

## Faculty of Philosophy

### Undergraduate Examinations Guidelines for Examiners and Assessors for Tripos Examinations 2023

#### I. PROCEDURE

##### **Chair of Examiners:**

There is one Chair of Examiners for all parts of the Tripos. The appointment is made by the General Board, on the nomination of the Faculty Board. It is the duty of the Chair of Examiners to provide agendas and minutes of the following meetings:

- a) Setting Tripos Papers meeting.
- b) Final meeting.

Copies of all these must be passed on to the Faculty Office.

##### **Internal Examiners and Assessors:**

Examiners and Assessors are appointed annually. Appointments are made by the General Board, on the nomination of the Faculty Board. Those who do not have experience of undergraduate examining are normally appointed as Assessors in the first instance. The University's eligibility criteria for examiners and assessor are found at:

<https://www.student-registry.admin.cam.ac.uk/examinations-further-guidance-staff/appointment-examiners-and-assessors/information-appointment>

The size of Boards of Examiners and Assessors varies with the number of students taking each part of the Tripos in a given year and is left to the discretion of the Faculty Board, in consultation with the Chair of Examiners. The Chair of Examiners also decides how to allocate papers among the appointed Examiners and Assessors. For all Parts of the Tripos, two individuals are responsible for each paper. In Part IA, one of the two individuals acts as marker, the other as moderator; in Parts IB and II, both individuals act as markers.

(For further details, see *Marking Exam Scripts* below.)

##### **External Examiners:**

There are three external examiners, one for each part of the Tripos. External examiners are appointed for one year at a time but following the first year of appointment an external examiner may be re-appointed for up to two more years. The University's eligibility criteria for external examiners are found at:

<https://www.student-registry.admin.cam.ac.uk/examinations-further-guidance-staff/appointment-examiners-and-assessors/information-appointment>

Appointments are made by the General Board, on the nomination of the Faculty Board.

##### *Duties of External Examiners*

- a) External examiners are invited, but not required, to attend the Setting Meeting in the Lent Term. Whether or not the external examiner is able to attend the meeting, she/he will be sent all typed up draft papers after the setting meeting and asked to comment on them. It is the responsibility of the Chair of Examiners in consultation with other appropriate examiners to finalize papers in the light of the external examiners' comments.
- b) External examiners will normally come to Cambridge for the final Examiners' Meeting, arriving shortly after the conclusion of the Reconciliation meeting. The duties of the external examiner during this period are described later in this document.
- c) External examiners will attend and contribute to the final meeting of Examiners and sign the Class Lists.

##### **Induction Meetings:**

Once all examiners and assessors have been appointed, the Chair of Examiners holds meetings with all new examiners and assessors in order to go over the guidelines, marking scheme and classing criteria. The first briefing meeting is normally held in January with a further meeting to discuss marking standards after the end of Lent Term (before the beginning of the examinations).

Brief reports of these meetings are completed by the Chair, giving details of who has attended, and any specific problems encountered. The Reports should be passed to the Faculty Office.

New examiners and assessors are required to attend these meetings.

### **Setting Tripos Papers:**

a) Early in the Lent Term (once the first list of candidates has been received from the Student Registry), the Chair of Examiners allocates two examiners for each paper. The two examiners bear equal responsibility for marking the paper assigned to them.

b) In early January, the Chair writes to **all** lecturers whose courses are listed in the Lecture List and invites them to suggest Tripos questions. This should include lecturers for papers borrowed from other faculties, who should make appropriate suggestions for the General Paper.

c) Once the suggested questions have been received, the Chair of Examiners passes them on to those responsible for setting the paper(s). The two setters for a paper should meet to produce a draft examination paper in advance of the Setting meeting. They should take account of the questions suggested by lecturers, the syllabus in the Guide to Courses, and past exam papers. They are asked to consult the previous two years of exam papers (which are available on the philosophy web page). The Chair also asks them to suggest questions for the General Papers. These questions may be drawn from all areas of the syllabus, including (e.g.) papers set by the Classics Faculty or HPS, but not Experimental Psychology if in Part IB.

d) Examiners must take care to make it clear in non-text papers if they expect students to refer to the work of particular people, for example by using a formula such as 'Discuss with reference to X's view'. To avoid confusion, examiners should not attribute quotations they set for discussion on non-text papers unless they intend the question to be about the author's views as opposed to the views of which the quotation happens to be a succinct expression.

e) During the Lent Term, the Chair arranges a Setting meeting of examiners and assessors, to agree drafts of all Tripos papers. The main business is to check the papers in order to ensure that questions are clear, that questions do not overlap within or between papers, that the syllabus is covered, and that papers take account of the lectures given during the year. After the Setting meeting typed up draft papers are sent for comment to the relevant external examiner. It is the responsibility of the Chair of Examiners, in consultation with other appropriate examiners, to finalize papers in the light of the external examiners' comments.

*(Agenda and minutes required.)*

### **Starting Exams:**

**For in-person exams only:** At the start of each Tripos examination, an examiner (normally one of the two who have set the paper concerned) attends for the first twenty minutes in order to answer questions put by candidates where this is appropriate. A gown must be worn.

### **Marking Exam Scripts:**

In all parts of the Tripos, students are allocated candidate numbers to preserve their anonymity.

#### *At Part IA*

Immediately after each examination, scripts are forwarded to the examiner who marks them and passes them on to the moderator.

Each examiner and moderator records an overall mark for each paper (see Section III of this document). Mark sheets are supplied by the Faculty Office for this purpose. Examiners may draw attention to any script they have found particularly difficult to assess.

The role of the moderator is to help in the assessment of difficult scripts and to ensure that the overall standard applied for the paper is correct. The moderator reads between one fifth and one quarter of the scripts for the paper, which are singled out by the examiner for that paper; scripts with a failing mark must be included. The moderator records an overall mark for each script read.

It is the responsibility of the Chair to select scripts to be read by each of the external examiners. These

will include all failures, and a range of disputed and borderline cases.

#### *At Parts IB and II*

Immediately after each examination, scripts are forwarded to both examiners / assessors for that paper. All markers record an overall mark for each paper (see section III of this document). Mark sheets are supplied by the Faculty Office for this purpose. Markers may draw attention to any script they have found particularly difficult to assess.

Each script is independently marked by two markers, who do not consult one another before the Reconciliation meeting, except with the agreement of the Chair of Examiners. Examiners submit their marks to the Chair before the Reconciliation meeting. The Faculty Secretary then transfers the marks to the final mark book.

#### **SpLD Candidates**

**Candidates with specific learning disabilities are marked with 'D' on the marking grids. The Faculty's policy on such candidates is not to penalize minor errors of spelling and wording. This applies to written examinations only (i.e. not to extended essays and dissertations).**

#### **Marking Submitted Essays and Dissertations:** *(Part IB and Part II)*

Submitted Essays (Parts IB and II) and Dissertations (Part II) are marked anonymously. Candidates use their candidate number.

**Extended essays and dissertations that are irrelevant to the approved title will incur the same penalty as irrelevance in sat Tripos exams.**

Extended Essays are handed in at the end of the Lent Term and Dissertations by the second Friday of the Easter Term. Extended Essays and Dissertations are available for marking shortly after they have been handed in. Examiners are expected to mark them before Tripos examinations start.

#### **Reconciliation/Moderation Meetings:**

All markers should attend this meeting, unless given leave by the Chair to conduct the necessary business remotely.

The Chair identifies those cases where (i) two examiners have given a paper sharply divergent marks, (ii) where smaller disagreements may affect the overall class of a candidate, or (iii) where despite a lack of disagreements a candidate sits on an important borderline.

At the Reconciliation/Moderation Meeting examiners and moderators (IA) or pairs of examiners (Parts IB and II) are invited to discuss these cases and to produce an agreed mark if possible. Examiners will therefore find it helpful to make notes on every question of every script as they are marking. Examiners who discuss mark disagreements should produce a brief statement of the reasons for any significant continued disagreement to assist the third examiner if consideration of the case is required.

#### **Reconciliation Meeting (Parts IB and II)**

In the event that the raw marks from the markers are not the same, we use three methods to arrive at a final mark.

1) If the disagreement is small and could not affect the candidate's class, the raw marks are averaged.

*Example A:* if the two raw marks are 64 and 66, the final mark is given as 65.

*Example B:* if the two raw marks are 65 and 66, the final mark is given as 65.5.

*Example C:* if the two raw marks are 68.5 and 67, the final mark is given as 67.75.

Note that raw marks can only contain half marks in the case of extended essays (see Section III, point 2, of this document). This is the only circumstance when a quarter or three-quarter mark could arise in

the final mark.

2) If not, then at the Reconciliation Meeting the two markers discuss their disagreement and attempt to reach an agreed mark. (If the disagreement is very large, skip this and go straight to 3.)

3) If the markers cannot reach an agreement, or if the disagreement is very large, they make notes explaining the nature of the disagreement. These notes are passed to a third marker. This is usually the External Examiner, but internal examiners (including the Chair of Examiners) may also be used at the discretion of the Chair of Examiners. The third marker re-reads the script and recommends a final mark, which may be at any point in the range between the two raw marks (including the endpoints). This final mark is proposed, with reasons, at the Final Meeting.

The Chair of Examiners decides what is to count as a “large” or “very large” disagreement in the light of the overall incidence of disagreements.

### Moderation Meeting (Part IA)

In Part IA each paper is allocated a marker and a moderator.

The marker, after marking the whole batch, chooses the 10% that seem most problematic and labels them "P" on the mark sheet. Any failing script *must* be regarded as problematic. Other reasons to regard a script as problematic include illegibility; irrelevance; shortness; mixtures of very poor and very good features (e.g. good ideas badly expressed).

Then from among the non-problematic scripts the marker selects the highest, the lowest, those on the class boundaries and those most clearly in the middle of each class boundary, one for each class in which a script falls. The marker should label each such script 'N' on the mark sheet.

Markers and moderators should use a marker/moderator form (provided) to record (briefly) the results of any changes made to marks in light of moderation.

Moderators should clearly distinguish in their activities between 'P' scripts that they are looking at because the first marker is unsure of them, and 'N' scripts sampled for moderation purpose. If there are significant disagreements between marker and moderator with 'N' scripts, then the moderator should sample more scripts around the same grade boundary as the contested script to ascertain whether there is a calibration problem with marks at that level.

If a script has been chosen for calibration, rather than singled out for second marking, the moderator should only make changes to the mark if there is a substantial disagreement, and only then after sampling other scripts in the same grading region to see whether there is a general problem.

In the case of the P scripts, the second mark is treated in the same way as in Parts IB and II. (I.e. it is entered on the marksheet and, if the two markers differ, reconciled in accordance with the procedure described under “Reconciliation” above.)

In the case of N scripts, the purpose of the second marking is only to assess whether the first marker has applied appropriate standards generally. So it is not entered in the marksheet and any differences between the markers are used only as a basis for a discussion at the reconciliation meeting about whether the first marker's marks need to be scaled across the board. In the case of the Logic paper, the marker should also forward to the moderator the marking scheme used for the formal questions, which will also be part of this discussion.

### **Final Meeting:**

The Chair of Examiners is responsible for arranging the final examiners' meeting. All examiners must attend this meeting unless special dispensation has been given by the Vice-Chancellor. Assessors do not normally attend the final meeting.

Classes of candidates are usually decided in order of their average mark. Cases which are not in doubt are decided in blocks, but borderline candidates are always discussed individually.

Candidate numbers are decoded only after the class list has been agreed.

At the end of the meeting examiners will have an opportunity to consider any recommendations they may wish to make to the Faculty Board concerning the conduct of future examinations. After the meeting, the Chair submits the class lists, as agreed, and signed by all examiners, to the Board of Examinations. The final class list is the responsibility of all the examiners.

*(Agenda and minutes required.)*

**Examiners' Reports on Individual Papers:**

The first examiner for each paper, consulting with the second examiner (or, in the case of Part IA, the examiner, consulting with the moderator), writes a report on the performance in that paper. Examiners are expected to make overall comments, **and comments on the answers to individual questions** or at least state how many candidates answered each individual question. After Faculty Board has considered individual reports, they will be made available to students. Examiners may also make confidential comments for the attention of the Faculty Board only.

The Faculty Office will send out a reminder about submitting reports, providing the link to the relevant webpage.

All reports are considered by the Faculty Board at its October meeting and once approved are placed online.

**Reports by Chair of Examiners:**

The Chair of Examiners writes a report on the overall conduct and standard of the examination. These are also considered by the Faculty Board at its October meeting, and made available thereafter for consultation by students.

**Reports by External Examiners:**

The main role of External Examiners is to ensure that examination and assessment procedures are fair and fairly operated, and that the standards applied are comparable with those of institutions of a similar academic level. The General Board issues guidelines covering the arrangements for External Examiners. Each external examiner is required to write a report for the Vice-Chancellor. The University's Education Committee then forwards these reports to the Faculty, asking it to respond to any points raised. The reports are considered by the Faculty Board in October, together with all the other reports, and changes are made where appropriate. The Guidelines for Examiners are revised annually to take account of any changes to examining procedures agreed by the Faculty Board.

The University recommends that external examiners reports are released in full to students except where they contain information of a 'confidential nature'. The Secretary of the Faculty Board writes to each external examiner asking for permission to make their reports, or an edited version, available to students.

## **Data Retention Policy**

All Examiners and Assessors should note the Faculty's Data Retention Policy and handle information connected to the examinations accordingly.

The following policy applies to the examinations forming the Philosophy Tripos, Parts IA, IB and II.

Routinely available data:

<i>Data</i>	<i>Retention period</i>	<i>Accessible through:</i>
<b>Final Mark Book</b> Overall numerical marks for each individual paper, as agreed by the Board of Examiners at their final meeting. (More detailed breakdowns of marks are <b>not</b> available.)	Indefinitely	<b>College Director of Studies or Senior Tutor's Office or Faculty Contact</b>

Data available on request in writing only:

<i>Data</i>	<i>Retention period</i>	<i>Accessible in writing through:</i>
<b>Minutes of final examiners' meetings</b>	<b>Indefinitely</b>	<b>Faculty Contact</b>
<b>Examiners' raw marks</b>	<b>One month after publication of the Class List</b>	<b>Faculty Contact</b>

**Chair of Examiners**  
Prof Arif Ahmed  
Email: ama24@cam.ac.uk

Faculty of Philosophy  
Raised Faculty Building  
Sidgwick Site  
Cambridge CB3 9DA

**Faculty Contact**  
Ms Eleanor Hammersley  
Email: ekh46@cam.ac.uk

Faculty of Philosophy  
Raised Faculty Building  
Sidgwick Site  
Cambridge CB3 9DA

Release of data under this policy does **not** constitute a formal subject access request under data protection legislation. Formal requests for access to all other personal data should be directed to the University's Information Compliance Office (<https://www.information-compliance.admin.cam.ac.uk/data-protection/subject-access-request>)

Information Compliance Officer  
Registry's Office  
The Old Schools  
Trinity Lane Cambridge CB2 1TN  
Tel. 01223 764142  
e-mail: data.protection @admin.cam.ac.uk

**The Faculty adheres to the University's policy covering aspects of examinations and examinations data. There is no requirement under the data protection legislation to release examinations scripts to candidates, and therefore no requirement for Faculties to return scripts to candidates.**

## II. GRADE DESCRIPTORS

In all these grade descriptors, evaluative terms like 'deficiencies' and 'strengths' should be interpreted relative to the Part being examined. For instance, the standard for 'extensive advanced knowledge' (as stated in the Upper Second higher range descriptor) should be higher at Part II than it is at Part IA.

### **Fail, lower range [0 to 9]**

Work in this category shows no attempt to answer the question set.

### **Fail, higher range [10 to 39]**

Work in this category shows an attempt to answer the question set. It may display some basic knowledge of the topic. Yet it is almost wholly inaccurate, incoherent, completely lacking in detail, completely disorganized, lacking any breadth of reference or almost completely unfocused on the wording of the question set. Work at the lower end of this category will have more than one of these defects.

### **Third, lower range [40 to 44]**

Work in this category shows some basic knowledge of the topic. Yet it displays extensive serious deficiencies in terms of its accuracy, coherence, detail, organisation, appropriate breadth of reference, or focus on the wording of the question set.

### **Third, higher range [45 to 49]**

Work in this category shows some basic knowledge of the topic. Yet it displays some serious deficiencies in terms of its accuracy, coherence, detail, organisation, appropriate breadth of reference, or focus on the wording of the question set.

### **Lower second, lower range [50 to 54]**

Work in this category shows extensive basic knowledge of the topic. Yet it also shows extensive deficiencies in terms of its accuracy, coherence, detail organisation, appropriate breadth of reference, or focus on the wording of the question set. However, a significant proportion of what is written does apply relevant information and argumentation to the question set. Achieving this mark on a question therefore signifies that the candidate has firm control of at least some of the essential points.

### **Lower second, higher range [55 to 59]**

Work in this category shows extensive basic knowledge of the topic. Yet it also shows some deficiencies in terms of its accuracy, coherence, detail, organisation, appropriate breadth of reference, or focus on the wording of the question set. But a significant proportion of what is written does apply relevant information and argumentation to the question set. Achieving this mark on a question therefore signifies that the candidate has firm control of most of the essential points.

### **Upper second, lower range [60 to 64]**

Work in this category shows extensive basic knowledge of the topic and some advanced knowledge of the topic. It shows some strengths, and few deficiencies, in terms of its accuracy, coherence, detail, organization, appropriate breadth of reference; and it is closely focused on the wording of the question set.

### **Upper second, higher range [65 to 69]**

Work in this category shows extensive advanced knowledge of the topic. It shows strengths in most of the following areas: accuracy, coherence, detail, organization, appropriate breadth of reference; and it is closely focused on the wording of the question set. In addition, work in this category will normally contain a detailed and broad-based engagement with the relevant material.

### **First, lower range [70 to 74]**

Work in this category shows all the merits of higher range Upper second class work. Yet it goes beyond such work in terms of the range of relevant material that it discusses and also in its level of precision or clarity or sophistication of argument.

**First, middle range [75 to 79]**

Work in this category shows excellent command of the topic. It shows strengths in all of the following areas: accuracy, coherence, detail, organization, appropriate breadth of reference; and it is closely focused on the wording of the question set. It goes beyond higher range Upper Second class work in terms of the range of relevant material that it discusses and also in its level of precision or clarity or sophistication of argument.

**First, higher range [80 to 85]**

Work in this category shows all the merits of middle range First class work. Work in this category will also approach the question set from an unexpected angle, or will contain unusually elegant, illuminating, or original passages; in addition to at least one of the last two qualities, it may also be especially well illustrated in a relevant fashion.

**General paper**

*A special issue arises with respect to the General paper for Parts IB and II, where candidates are given a number of short titles rather than specific questions. The intention is that candidates should in effect set their own question within the area (or one of the areas) indicated by the title and should set it with a view to the fact that they have 4000 words in which to answer it. Work which does not fall within any reasonable interpretation of the title incurs the same penalties as does irrelevant work in other papers.*

**Recycled Material**

The Tripos Examination aims to test the breadth as well as the depth of candidates' knowledge. Accordingly, candidates should in general not receive additional credit for material already submitted for examination.

Obviously, this rule cannot be completely hard and fast. For instance, an argument that is well known in one area of the subject certainly merits credit when reused in some novel and interesting connection. However, the rule does apply if in the examiners' judgment a candidate is using essentially the same content to make essentially the same point.

The intention is also that the rule be applied proportionately. Clearly then the reuse of, say, a few sentences cannot invalidate the answer where they reappear. And it is also acceptable for a student to report in one essay a point or argument from another, as a premise for then continuing and expanding on that idea. Examiners are asked (as always) to use their judgement, to ensure that withholding of marks only applies to cases of substantial recycling.



### III. CLASSING CRITERIA

1. In all parts of the Tripos, each paper carries equal weight, subject to two exceptions
  - a) In Part IA, Paper 5 (Formal Methods) carries only half the weight of the other four papers. (This is reflected in clause 6a, below.)
  - b) In Part IB, Paper 8 (Experimental Psychology) is worth double the weight of the other papers. (This is reflected in clause 6b, below).

2. Each candidate is given a single mark for each of their examined papers, extended essays, and dissertations. This single mark is based upon the raw marks supplied by the markers (see discussion of Reconciliation Meeting in Section I of this document), who will follow the guidelines in Section II of this document.

For dissertations and the General Paper, markers will directly award a raw mark to a candidate, and report this directly to the Faculty Office.

For subject papers, markers should mark each question separately. To calculate a raw mark, they should take the average (rounded to the *nearest integer*) of the individual marks a candidate receives for each question. This raw mark is then reported to the Faculty Office.

*Example: if a marker awards 74, 65 and 72 for a candidate's three essays, the marker should report a single raw mark of 70 for that candidate.*

For extended essays, markers should mark both essays separately. They should then report *both* marks to the Faculty Office. The four marks (two marks per essay) are given equal weight in calculating the final mark. (Ordinarily, a marker's raw mark for a candidate's extended essays is the *unrounded* average of the two marks for the two essays. However, since supervisors are not permitted to mark their supervisees' work, there may be cases when a single candidate needs to have three or four markers for their essays.)

*Example: if a marker gives marks of 74 and 67 for a candidates' two essays, the marker should report both marks, and the raw mark from that marker will be 70.5.*

3. Students submitting extended essays and dissertations must upload these documents (and any impact statement) onto Moodle in accordance with instructions from the Faculty Office. Notwithstanding the use of Turnitin, any examiner or assessor who has reason to suspect plagiarism in submitted work should contact the Chair of Examiners immediately. For the Faculty's policy on plagiarism see: <https://www.phil.cam.ac.uk/files/plagiarism.pdf>

4. Examiners are reminded that the (normal) practice of averaging marks for individual questions to arrive at a mark for a paper, and then averaging the various marks for all the papers to arrive at a final overall mark, will tend to compress those final marks into a relatively narrow band. If the spread of final marks is to reflect the spread in the examination performances, then the full range of marks for individual questions, as described in the grade descriptors, should be regularly used. Markers are reminded in particular of the great importance of not disadvantaging Cambridge undergraduates by being grudging with first-class marks for any part of the Tripos. While examiners may reasonably wish to resist grade-inflation, first-class work should be clearly marked as such.

5. Markers may annotate their mark if they wish, thus: 's.w.' for a script containing short work, '\*\*' for a script containing some work significantly better than the mark would otherwise suggest, and '?' to indicate a doubt, e.g., over relevance. Incomplete answers will be penalised.

#### 6. Procedure for agreeing marks at the final meeting

a) At Part IA, the Formal Methods paper (Paper 5) carries half the weight of the other four papers. So, a student's overall mark at Part IA is given by this formula:

$$[2 \cdot (P1 + P2 + P3 + P4) + P5] / 9, \text{ rounded to one decimal place}$$

where  $P_n$  is their agreed final mark for Paper  $n$ ,

*Example: if a student respectively receives marks of 63, 67, 68, 71, 70 for Papers 1–5, their overall mark shall be 67.6.*

b) At Parts IB and II, a student's overall mark is the average of their marks in the individual papers, rounded to one decimal place, unless they have taken Part IB Experimental Psychology. If the student has taken Part IB Experimental Psychology, the mark recorded for that paper will be the numerical mark received from NST, and the student's overall mark is given by this formula:

$[Pa + Pb + Pc + 2 \cdot \text{Exp}] / 5$ , rounded to one decimal place

where Exp is the mark received from NST for Experimental Psychology, and Pa, Pb and Pc are the agreed final marks for the student's other three (Philosophy) papers,

*Example:* if a Part IB or Part II student (not taking Experimental Psychology) receives marks of 64.5, 66, 67.25, 70, and 70.5, their overall mark shall be 67.7.

*Example:* if a Part IB student receives a mark of 64 in Experimental Psychology, and marks of 64.5, 68 and 72 in their three Philosophy papers, their overall mark shall be 66.5.

c) In deciding the **overall class**, decisions should follow the following rule, as applied to the *overall mark* (as calculated above):

3rd = 40+; 2.ii = 50+; 2.i = 60+; 1 = 68.5+.

This rule is subject to the following modifications:

i) The examiners have discretion to award a mark of distinction ('starred first') to candidates whose scripts exhibit the qualities of first-class answers to an exceptional degree.

ii) A candidate shall receive a first-class mark overall only if their **overall mark** is at least 68.5, **and** at least two papers are first class papers (i.e., they received a final agreed mark of at least 70)

In applying this rule: both Part IB Experimental Psychology and Part IA Formal Methods counts as a *single* paper (despite their different weights in calculating a student's overall mark).

(iii) The Final Meeting will then draw up the class list. Classes of candidates are usually decided in order of their average mark. Cases which are not in doubt are decided in blocks, but borderline candidates are always discussed individually. If a borderline candidate has submitted an impact statement along with any coursework then the examiners should take it into consideration at this point.

d) **For Part II only:**

Following all decisions on all Part II marks and classes, the Part II meeting will allocate a consolidated Tripos mark and class.

The Philosophy Faculty agreed in 2020 that the consolidated mark will be calculated as a weighted sum of the paper marks as follows:

Part IB papers weighted at 30%

Part II papers weighted at 70%

Following agreement by the Faculty Board in 2021, the consolidated class is then determined in accordance with 6c except that instead of 6c(ii) we apply the rule that for a first at least TWO papers at Part II are first-class papers by normal standards i.e.,  $\geq 70$ .

(e) In cases where a candidate is moved from one class to another as a result of applying the rules in 6c or 6d, their recorded overall mark shall remain unchanged.

A candidate's recorded overall performance in the examination shall be their assigned class *and* their recorded overall mark.

## **Student Administration and Records**

(Grade Roster/HEFCE Requirements for Student Records)

Student Records and Statistics are required to provide to all students a written transcript of their academic achievements. The marks reported for each candidate shall be their numerical mark for each paper, their numerical average mark overall, and their overall class mark and if applicable, their consolidated Tripos mark and class.

Professor Alexander Bird

Chair of the Faculty of Philosophy

March 2023