1. INTRODUCTION

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, a progression decision and/or classification of an award.

These conventions apply to the Final Honours School in Materials, Economics & Management for the academic year 2017-18. The E(M)EM Standing Committee is responsible for approving the Conventions and considers these annually, in consultation with the examiners. The formal procedures determining the conduct of examinations are established and enforced by the University Proctors. These Conventions are a guide to the examiners and candidates but the regulations set out in the Examination Regulations have precedence. Normally the relevant Regulations and Course Handbook are the editions published in the year in which the candidate embarked on the FHS programme. The Examination Regulations may be found at: http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/.

The paragraphs below indicate the conventions to which the examiners usually adhere, subject to the guidance of the appointed external examiners, and other bodies such as the E(M)EM Standing Committee, the Academic Committee in the Department of Materials, the Mathematical, Physical and Life Sciences Division, the Social Sciences Division, the Education Committee of the University and the Proctors who may offer advice or make recommendations to examiners.

The Materials examiners are nominated by the Nominating Committee of the Department of Materials and those nominations are submitted for approval by the Vice-Chancellor and the Proctors. Formally, examiners act on behalf of the University and in this role are independent of the Department of Materials, the colleges and of those who teach the MEM M.Eng. programme. However, for written papers on Materials Science examiners are expected to consult with course lecturers in the process of setting questions.

2. RUBRICS AND STRUCTURE FOR INDIVIDUAL PAPERS

Part II candidates take one compulsory Materials Options paper and one paper from a range of Management and Economics options.

Materials Papers:

The Materials Options paper in Part II is set by lecturers of the option courses and two examiners, the examiners acting as checkers.

The Materials examiners, in consultation with lecturers, produce complete model answers for every question set, including a clear allocation of marks for each part or sub-part of every question. These are annotated to indicate what is considered ‘book-work’, what is considered to be ‘new material’ requiring candidates to extend ideas from what has been covered explicitly in the course, and what is considered to be somewhere in between. This enables the examiners to identify how much of the question is accessible to less strong candidates and the extent to which the question has the potential to differentiate among the very best candidates. The marking scheme for each question aims to ensure that weaker candidates can gain marks by answering some parts of the question, and stronger candidates can show the depth of their understanding in answering other parts. The wording and content of all examination questions set, and the model answers, are scrutinised by all examiners, including, in particular, the external examiners. The marking schemes are approved by the examining board alongside the papers.

Materials Examiners check that questions are of a consistent difficulty within each paper and between Materials papers.

The Materials Option paper comprises one section for each twelve-hour Options lecture course, each section containing two questions: candidates are required to answer one question from each of any three sections and a fourth question drawn from any one of the same three sections. The maximum

* for the 2017-18 examinations the Nominating Committee comprised Prof. Grant & Dr Taylor.
number of marks available on the option paper is 100, and all questions carry equal marks. Questions are often divided into parts, with the marks for each part indicated on the question paper.

For the Materials papers in Part II, the only types of calculators that may be used in examinations are from the following series:

- CASIO fx-83
- CASIO fx-85
- SHARP EL-531

Candidates are required to clear any user-entered data or programmes from memories immediately before the exam begins. The examiners may inspect any calculator during the course of an exam.

**Economics and Management papers:**

Below are the links to both subjects’ WebLearn sites where further details relating to individual papers can be found:

Economics
Management

The Economics and Management papers are set by examiners nominated respectively by the Economics Faculty and the Saïd Business School. Candidates are advised to read particularly carefully the specific instructions on the front of each paper as to the number of questions they should submit, since the rubrics on Economics and Management papers differ slightly from those for the Materials papers.

**3. MARKING CONVENTIONS**

**3.1 University scale for standardised expression of agreed final marks**

Agreed final marks for individual papers will be expressed using the following scale: 0-100.

**3.2 Qualitative criteria for different types of assessment**

For the Materials assessments, qualitative descriptors, based on those used across the Mathematical, Physical and Life Sciences Division, are detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Qualitative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70-100</td>
<td>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. The higher the mark in this band the greater will be the extent to which these criteria will be fulfilled; for marks in the 90-100 range there will be no more than a very small fraction, circa 5-10%, of the piece of work being examined that does not fully meet all of the criteria that are applicable to the type of work under consideration. The ‘piece of work’ might be, for example, an individual practical report, a question on a written paper, or a whole written paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>The candidate shows good or very good problem-solving skills, and good or very good knowledge of much of the material over a wide range of topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>The candidate shows basic problem-solving skills and adequate knowledge of most of the material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-29</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Economics and Management papers, please refer to both subjects’ WebLearn sites where further details relating to individual papers can be found:

Economics
Management

3.3 Verification and reconciliation of marks

Materials Written Papers:
During the marking process the scripts of all written papers remain anonymous to the markers. The markers are guided by the model answers.

All scripts are double marked, blind, by the setter and the checker each awarding an integer mark for each question. After individual marking the two examiners meet to agree marks question by question. If the differences in marks are small (~10% of the maximum available for the question, 2-3 marks for most questions), the two marks are averaged, with no rounding applied. Otherwise the examiners identify the discrepancy and read the answer again, either in whole or in part, to reconcile the differences. If after this process the examiners still cannot agree, they seek the help of the Chairman, or another examiner as appropriate, to adjudicate. An integer total mark for each paper is awarded, where necessary rounding up to achieve this.

The Materials Options paper is marked by course lecturers acting as assessors and a Materials examiner acting as a checker.

The Materials external examiners provide an independent check on the whole process of setting and marking.

Economics & Management Written Papers:
Please refer to both subjects’ WebLearn sites where further details relating to individual papers can be found:

Economics
Management

Coursework

(1) 4th Year Management Project

The management project is allocated a maximum of 200 marks and is marked by the Saïd Business School.

The projects are assessed and graded independently by two Assessors. The supervisor’s comments on the performance of the candidate are provided to the Assessors. The marks provided by the Assessors are moderated by an Examiner, and the final mark is ratified by the Board of Examiners.

The process is:

- Supervisors provide a report on the performance of the student, indicating any special circumstances that could have affected the student’s performance on the project and report preparation.
- The project reports are graded blind by two Assessors, taking account of the Supervisor’s comments. At least one of the Assessors will have knowledge of the area of the project.
- The Supervisor’s report, and Assessors’ reports and marks are provided to an Examiner, who moderates the marks and provides a final mark for ratification by the Board of Examiners.
- Supervisors may not act as Assessor or Examiner for a project they have supervised.

An Assessor may also act as Examiner for a project. The Assessor should assess and mark the report before having sight of the other Assessor’s report and marks.

3.4 Scaling

Written Papers

As the total number of MEM students is small, it is not unusual for mean marks to vary from paper to paper, or year to year. It is not therefore normal practice to adjust marks to fit any particular distribution.
Materials Papers:

Where marks for papers are unusually high or low, the examiners may, having reviewed the difficulty of the paper set or other circumstances, decide with the agreement of the external examiners to adjust all marks for those papers. Such adjustment is referred to as ‘scaling’. The normal procedure for ‘scaling’ of the Materials written papers will be as follows:

(a) Papers with a mean taken over all candidates of less than 55% or more than 75% are normally adjusted to bring the mean respectively up to 55% or down to 75%. Normally this is achieved by adding/subtracting the same fixed number of marks to/from each candidate’s score for the paper.

(b) For papers with a mean in the ranges either of 55-60% or 70-75%, including those scaled under (a) above, the questions and typical answers are compared in order to ascertain, with the help of the external examiners, whether the marks are a fair reflection of the performance of the candidates as measured against the class descriptors. If not, the marks are adjusted. Normally this is achieved by adding/subtracting the same fixed number of marks to/from each candidate’s score for the question or for the paper.

(c) The mean mark and the distribution of marks, both taken over all written papers, are considered, again with the help of the external examiners, in order to ascertain whether these overall marks are a fair reflection of the performance of the candidates as measured against the class descriptors. If not, the overall marks are adjusted. Normally this is achieved by adding/subtracting the same fixed number of marks to/from each candidate’s overall score.

Economics and Management Papers:

Please refer to both subjects’ WebLearn sites where further details relating to individual papers can be found:

Economics
Management

In deciding what ‘scaling’, if any, to apply normally the examiners will take into account the following additional information:

(a) For each paper, comments from the MEM examiners representing the Economics or Management Faculty as appropriate

(b) The performance of the MEM cohort on the other Economics and Management papers

(c) The performance of the MEM cohort on the Materials papers

3.5 Short-weight convention and departure from rubric

Materials Written Papers

The rubric on each paper indicates a prescribed number of answers required (e.g. “candidates are required to submit answers to no more than five questions”). Candidates will be asked to indicate on their cover sheet which questions, up to the prescribed number, they are submitting for marking. If the cover slip is not completed then the examiners will mark the questions in numerical order by question number. If the candidate lists more than the prescribed number of questions then questions will be marked in the order listed until the prescribed number has been reached. The examiners will NOT mark questions in excess of the prescribed number. If fewer questions than the prescribed number are attempted, (i) each missing attempt will be assigned a mark of zero, (ii) for those questions that are attempted no marks beyond the maximum per question indicated under section 2 above will be awarded and (iii) the mark for the paper will still be calculated out of 100. In addition, for the Materials Options Papers, as per the rubric, the examiners will mark questions from only three sections. Should a candidate attempt questions from more than three sections the examiners will mark those questions from the first three sections in the order listed by the candidate on the cover slip. If the cover slip is not completed then the examiners will mark the sections in alphabetical order by section delineator (section A, section B, etc.).

Economics and Management Written Papers:

Please refer to both subjects’ WebLearn sites where further details relating to individual papers can be found:

Economics
Management
3.6 Late- or non-submission of elements of coursework

Including action to be taken if submission has been or will be affected by illness or other urgent cause, and circumstances in which academic penalties may be applied.

The Examination Regulations prescribe specific dates and times for submission of the required elements of coursework to the Examiners (1. A set of nine reports of practical work as specified in the Course Handbook (normally each individual report within the set has been marked already as the laboratory course progresses - penalties for late submission of an individual practical report are prescribed in the Course Handbook and are applied prior to any additional penalties incurred under the provision of the present Conventions.); 2. A Team Design Project Report and associated oral presentation; 3. A set of four Industrial Visit Reports as specified in the course handbook; and 4. A Part II Management Project). Rules governing late submission of these four elements of coursework and any consequent penalties are set out in the ‘Late submission and non-submission of a thesis or other written exercise’ clause of the ‘Regulations for the Conduct of University Examinations’ section of the Examination Regulations (Part 14, ‘Late Submission, Non-submission, Non-appearance and Withdrawal from Examinations’ in the 2017/18 Regulations). A candidate who fails to submit an element of coursework by a prescribed date and time will be notified of this by means of an email sent on behalf of the Chair of Examiners.

Under the provisions permitted by the regulation, late submission of an element of coursework, as defined above, for Materials, Economics and Management examinations will normally result in one of the following:

(a) Under paras 14.4 to 14.9. In a case where illness or other urgent cause has prevented or will prevent a candidate from submitting an element of coursework at the prescribed date, time and place the candidate may, through their college, request the Proctors to accept an application to this effect. In such circumstances the candidate is strongly advised to (i) carefully read paras 14.4 to 14.9 of the aforesaid Part 14, where the mandatory contents of such an application to the Proctors are outlined and the several possible actions open to the Proctors are set out, and (ii) both seek the guidance of their college Senior Tutor and inform at least one of their college Materials Tutorial Fellows. Some, but not all, of the actions open to the Proctors may result in the work being assessed as though it had been submitted on time (and hence with no late submission penalty applied).

(b) Under para 14.10. In the case of submission on the prescribed day for the submission but after the prescribed time on that day for the submission and without prior permission from the Proctors: a penalty of a reduction in the mark for the coursework in question of up to 10% of the maximum mark available for the piece of work, taking into account any circumstances communicated to the examiners by the Proctors should they approve a request by the candidate, submitted to the Proctors via the Senior Tutor of their college within five working days of notification of non-submission, that the examiners take into account the circumstances of the late submission.

(c) Under para 14.11. In the case of submission after the prescribed date for the submission and within 14 calendar days of notification of non-submission and without prior permission from the Proctors: subject to leave from the Proctors to impose an academic penalty, for the first day or part of the first day that the work is late a penalty of a reduction in the mark for the coursework in question of up to 10% of the maximum mark available for the piece of work and for each subsequent day or part of a day that the work is late a further penalty of up to 5% of the maximum mark available for the piece of work; the exact penalty to be set by the Examiners with due consideration given to the circumstances as advised by the Proctors. The reduction may not take the mark below 40%.

(d) Under Para 14.12. In the case of failure to submit within 14 calendar days of the notification of non-submission and without prior permission from the Proctors: a mark of zero shall be recorded for the element of coursework and normally the candidate will have failed Part I or II as appropriate of the Examination as a whole.

Where an element of coursework is not submitted or is proffered more than 14 days after notification of non-submission the Proctors may, exceptionally, under their general authority, and after (i) making due enquiries into the circumstances and (ii) consultation with the Chairman of the Examiners, permit the candidate to remain in the examination. In this case for the element of coursework in question (i) the Examiners will award a mark of zero and (ii) dispensation will be granted from the Regulation that requires a minimum mark of 40% if the candidate is not to fail the examination as a whole.
3.7 Penalties for over-length work and departure from approved titles or subject-matter

For elements of coursework with a defined word limit: if a candidate exceeds this word limit without permission normally the examiners will apply a penalty of 10% of the maximum mark available for the piece of work. [It is only possible to apply for permission to exceed a word limit if the Examination Regulations for the specific element of coursework concerned state explicitly that such an application is permitted, excepting that the Proctors may, exceptionally, under their general authority grant such permission.]

3.8 Penalties for poor academic practice

Substantial guidance is available to candidates on what constitutes plagiarism and how to avoid committing plagiarism (see Appendix B of the FHS Course Handbook and https://www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/guidance/skills/plagiarism?wssl=1).

If plagiarism is suspected, the evidence will be considered by the Chair of the Examiners (or a deputy). He or she will make one of three decisions (http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/media/global/wwwadminoxacuk/localsites/educationcommittee/documents/policyguidance/Plagiarism_procedures_guidance.pdf):

(a) No evidence, or insufficient evidence, of plagiarism – no case to answer.
(b) Evidence suggestive of more than a limited amount of low-level plagiarism – referred to the Proctors for investigation and possible disciplinary action.
(c) Evidence proving beyond reasonable doubt that a limited amount of low-level plagiarism has taken place – in this case the Board of Examiners will consider the case and if they endorse the Chair’s judgement that a limited amount of low-level plagiarism has taken place will select one of two actions:

(i) Impose a penalty of 10% of the maximum mark available for the piece of work in question. For a student who remains on course in addition there will be a requirement to demonstrate to their college Materials Tutorial Fellow that in the period between the present offence and the next submission of work for summative assessment they have followed to completion the University’s on-line course on plagiarism (https://www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/guidance/skills/plagiarism?wssl=1).

(ii) No penalty, but a warning letter to be issued to the candidate explaining the offence, indicating that on this occasion it has been treated as a formative learning experience, and that the present incident will be taken into account should there be a further incidence of plagiarism. For a student who remains on course in addition there will be a requirement to demonstrate to their college Materials Tutorial Fellow that in the period between the present offence and the next submission of work for summative assessment they have followed to completion the University’s on-line course on plagiarism (https://www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/guidance/skills/plagiarism?wssl=1).

4. PROGRESSION RULES AND CLASSIFICATION CONVENTIONS

4.1 Qualitative descriptors of classes (FHS)

The following boundaries (CVCP) and descriptors (MPLSD) are used as guidelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Honours</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>Honours 70 – 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II(i)</td>
<td>Honours 60 – 69</td>
<td>The candidate shows good or very good problem-solving skills, and good or very good knowledge of much of the material over a wide range of topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II(ii)</td>
<td>Honours 50 – 59</td>
<td>The candidate shows basic problem-solving skills and adequate knowledge of most of the material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class III Honours 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.

Pass 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.

Fail 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.

In reaching their decisions the examiners are not permitted to refer to a candidate’s outcome in, or profile across the assessments in, the First Public Examination ('Prelims').

In borderline cases the examiners use their discretion and consider the quality of the work the candidate has presented for examination over the whole profile of FHS assessments; thus for Part I outcomes the Part I assessments, and for overall degree outcomes the assessments for both Parts I and II. The external examiners often play a key role in such cases.

4.2 Classification rules (FHS)

Part I:

The examiners are required to classify each candidate according to her/his overall average mark in Part I as (a) worthy of Honours, (b) Pass or (c) Fail. The examiners do not divide the categories further but tutors and students may infer how well they have done from their marks.

Unclassified Honours – A candidate is allowed to proceed to Part II only if he/she has been adjudged worthy of honours by the examiners in Part I.

Candidates adjudged worthy of honours normally proceed to Part II but they may, if they wish and subject to approval from the relevant bodies, leave after Part I in which case an Unclassified Honours B.A. degree will be awarded.

Pass – The examiners consider that the candidate is not worthy of honours and therefore will not be allowed to proceed to Part II. The candidate may leave with a B.A. (without honours) or may retake Part I the following year (subject to college approval).

Fail – The examiners consider that the candidate is not worthy of a B.A. The candidate either leaves without a degree or may retake Part I the following year (subject to college approval).

Part II:

Classified Honours – Once marking is completed for both Parts I and II an overall percentage mark is computed for each candidate and classification then takes place. Subject to the requirement that Part II be adjudged worthy of honours (see below), classification is based solely on the overall percentage mark; the candidate’s profile of marks from each element of assessment is only taken into account in borderline cases. However, a candidate cannot be awarded an M.Eng. degree unless his/her performance in Part II is adjudged worthy of honours i.e. a candidate must be adjudged worthy of honours both in Part I and in Part II to be awarded the M.Eng. degree. Failure to achieve honours in Part II will result in the candidate leaving with an unclassified B.A. (Hons) irrespective of the aggregate mark.

Pass – Notwithstanding the award of unclassified honours in Part I, the examiners consider that the candidate’s overall performance is not worthy of an M.Eng. The candidate is listed as a Pass on the class list and is awarded an unclassified B.A. (Hons) on the basis of Part I performance.

Fail – The examiners consider that the candidate’s overall performance is not worthy of an M.Eng. and that the performance in Part II is not worthy of a Pass. The candidate is excluded from the class list but is nevertheless awarded an unclassified B.A. (Hons) on the basis of Part I performance.
• The examiners cannot award unclassified honours on the basis of Part II performance unless permitted to do so by the Proctors.

• Nevertheless, candidates awarded a Pass or a Fail by the Part II examiners leave with an unclassified B.A. (Hons) because they were judged worthy of that in Part I (i.e. their degree is the same as if they had left immediately after Part I).

• In terms of the degree awarded, there is no difference between a Pass and a Fail in Part II. The only difference is whether or not the name appears on the class list.

• Candidates cannot normally retake Part II because the Examination Regulations require that they must pass Part II within one year of passing Part I. This rule can be waived only in exceptional circumstances, with permission from the Education Committee.

4.3 Progression rules

The attention of candidates for Part I of the Examination is drawn to key phrases in clauses 6 and 7 of Section A and clause 3 under Part I of Section B of the Special Regulations for the Honour School of Materials, Economics and Management:

Section A. 6. ...no candidate may present him or herself for examination in Part II unless he or she has been adjudged worthy of Honours by the Examiners in Part I.

Section A. 7. To achieve Honours at Part I normally a candidate must fulfil all of the requirements under (a), (b) & (c) of this clause. (a) Obtain a minimum mark of 40% averaged over all elements of assessment for the Part I Examination, (b) obtain a minimum mark of 40% in each of at least four of the six written papers sat in Trinity Term of the year of Part I of the Second Public Examination, and (c) satisfy the coursework requirements set out in Section B, Part I [of the Regulations].

Section B. Part I. 3. In the assessment of the Materials coursework, the Examiners shall take into consideration the requirement for a candidate to complete satisfactorily the coursework to a level prescribed from time to time by the Faculty of Materials and published in the Course Handbook. Normally, failure to complete satisfactorily all three elements of Materials Coursework will constitute failure of Part I of the Second Public Examination.

4.4 Use of vivas

There are no vivas in either Part I or Part II of the examination.

5. RESITS

Part II may be entered on one occasion only.

6. FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE (FAP)

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, the internal examiners 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. Normally, this FAP meeting will take place before Part A of the meeting of the internal examiners at which the raw examination results are reviewed. When reaching these FAP meeting decisions on impact level, the internal 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 Part B of the meeting of the internal examiners at which the raw examination results are reviewed and recommendations to the Finals Board are formulated regarding any action(s) to be taken in respect of each FAP. Further information on the procedure is provided in the Policy and Guidance for examiners, Annex C and information for students is provided at www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/exams/guidance. It is very important that a candidate’s FAP submission is adequately evidenced and, where appropriate, verified by their college; the University forbids the Board of Examiners from seeking any additional information or evidence.
7. DETAILS OF EXAMINERS AND RULES ON COMMUNICATING WITH EXAMINERS

The Materials, Economics and Management Examiners in Trinity 2018 are: Prof. Martin Castell, Prof. Patrick Grant, Prof. Sergio Lozano-Perez, Prof. James Marrow, Prof. Richard Todd and Prof. Jonathan Yates (Chair) (examiners from the Department of Materials); Prof. Godfrey Keller (examiner from the Department of Economics); and Dr Ken Okamura, Prof. Chris McKenna, Prof. Hiram Samel (examiners from the Saïd Business School). The external examiners are Prof. Alison Davenport (Materials, University of Birmingham), Prof. Mike Reece (Materials, Queen Mary, University of London), Prof. Anindya Banerjee (Economics, University of Essex) and Prof. Bart MacCarthy (Management, Nottingham University Business School).

It must be stressed that to preserve the independence of the examiners, candidates are not allowed to make contact directly about matters relating to the content or marking of papers. Any communication must be via the candidate’s college, who will, if the matter is deemed of importance, contact the Proctors. The Proctors in turn communicate with the Chairman of Examiners.

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

Annexe

Summary of maximum marks available to be awarded for different components of the MS Final Examination in 2018 (For Part I and Part II students who embarked on the FHS respectively in 2017/18 and 2016/17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Paper 1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Paper 2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Paper 3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Paper 4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Economics (Ec1)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Management</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microeconomics</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicals</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial visits</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Design Project</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part I Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>820</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Project</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Options Paper 2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One paper from a choice of Economics and Management Papers.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part II Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>400</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1220</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9