completely irrelevant or ignorant answer; nothing or almost nothing written.

NB. Candidates should note that one of the commonest reasons for answers receiving poor marks is irrelevance. It is very important to direct your answer at the question which has actually been asked.

**Conventions for logic answers in Introduction to Philosophy**

These criteria will be used for marking logic work in the Introduction to Philosophy course for Prelims in PPE, PPL, PML, and PT, and for the Logic paper in Classics Mods. The criteria do **not** apply to work on the paper Elements of Deductive Logic.

Mark (on a scale 0-100)	Criterion
0-20	Question unattempted or virtually unattempted .
20-80	Marks in this range represent the fraction of the question that has been satisfactorily answered, ranging from 20 (question virtually unanswered) to 80 (entire question satisfactorily answered). Marks in this range will normally be given by applying the indicative mark scheme on the question (to obtain a mark between 0 and 25) and then mapping it to lie between 20 and 80. See below. NB: this is <i>not</i> a scaling. The great majority of marks given will lie in this range.
80-100	Entire question satisfactorily answered; clarity and elegance of candidate's work surpasses normal expectations; in the higher range, candidate demonstrates genuine originality in their approach, method and notation. Marks in this range will be given exceptionally rarely, on a par with marks in the 80+ range on essay questions

*Mapping of marks to the 20-80 range:*

<b>Mark on question</b>	<b>Mapped to</b>	<b>Mark on question</b>	<b>Mapped to</b>
0	20	13	52
1	22	14	56
2	25	15	60
3	27	16	64
4	30	17	67
5	32	18	68
6	34	19	70
7	37	20	72
8	39	21	73
9	42	22	75
10	44	23	77
11	46	24	78
12	49	25	80