

## GUIDELINES ON EXAMINATIONS

### NST PART III HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

These guidelines are in addition to the Examiners' Guidelines issued by the Student Registry and explain how the Department of History and Philosophy of Science implements the formal guidance for NST Part III HPS. Student registry guidance can be found at the following links:

<http://www.natsci.tripos.cam.ac.uk/exams/examiners>

<http://www.student-registry.admin.cam.ac.uk/examinations-further-guidance-staff/information-examiners>

#### **1. Examiners and assessors**

The Examiners for the Part III in History and Philosophy of Science report to the HPS Board. The Examiners comprise a Senior Examiner, a Moderating External Examiner and as many other examiners as the HPS Board feels appropriate to ensure robust oversight over the examination process. The HPS Board decided in October 2016 that there should be 6–7 internal examiners including the Senior Examiner, that the Director of Graduate Studies should normally act as an examiner and that the Secretary of the Degree Committee would normally act as Secretary of Examiners' Meetings.

##### *a) Senior Examiner*

The Senior Examiner is appointed annually to act for a year at a time. The Senior Examiner normally changes each year and is someone who has had previous experience as an examiner for this Part III. They are responsible for overseeing the examination process, including the nomination of examiners and assessors for individual pieces of work. S/he chairs the Examiners' Meetings, liaises with and approves the selection of work for the External Examiner, and provides guidance to and answers any queries raised by other examiners or assessors. The Senior Examiner also assesses individual pieces of work.

The Senior Examiner is required to write a report on the year's examination process. The report is received and discussed along with the External Examiner's Report at the first HPS Board meeting of the following academic year. Reports of Senior Examiners and External Examiners are posted on the Department's website, with the exception of any passages that the HPS Board agrees are confidential because they refer directly to specific individuals.

##### *b) Examiners*

The Senior Examiner is assisted by 5–6 other examiners, who are appointed to act for a year at a time but may be reappointed annually for a period of up to three years.

*c) External Examiners* are normally appointed for three years, on a one-year-at-a-time basis; they may exceptionally be reappointed for a fourth year after which they may not be reappointed until a period equal to the last term of service has elapsed, although exceptions may be made in certain circumstances. External Examiners may not hold an office in the University, or a Fellowship or some other office or post in a College, and should not habitually reside within 10 miles of the centre of Cambridge. Former members of staff are not eligible for appointment until at least three years has passed since their departure. The External Examiner answers directly to the Vice-Chancellor, not the HPS Board.

*d) Assessors* will be appointed to assist with the marking of individual pieces of coursework. The examiners will be responsible for nominating assessors and should ensure, when selecting someone who has not assessed for this degree before, that they are paired with an experienced internal

assessor, and that they are advised to attend a Training Session on 'Marking Examinable Coursework' held on an as needed basis.

#### *e) Appointments*

Appointment and reappointment of examiners is by the General Board, on the advice of the HPS Board. The Senior and External Examiners must be appointed by the end of the Easter Term preceding the Examination; the other examiners must be appointed by the end of Michaelmas Term of the exam year. The HPS Degree Committee is responsible for appointing assessors as and when required and may appoint as many as are necessary given the number of students and topics for assessment.

#### *f) Meetings*

There are three formal Board of Examiners meetings per year, in December, April and June where marks are agreed, and three informal meetings in November, March and May where markers are nominated for individual pieces of work (this may be done by email circulation at the Senior Examiner's discretion); the nominations are then forwarded to the HPS Board for approval. All examiners are expected to attend all of the formal examiners' meetings. Assessors do not attend any examiners' meetings. If an examiner or External Examiner cannot attend the final Board of Examiners Meeting in June s/he will need to request formal dispensation from the General Board; forms are provided here: <http://www.student-registry.admin.cam.ac.uk/examinations-further-guidance-staff/examiners/appointment-examiners-and-assessors/dispensation-non>

#### *g) Examiners 2024–25*

Senior Examiner: Matt Farr

Examiners: Anna Alexandrova, Rosanna Dent, Nick Hopwood, Tom McClelland, Richard Staley, Charu Singh

External Examiner: Charlotte Sleigh (UCL)

Assessors: To be appointed

## **2. Arrangements and timetable for examination**

<b>Research Paper 1 (5,000 words)</b>		
Topics submitted	Research Paper 1 topics due Once the topics have been submitted, the examiners nominate assessors for Research Paper 1. Topics, supervisors and assessors are then approved by the Degree Committee.	4 Nov 2024
Work submitted	Research Paper 1 submitted before noon	18 Nov 2024
Work marked	Research Paper 1 marked in time for first Examiners' Meeting	18 Nov–2 Dec 2024
<b>First Board of Examiners Meeting</b>	At this meeting the Part III Examiners agree the provisional marks for Research Paper 1. The External Examiner does not attend this meeting. Minutes of this meeting, together with the markbook and copies of assessors' reports are submitted to the HPS Board immediately after the meeting.	9 Dec 2024
Feedback	After the first Examiners' Meeting the Part III Manager meets individually with candidates, reports the provisional agreed mark for Research Paper 1, and provides them with the non-confidential parts of the assessors' reports. Students may consult their supervisors for further interpretation of these reports.	9 Dec 2024
External Examiner	Work is sent to the External Examiner and any moderation is conducted at the April Examiners' Meeting	30 Apr 2025

<b>2 x Set Essays (2 x 2,500 words)</b>		
Setting the paper	The Part III Examiners solicit questions from MPhil/Part III lecture leaders in the latter part of Michaelmas Term. They circulate a draft of the Set Essay paper to the External Examiner for approval and comment with a view to finalising the paper at the start of Lent Term.	Between end of Michaelmas Term and start of Lent Term
Nomination of Assessors	Assessors will be formally approved by the HPS Board at the first meeting of Lent Term	27 Jan 2025
Paper released	The Set Essay paper is uploaded to Moodle at noon	12 Mar 2025
Essays submitted	Part III students write two essays chosen from a list of questions based on the MPhil/Part III lectures. They have one week in which to prepare the essays for submission to the Examiners.	19 Mar 2025
Work marked	Set Essays marked	19 Mar–2 Apr 2025
External Examiner	Work is sent to the External Examiner at the same time as Research Paper 2 and any moderation will be conducted at the April Examiners' Meeting	30 Apr 2025
<b>Second Board of Examiners Meeting</b>	Marks for the Set Essays are agreed at this meeting	30 Apr 2025
Feedback	Feedback on Set Essays and Research Paper 2 is given together	30 Apr 2025
<b>Research Paper 2 (5,000 words)</b>		
Topics submitted	Research Paper 2 topics due Once the topics have been submitted, the examiners nominate assessors for Research Paper 2. Topics, supervisors and assessors are then approved by the Degree Committee.	9 Dec 2024
Work submitted	Research Paper 2 submitted before noon	10 Mar 2025
Work marked	Research Paper 2 marked	10 Mar–2 Apr 2025
External Examiner	Selected work is sent to the External Examiner for moderation prior to the April Examiners' Meeting	30 Apr 2025
<b>Second Board of Examiners Meeting</b>	Marks are agreed for Research Papers 1 & 2 and the Set Essays (the overall mark is determined once the Dissertation has been examined). Copies of the minutes of the meeting, together with the markbook and copies of assessors' reports are submitted to the HPS Board immediately after the meeting.	30 Apr 2025
Feedback	After the Essay Examiners' Meeting, the Part III Manager meets with candidates, reports the provisional agreed essay mark and provides them with the non-confidential parts of the assessors' reports	30 Apr 2025
HPS Board approval	Provisional marks for each element in the first half of the course are approved by the Degree Committee on behalf of the HPS Board. Whilst the marks make up 50% of the total, they are not combined at this point.	12 May 2025
<b>Dissertation (12,000 words)</b>		
Topics submitted	Dissertation topics due Once the topics have been submitted, the examiners nominate assessors for the Dissertation. Topics, supervisors and assessors are then approved by the Degree Committee.	28 Feb 2025
Work submitted	Dissertation submitted by noon	27 May 2025
Work marked	Dissertations marked	27 May–13 Jun 2025
External Examiner	Selected work is sent to the External Examiner after it has been marked so work relating to any moderation can be done prior to the Final Examiners' Meeting	20 Jun 2025
<b>Final Board of Examiners Meeting</b>	Marks are agreed for the Dissertation and an overall mark is determined. The Lipton Prize is awarded for the best performance. When combining marks, each of the four elements of the course are treated separately according to their percentage value.	26 Jun 2025

Feedback	After the Examiners' Meeting, the Part III Manager meets with candidates, reports the provisional agreed class, and provides them with the non-confidential parts of the assessors' reports	26 Jun 2025
<b>Degrees approved/ confirmation of results</b>	The Part III Class List is submitted to the Education Section before the MSci degrees are approved. The date of the Class List submission must be confirmed by the Senior Examiner and the deadline is usually immediately after the final Examiners' Meeting.	27 Jun 2025

### 3. Form and standard of the examination

The scheme of examination for the Natural Sciences Tripos Part III course in History and Philosophy of Science shall be as follows:

- (i) *Research Paper 1*, of not more than 5,000 words, on a topic chosen in discussion with the supervisor and approved by the HPS Board. It must fall into one of the ten designated subject areas.
- (ii) *Two Set Essays*, each of not more than 2,500 words, chosen from a list of *fourteen* topics drawn from those covered by the MPhil/Part III Lecture.

There are no supervisors for Set Essays. The relationship between the set questions and the core readings is the same as for Part II primary source seminars. MPhil/Part III Lecture leaders should be consistent in the information they give to all students, and supervision readings will be available on Moodle so that the range of material being covered is clear and reading lists have been published. There are 14 lectures, and there will be a set question on each lecture. Students are advised to take supervisions on four topics in order to prepare to answer two set questions. Students are advised not to narrow their interests too much and to prepare appropriately broadly.

The Part III Examiners will put together a list of pairs of assessors for each question which will be submitted to the Secretary of the HPS Board for approval by the Board. In previous years lecture leaders have marked the question relevant to their lecture together with one other person.

- (iii) *Research Paper 2*, of not more than 5,000 words, on a topic chosen in discussion with the supervisor and approved by the HPS Board. It must fall into one of the ten designated subject areas, and should not be in the same subject area as Research Paper 1.

- (iv) *A Dissertation*, of not more than 12,000 words, on a topic approved by the HPS Board. The Dissertation may be written in the same subject area as one of the Research Papers, but it must address a different question and it must show evidence of a substantial new research effort. Any use of the Research Papers or Set Essays in the Dissertation has to be appropriately referenced, just like any other primary or secondary source.

#### *Subject areas*

Each piece of work should be on a topic approved by the HPS Board and should be related to one of the ten subject areas. Permission of the HPS Board may be obtained for two pieces of work to be offered in one area, or for one piece of work to be offered in an area which is not listed but is related to History and Philosophy of Science and Medicine. Once a subject area has been approved by the HPS Board, permission must be sought to change it. In cases where a candidate has been permitted to write two pieces of work in the same general area, the work must address different questions, and each piece must show evidence of a substantial new research effort. Any use of previous work has to be appropriately referenced, just like any other primary or secondary source, as if the essay had a different author.

1. Ancient, medieval and early modern sciences
2. Ancient, medieval and early modern medicine

3. Sciences in the age of empire, c. 1750–1900
4. Modern medicine and biomedical sciences
5. Modern sciences
6. Metaphysics, epistemology and the sciences
7. Ethics and politics of medicine and the sciences
8. Philosophy of the physical sciences
9. Philosophy of biology and the life sciences
10. Philosophy of social and cognitive sciences

#### *Submission of work*

The essays and dissertation must have numbered pages and include footnotes, a bibliography and any appendices. Candidates are required to submit their examined work electronically via Moodle, where it is screened by Turnitin, which detects matches between the submitted work and other electronic sources. For all pieces of coursework, candidates are required to include a title page on which they declare the exact word length, the title and the name of the supervisor. They must also confirm that the work has not been submitted before, and that they have read and obeyed the University's plagiarism guidelines.

#### **4. Criteria for passing the Part III**

The coursework must cover a range of topics and, taken together, show evidence of a broad knowledge of history and philosophy of science (and technology and medicine). There is no provision for submitting a revised coursework.

The weighting of the different components of the Part III is as follows:

- Research Paper 1: 17%
- Two Set Essays: 16% (8% each)
- Research Paper 2: 17%
- Dissertation: 50%

The following mark scheme is used:

#### *70+: First Class (I)*

A first-class mark may be awarded on various grounds. The argument may be sophisticated, incisive or demonstrate flair; there may be a wealth of relevant information, showing exceptional knowledge and understanding of the issues involved; the approach may be unorthodox in the best sense, suggesting new and worthwhile ways of considering material. The best first-class performances will combine elements of all three.

In addition to these general criteria, different assignments have the following specific requirements:

*Set Essays:* Close engagement with the question set; ability to express complex ideas clearly and concisely.

*Research Papers, Dissertation:* Well-researched and independent, with either an original thesis or a known thesis presented and defended in an original way.

#### *60–69: Upper-second Class (II.i)*

Work in this class should show evidence of good understanding of the relevant material, and contain clear and convincing argument and analysis. Within this class, the best work is given marks in the range of 67–69 (*High II.i*), which may be earned by meeting the general II.i criteria and also providing more complex argumentation, broader base of relevant information, clearer understanding of difficult issues, or new and interesting ways of dealing with the material.

*50–59: Lower-second Class (II.ii)*

Work in this class displays significant weaknesses, although broadly relevant and generally competent. Major weaknesses may include neglect of important literature or argument, faulty argumentation, insufficient detail, lack of clarity, poor organisation, and failure to address the set or declared topic.

*40–49: Third Class (III)*

Work in this class is seriously deficient in knowledge and understanding, for which the following signs may be taken as evidence: undue brevity, failure to formulate a cogent research topic or address a set question, and evident haste and carelessness.

*0–39: Fail*

Work in this class displays only a minimal understanding of the relevant material, consisting of irrelevant, ignorant or extremely superficial discussions.

*Continuation to the PhD*

An overall First Class performance at Part III is normally necessary for continuation as a PhD student in the Department. Potential supervisors for students failing to meet this condition will need to make a special case to the HPS Board, along with a statement from the student. A mark of 75 and over can significantly aid a candidate in gaining funding for doctoral research.

## **5. The examination process**

Each essay and dissertation is read by at least two senior members or associates of the Department, neither of whom will have supervised the work being marked. Both will submit independent reports consisting of a confidential (optional) and non-confidential parts. Both parts are considered at the Board of Examiners meetings and thus by the Degree Committee. The non-confidential parts will be made available to the candidate. All work is marked anonymously.

Two assessors are appointed to mark each piece of work. Normally, a different pair of assessors will be nominated to mark each piece of a student's work and normally no assessor may mark more than two pieces of work for any student. Under normal circumstances, for each piece of work submitted, a member of core staff will be one of the internal assessors. The supervisor is disqualified from marking work s/he has supervised. The Senior Examiner and the other examiners may – and usually will – act as assessors of individual pieces of work.

Once submitted, work is sent to the assessors for marking, together with report forms and a letter that provides guidance on how to mark, details of deadlines and a link to these guidelines.

For each piece of work to be marked, the assessors are requested to submit an independent report, individual marks and an agreed mark (where possible), prior to the relevant Examiners' Meeting.

Assessors are asked to complete the report forms on SharePoint. Report forms are designed to divide comments into those that the student can see, and will profit from, and those that are confidential. The comments that the student will see should not include explicit marks, classifications, remarks about a student's ability to continue with further graduate research, or remarks about publishability. Students will be given the open comments and the agreed mark, but not the names of the assessors or the individual marks. Further guidance on how to prepare an assessor's report can be found later in this document.

Students have approximately six weeks to produce each piece of work. Assessors are asked to be realistic about what is achievable in this period of time.

The time frame for marking is usually about 10 days. Once assessors have arrived at their independent mark and exchanged report forms, they should attempt to agree a joint mark with the other assessor who is marking the work. Co-assessors should not try to arrive at a joint mark until both have drafted their independent reports with suggested marks. Where there is a discrepancy in the individual marks, internal examiners are encouraged to discuss the work and, if possible, to agree upon a mark.

Once a joint mark has been agreed – or if it has become apparent that this is not possible – the report form should be completed on SharePoint. Assessors are asked to indicate on the form any work which they think should be seen by the External Examiner.

Assessors are asked to adhere strictly to the dates by which they are required to mark coursework. Assessors do not attend Examiners' Meetings.

## **6. Oral examination**

The examination can include an oral examination. If the assessors cannot agree on a mark, or they agree a mark for the Dissertation which is a fail, they have the option to arrange for the candidate to have an oral examination. The oral examination may concern the Dissertation and any other part of the Part III course. An assessor can request an oral examination, irrespective of mark, of any candidate, for the purposes of clarifying questions concerning sources, the relationship of a Dissertation to the other pieces of work, etc. The Senior Examiner should be contacted if it is felt that an oral examination is necessary. Assessors may assist with any oral examination that is required for a candidate whose work they have marked, but at least one examiner must be involved.

The oral examination will normally be held within three weeks of the date of submission of dissertations, so that the reports may be considered by the final Examiners' Meeting in Easter Term. In order to conform to this timetable, Examiners will inform candidates of the requirement of the oral examination as soon as is practicable.

## **7. External Examiner**

The External Examiner is invited to conduct his/her responsibilities as s/he thinks fit and is invited to discuss with other examiners, in particular the Senior Examiner, how best s/he may fulfil the function of monitoring the examination procedure. It is expected that the External Examiner will perform an adjudicatory function for certain Essays and Dissertations in addition to the moderating function that is his/her sole and principal prerogative.

Subject to the way in which the External Examiner decides to discharge his/her duties, once work has been marked by two assessors s/he may be sent a selection of work that has received particularly high marks, particularly low marks, work in which there is a marked discrepancy between the two internal examiners, work that has no agreed mark, work where the initial marks cross significant class boundaries and the agreed mark is in the lower boundary, and any other anomalous work. If the External Examiner wishes, s/he may also be sent a sample of average work for calibration purposes.

The External Examiner is provided with a table of all available internal marks and agreed marks and the reports of all candidates and has a general invitation to read any piece of work.

The External Examiner is asked to make notes on the work s/he has read. In cases of disagreement, the External Examiner's mark should be treated as a proposed resolution of the internal marks.

Except under exceptional circumstances, the External Examiner will be present at the second Board of Examiners meeting in April and the final Board of Examiners meeting in June, but does not attend the first Board of Examiners meeting.

External Examiners are required to submit a written report to the Vice-Chancellor at the conclusion of their involvement with the examination, and may comment on any aspect of the examination, including the fairness of the assessment and the standards of the students for the part of the examination with which they are concerned. The University attaches great importance to the feedback given by External Examiners. The reports are forwarded to the HPS Board for a response and are usually discussed at the next meeting of the HPS Board in October of the new academic year. In addition the General Board Education Committee scrutinizes all Examiners' reports and will ask Education and Student Policy to follow up any matters of concern with the HPS Board.

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

### **8. The supervisor**

Part III coursework is supervised by senior members and associates of the Department. The HPS Board will not normally approve the appointment of one individual supervisor for more than two pieces of work prepared for the Part III (normally an essay and the dissertation as they may be in related areas). Students are in general encouraged to work with as wide a range of supervisors within the Department as is feasible. Once a supervisor has been approved by the HPS Board permission must be sought for any change. Supervisors, if also examiners, do not participate in the discussion of marks of their students.

### **9. Guidelines for composing non-confidential reports on coursework**

Reports are drafted principally for the Board of Examiners meetings (and thence the HPS Board) and the addressee of each Report is the Senior Examiner. They are only secondarily for the eyes of the candidates themselves. However, as they are the only written feedback that students receive on the final version of their submitted work, the comments in the reports should convey an accurate and balanced sense of the quality of the work. The following specific points should be noted:

- Comments should indicate clearly the merits as well as the demerits of the work, although critical points will often require more space to express.
- There should not be a mismatch between the tenor of the comments and the proposed mark or class of mark.
- Comments should evaluate the work, not merely summarise what the student has done. A lengthy non-evaluative summary is not normally necessary.
- It is particularly useful to candidates if the reports on their early essays indicate general ways in which they can improve their work.
- For the sake of consistency, the non-confidential part of the report should normally be between 200 and 500 words. Comments should be sufficiently detailed to give the student and the co-assessor a good sense of how specific aspects of the work have been judged.
- Sloppiness in spelling, grammar and style (especially when making critical comments on similar sloppiness in the submitted work) should be avoided.
- Comments should consider the work involved in researching and preparing the content of the essay, as well as the results of that research.

Assessors may find it helpful to consider the following questions when drafting their reports:

1. What is the main achievement of this work? Is there an original contribution? If so, what is it?
2. Does the candidate show a good understanding of relevant material? Is the content of the work informative and insightful?
3. Does the candidate advance effective arguments contributing towards well-articulated conclusions?



4. Has the candidate used a sufficient number and range of appropriate sources? Are they effectively used and properly credited and cited?
5. Does the work have a clear and effective structure? Is the writing clear, grammatical, and free of typographical and other errors? Is the style of the references and footnotes clear and consistent?
6. Please distinguish between any comments on how to improve this work and comments that offer advice for future work.

## 10. Plagiarism

Examiners and assessors are asked to familiarise themselves with the Department's and the University's guidelines on plagiarism which can be found on <https://www.hps.cam.ac.uk/students/plagiarism> and <http://www.plagiarism.admin.cam.ac.uk/>.

Candidates are required to upload examined work to Moodle, where it is checked by Turnitin UK. If Turnitin detects matches between submitted work and another source that is higher than 20%, the Senior Examiner will review the resulting originality report to judge whether the matches are innocent, or appropriately referenced (which does not constitute plagiarism) or whether there has been excessive uncited use of material from other sources (which may be considered poor academic practice or plagiarism depending on the extent and context of the matches). At this point, the Senior Examiner may ask the External Examiner for a further opinion and the work may also be referred to the University Proctors for further investigation. In such cases the Turnitin originality report may be used as evidence. If any plagiarism is found, marks may be deducted to take account of poor scholarship and any plagiarized sections and in the worst case scenario the degree may be withheld. A written record of the procedures followed in any individual case will be kept by the Senior Examiner.

Turnitin is only one method of checking the originality of submitted work and examiners and assessors may initiate other investigative procedures (e.g. searching Google) if they have unresolved queries about the originality of work, regardless of whether or not Turnitin has substantiated any concerns.

If an assessor suspects that work submitted for examination contains unattributed work from other sources, he or she should report the matter to the Senior Examiner. The University's procedures for dealing with suspected plagiarism are to be found at <http://www.plagiarism.admin.cam.ac.uk/information-staff/procedures-and-policy-investigating-plagiarism>.

Assessors are asked, in the first instance, **not** to mark down work in a punitive way on suspicion of wrongdoing, but are asked to provide an assessment of the academic merit of the work **of the candidate**; this will provide a basis for the final result and for any disciplinary actions by the University.

If unacknowledged work is revealed, assessors may then be asked to attempt to determine its full extent, excise the unacknowledged material and mark the work that remains, taking into account the poor scholarship. In some cases this process may be expected to leave a document that does not meet the basic requirements of the exam.

## 11. Unauthorised late submission

Candidates are required to submit each essay and the dissertation on Moodle before 12noon on the day of the deadline. The Senior Examiner will advise the Examiners' Meeting of any unauthorised late submissions and, unless there are exceptional circumstances, according to NST rules, a zero mark will be awarded for this piece of work. The Department adheres strictly to the rule that

permission to submit essays or dissertations late will only be granted by the HPS Board (or by Chair's action) if a formal request has been received from the Applications Committee.

## 12. Imposing word limits

The word limit, which includes footnotes but excludes bibliography and any appendices, is strictly enforced. In order to ensure the equitable enforcing of the word limit laid down for Part III work, candidates are required to state the word count when they submit their work. Upon submission the Administrator receiving the work will have delegated responsibility from the Senior Examiner to inspect each piece of work to ensure that the word limit has been respected. In cases where work is over the limit a mark will be placed at the point where the word limit has been reached and examiners reserve the right to stop reading when they get to that point.

## 13. Exceptions and permissions

### *Policy on data, editions, translations and bibliographies*

An essay or dissertation should be self-contained, including or citing all information needed for an examiner to follow its argument.

The word limit normally includes text and footnotes but not the bibliography. However, in certain cases permission may be obtained for materials relevant to the argument of the essay or dissertation to be submitted for the information of the examiners in the form of an appendix, with such materials *excluded* from the word count. Materials falling into this category may include primary source materials (texts and images) that are not readily accessible, transcriptions, translations, questionnaire responses, statistical tables, formal proofs, technical descriptions of objects, analytical bibliographies and other data produced by the candidate that they wish to make accessible.

Conversely, material contributing to the word count should normally consist of the candidate's own discussion and analysis of such materials. Exceptionally, when a critical edition or translation, a formal proof, an analytical bibliography, or a technical description of objects and their provenances is based on substantial original scholarship and cannot be easily separated from the argument of an essay or dissertation, permission may be obtained for it to be *included* within the body of the essay or dissertation, hence contributing to the word count. No more than one third of an essay or dissertation should consist of such material.

Applications for such permissions should be sought, in consultation with the supervisor, from the MPhil/Part III Senior Examiner via the Part III Manager.

### *Extenuating circumstances, exam allowances and exam warnings*

Part III students are treated as undergraduates in respect to examinations. The University has a well-established procedure for considering medical and other extenuating circumstances. Assessors **are not empowered to consider extenuating circumstances of candidates and must mark the work as presented**. Such cases are referred to the University's Applications Committee.

An exam allowance can be applied for in rare circumstances where a candidate has been unable to take all or part of their exam or has failed because of serious or unforeseen circumstances. Applications should be made as soon as the candidate knows they have a problem and should be submitted by the College Tutor, using the correct form.

<http://www.student-registry.admin.cam.ac.uk/about-us/applications-committee>

Applications for such permissions should be sought, in consultation with the supervisor and tutor, at the time at which the problem arises and prior to submission of the piece of work in question.

The Senior Examiner will receive a report notifying them of any candidates with specific learning difficulties. Candidates suffering from illness or other grave cause will be dealt with by the Applications Committee.

#### **14. Problems, queries, complaints and appeals**

Candidates are expected to exhaust informal routes wherever possible, and to use the correct procedure for the matter they wish to complain about. Queries should be directed through an appropriate third party, e.g. College Tutor, Part III Manager or Secretary of the Board. Candidates may not make direct contact with an examiner, including the Senior Examiner.

##### *Academic judgment*

The University's complaint and appeal procedures do not cover complaints that relate to matters of academic judgment. The procedures cannot interfere with the operation of academic judgment. This position corresponds to that adopted by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA Rule 3.2).

Academic judgment has been defined as a judgment made about a matter where only the opinion of an academic will suffice. It therefore includes, but is not restricted to, decisions about academic standards attained, marks and grades to be assigned, and degrees/degree classifications to be awarded, etc.

##### *Complaints*

At the earliest stages, a complaint may be resolved with the support, involvement or intervention of College officer or a member of University staff. Candidates wishing to make a complaint, or to appeal against a decision already made, are therefore encouraged in the first instance to consult and seek the advice of their Director of Studies or Tutor (since the College assumes pastoral and other responsibilities), a University Teaching Officer, an appropriate departmental Administrator, or the Head of Department.

##### *Examination review procedure for undergraduate exams*

There is a formal appeals procedure for all Tripos Exams which is administered by the Board of Examinations. Candidate must contact the Board of Exams in writing. The Board will then consult the HPS Board, which may consult the Examiners. For further information see: <http://www.studentcomplaints.admin.cam.ac.uk/>

#### **15. Feedback to students**

Research Paper 1 is examined prior to the end of the Michaelmas Term in order to provide students with early feedback on their performance so they can gauge the level of achievement which the course requires and so they have reliable pointers as to future applications for PhD applications, whose deadlines are often early in the academic year. Provisional marks may also be considered, with due caution, by the Department in assessing applications to continue to the PhD degree. The Set Essays and Research Paper 2 are examined together at the end of Lent Term and feedback on these components of the course is available early in Easter Term. At the early Easter Term Examiners' Meeting a provisional overall mark is agreed for the Research Papers and Set Essays; this remains provisional until all marks are finalised at the Dissertation Examiners' meeting in June, as it may be subject to moderation at that time.

After each Examiners' Meeting, the Part III Manager meets with students, reports the provisional agreed mark and provides them with the non-confidential parts of the Examiners' reports. The marks are subject to moderation up until the final Examiners' Meeting. At the end of the course the Department provides students with an informal transcript with details of each of their individual marks. Formal transcripts can be downloaded from CamSIS.

## 16. Approval of MSci degree

The recommendations of the Part III Examiners, together with mark sheets and independent reports, are received at the June Board of Examiners meeting. Where the appropriate conditions of achievement are met, the Examiners will recommend the award of the MSci degree.

When candidates collect their MSci degree they are also be awarded the BA. Where there has been a delay to the submission date of the Dissertation, confirmation of the degree may have to be postponed until the next HPS Board meeting in October of the new academic year.

The Class List must be signed by the Senior, Ordinary and External Examiners at the final Board of Examiners meeting of Easter Term. It must be submitted, along with the electronic mark book, to Student Administration and Records by 12noon on the Tuesday **before** General Admission.

Results are posted on CamSIS and at Senate House as soon as possible after the final Examiners' Meeting.

## 17. Prizes

At the second Board of Examiners Meeting, the student whose Research Papers and Set Essays comprise the best performance in the first half of the Part III course is awarded the Jacob Bronowski Prize: £100.

The Peter Lipton Prize was endowed in memory of Professor Peter Lipton, a former Head of Department. It is awarded each year to the Part III student who has the best *overall* performance. At the June Examiners' Meeting, the student who in the view of the Examiners has the best performance overall is awarded the Lipton Prize: £100.

Candidates with approved extensions whose work is not assessed in time for the second or third meeting of the Board of Examiners will not normally be considered for prizes.

## 18. Retaining work

The Department will retain copies of coursework and may make them available to future candidates unless the student makes a written request to the contrary to the Secretary of the HPS Board.

## 19. Fees and expenses

Each examiner and assessor who is not an officer of the University of Cambridge will receive a fee. Teaching officers of the University are **not** eligible to receive a fee or expenses (with the exception of Associate Lecturers who do not receive a stipend).

The External Examiner is paid fees and expenses, including the cost of overnight accommodation where appropriate.

To claim their fee, each examiner and assessor should submit one claim form for the course at the end of the academic year.