

MSc/MSt Archaeological Science
Examining Conventions
Academic Year 2019/20

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 and classification of an award.

The supervisory body responsible for approving the examination conventions is the Social Sciences Board's Quality Assurance Committee.

2. Rubrics for individual papers

MSc

1. Three 2-hour written exams in the second week of Trinity Term of the academic year of admission, on each of the three elements of the course. Three questions are to be answered for each exam. Each exam will be divided into sections and the candidates required to answer at least one question from each of two sections. An option from Archaeology or Classical Archaeology may be substituted for one of the three elements of the MSc, in which case only two written exams will be taken.

2. A pre-set essay of not more than 10,000 words. The subject and length of each essay must be approved by the Chair of Examiners for Archaeological Science. Candidates must upload their essay to the Assignments section of the course WebLearn site not later than noon on the Monday of the first week of Trinity Full Term.

3. In lieu of one of the three papers described in the Schedule, candidates may, with the permission of the School of Archaeology's Graduate Studies Committee, take one of the options from the MSt in Archaeology or MSt in Classical Archaeology (Schedule B only). Candidates taking such an option would be examined on one pre-set essay of approximately 5000 words on a topic in Archaeological Science in-lieu of the requirements laid out in 2 above. Candidates must upload their essay to the Assignments section of the course WebLearn site not later than noon on the Monday of the first week of the Full Term following tuition for that option.

4. A dissertation of no more than 20,000 words (excluding bibliography and/or catalogue, but including notes and appendices), on a research area selected in consultation with the supervisor and approved by the Chair of Examiners for Archaeological Science. Titles must be submitted to the PGT Administrator. Candidates must upload their dissertation to the Assignments section of the course WebLearn site not later than noon on 11th September 2020.

5. The examiners may require to see the records of practical work carried out during the course.

6. Candidates must present themselves for an oral examination if required by the examiners. This may be on the candidate's written paper, essay or dissertation, or all three. Oral examinations will be held for candidates that are on the distinction/merit or pass/fail borderlines but not on the pass/merit border.

MSt

1. Three 2-hour written exams in the second week of Trinity Term of the academic year of admission, on each of the three elements of the course. Three questions are to be answered for each exam. Each exam will be divided into sections and the candidates required to answer at least one question from each of two sections. An option from Archaeology or Classical Archaeology may be substituted for one of the three elements of the MSc, in which case only two written exams will be taken.

2. A pre-set essay of not more than 10,000 words. The subject and length of each essay must be approved by the Chair of Examiners for Archaeological Science. Candidates must upload their essay to the Assignments section of the course WebLearn site not later than noon on the Monday of the first week of

Trinity Full Term.

3. In-lieu of one of the three papers described in the Schedule, candidates may, with the permission of the School of Archaeology's Graduate Studies Committee, take one of the options from the MSt in Archaeology or MSt in Classical Archaeology (Schedule B only). Candidates taking such an option would be examined on one pre-set essay of approximately 5000 words on a topic in Archaeological Science in lieu of the requirements laid out in b) above. Candidates must upload their essay to the Assignments section of the course WebLearn site not later than noon on the Monday of the first week of Trinity Full Term.

4. A report, not exceeding 5,000 words, on a practical project selected in consultation with the supervisor and approved by the Chair of Examiners for Archaeological Science. The title of the report must be submitted to the Chair of Examiners for Archaeological Science. Candidates must upload their report to the Assignments section of the course WebLearn site not later than noon on the Friday of the ninth week of Trinity Full Term .

5. The examiners may require to see the records of practical work carried out during the course.

6. Candidates must present themselves for an oral examination if required by the examiners. This may be on the candidate's written paper, essay or report, or all three. Oral examinations will be held for candidates that are on the distinction/merit or pass/fail borderlines but not on the pass/merit border.

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:

70 - 100	Distinction
65 - 69	Merit
50 - 64	Pass
0 - 49	Fail

3.2 Verification and reconciliation of marks

All pre-submitted items of work and all exam scripts are double-blind marked according to the marking criteria for the degrees as set out in these Exam Conventions. The two examiners discuss their grades after independently marking them, and agree a mark, usually following the lead of the person more knowledgeable on the topic at hand. Where a mark cannot be agreed and the difference crosses a grade boundary, a third marker may be brought in, and/or the case will be highlighted for the external examiner.

3.3 Scaling N/A

3.4 Short-weight convention and departure from rubric

The maximum deduction that can be made for short weight should be equivalent to the proportion of the answer that is missing. Where a candidate has failed to answer a compulsory question, or failed to answer the required number of questions in different sections, the complete script will be marked and the issue flagged. The board of examiners will consider all such cases so that consistent penalties are applied.

3.5 Penalties for late or non-submission

Under normal circumstances the following penalties will be applied by the Examiners:

Late submission	Penalty
Up to one day <i>(submitted on the day but after the deadline)</i>	-5 marks (- 5 percentage points)
Each additional day <i>(i.e., two days late = -6 marks, three days late = -7 marks, etc.; note that each weekend day counts as a full day for the purposes of mark deductions)</i>	-1 mark (- 1 percentage point)
Max. deducted marks up to 14 days late	-18 marks (- 18 percentage points)
More than 14 days after the notice of non-submission	Fail

Failure to submit a required element of assessment will result in the failure of the assessment. The mark for any resit of the assessment will be capped at a pass.

3.6 Penalties for over-length work and departure from approved titles or subject-matter

Under normal circumstances the following penalties will be applied by the Examiners:

For work that is over length: Essays or dissertations will be penalised by up to 1 mark for every 2% (or part thereof) by which they exceed the specified word limit. If the piece of work exceeds the limit by 10% or more, it will fail.

3.7 Penalties for poor academic practice

The Examination Board shall deal wholly with cases of poor academic practice where the material under review is small and does not exceed 10% of the whole.

Assessors should mark work on its academic merit with the board responsible for deducting marks for derivative or poor referencing.

Determined by the extent of poor academic practice, the board shall deduct between 1% and 10% of the marks available for cases of poor referencing where material is widely available factual information or a technical description that could not be paraphrased easily; where passage(s) draw on a variety of sources, either verbatim or derivative, in patchwork fashion (and examiners consider that this represents poor academic practice rather than an attempt to deceive); where some attempt has been made to provide references, however incomplete (e.g. footnotes but no quotation marks, Harvard-style references at the end of a paragraph, inclusion in bibliography); or where passage(s) are 'grey literature' i.e. a web source with no clear owner.

If a student has previously had marks deducted for poor academic practice or has been referred to the Proctors for suspected plagiarism the case must always be referred to the Proctors.

In addition, any more serious cases of poor academic practice than described above should also always be referred to the Proctors.

3.8 Penalties for non-attendance

Failure to attend an examination will result in the failure of the assessment. The mark for any resit of the assessment will be capped at a pass.

4. Progression rules and classification conventions

4.1 Qualitative descriptors of Distinction, Merit, Pass, Fail

4.1.1 Marking Criteria for Timed Written Examinations

	Mark Range	Core Criteria	Ancillary Observations
Distinction	80-100	<p>An exemplary answer</p> <p>Features comprehensive, excellent, well-documented knowledge of relevant theoretical and/or methodological approaches, and archaeological material case studies, going well beyond core literature</p> <p>The answer is scholarly, with outstanding synthesis and sustained high level of critical analysis of evidence and major issues</p> <p>Features originality of approach and/or discussion</p> <p>The answer is meticulously organised and presented</p>	<p>The answer may, in principle, be of publishable standard</p> <p>The answer may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding</p> <p>The answer may be highly sophisticated or incisive</p> <p>It may show new and worthwhile ways of considering the material</p>
	70-79	<p>An excellent answer</p> <p>Features close engagement with the question</p> <p>Demonstrates excellent understanding and unequivocal grasp of an extensive range of relevant theoretical and/or methodological approaches, and archaeological material case studies, going beyond core literature</p> <p>Demonstrates thorough knowledge of current major issues in the field</p> <p>Features excellent synthesis, analysis and critique of relevant evidence and theories</p> <p>Arguments are well-structured, clearly and persuasively made</p> <p>Features originality of approach and/or discussion</p>	<p>The answer may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding</p> <p>The answer may be highly sophisticated or incisive</p> <p>It may show new and worthwhile ways of considering the material</p>
Merit	65-69	<p>A very good answer</p> <p>Features competent and accurate reproduction of received ideas and good, broad-based engagement with and understanding of the <i>core</i> relevant theoretical and/or methodological approaches, and archaeological material case studies are used comparatively</p> <p>The answer is regularly sophisticated in analysis, with impressive display of relevant knowledge and originality</p> <p>The answer is clearly organised, argued and well-illustrated</p>	<p>The answer may have <i>Distinction</i> qualities in places, but less consistently so, and may be less comprehensive or sophisticated in critique</p>
Pass	60-64	<p>A consistently competent answer</p> <p>Features competent and accurate reproduction of received ideas and good, broad-based engagement with and understanding of the <i>core</i> relevant concepts, methods and material; some archaeological case studies are used comparatively</p> <p>The answer is sometimes sophisticated in analysis, and displays relevant knowledge and some originality</p> <p>It is possible there are some minor errors of fact or omissions of relevant material</p>	<p>Ideas, critical comment or methodology may in places be under-developed or over-simplified; arguments may be less sophisticated and coherent than is the case in the 65-69 mark range</p> <p>The work may otherwise be of <i>Merit</i> quality but show some <i>Distinction</i>-level inspiration</p>

	50-59	<p>An answer which is competent in places or in some respects but weak in others</p> <p><i>Positive</i></p> <p>The answer exhibits some knowledge and understanding of the chosen topic and the relevant evidence and ideas</p> <p>The answer is competent and broadly relevant</p> <p><i>Negative</i></p> <p>Some important information and references are lacking</p> <p>There may be poor use of archaeological case studies or evidence in the answer</p> <p>Poor understanding or application of relevant theory and/or methods</p> <p>The answer displays weaknesses of understanding and superficiality</p> <p>Some arguments are lacking in focus, development or coherence</p> <p>The answer may feature some significant factual errors</p> <p>There may be a considerable proportion that is irrelevant or doesn't address the question</p>	<p>The answer may have <i>Merit</i> quality in places but be too short, rushed, unfinished, badly organised or may not adequately address the question</p> <p>To be awarded marks in this band the answer must feature the positive traits identified (left); placement within this mark band depends upon the extent to which the positive traits are undermined by the negative traits</p>
Fail	40-49	<p><i>Positive</i></p> <p>The answer exhibits rudimentary knowledge and analysis of relevant material</p> <p>There is evidence of some basic understanding</p> <p><i>Negative</i></p> <p>There is little evidence of awareness of essential literature, evidence or arguments</p> <p>Material is inadequately discussed, misrepresented or misunderstood</p> <p>There are significant factual errors and/or incoherent arguments</p> <p>The answer is poorly organised</p>	<p>The candidate may have missed the point of the question</p> <p>The answer may be unduly brief</p> <p>The candidate may have failed to adhere to the rubric (e.g. by answering well but on material explicitly excluded)</p> <p>An otherwise competent candidate who has fallen seriously short of time may fall into upper end of this category</p>
	1-39	<p>There is some attempt at the exercise, but it is seriously lacking in planning, content and presentation</p> <p>The answer may show a modicum of relevant elementary knowledge but be largely irrelevant, superficial and incoherent with significant misunderstanding and errors</p>	<p>Marks at the top end of this scale may include superficial knowledge of some relevant points</p> <p>Marks at the bottom end of this scale include virtually nothing, or nothing of relevance in the answer</p>
	0	Work not submitted.	

4.1.2 Marking Criteria for Submitted Essays

	Mark Range	Core Criteria	Ancillary Observations
Distinction	80-100	<p>An exemplary piece of work, with clear publication potential</p> <p>Evidence of creative, original thinking, resulting in novel ideas in conceiving the question</p> <p>Features comprehensive, excellent, well-documented knowledge of relevant theoretical and/or methodological approaches, and archaeological material case studies, going well beyond core literature</p> <p>The work is scholarly, with outstanding synthesis and sustained high level of critical analysis of evidence and major issues</p> <p>Features originality of approach and/or discussion</p> <p>Novel conclusions are drawn</p> <p>The work is meticulously organised and presented</p> <p>The work features well-presented illustrations that are excellently utilised in the discussion</p>	<p>The work may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding</p> <p>The work may be highly sophisticated or incisive</p> <p>It may show new and worthwhile ways of considering the material</p>
	70-79	<p>An excellent piece of work, that is well focused</p> <p>Features close engagement with the question and provides a full answer to the research question posed</p> <p>Demonstrates excellent understanding and unequivocal grasp of an extensive range of relevant theoretical and/or methodological approaches, and archaeological material case studies, going beyond core literature</p> <p>Demonstrates thorough knowledge of current major issues in the field</p> <p>Features excellent synthesis, analysis and critique of relevant evidence and theories</p> <p>Arguments are well-structured, clearly and persuasively made</p> <p>Features originality of approach and/or discussion</p> <p>The work features well-presented illustrations that are excellently utilised in the discussion.</p>	<p>The work may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding</p> <p>The work may be highly sophisticated or incisive</p> <p>The work may show new and worthwhile ways of considering the material, especially combining approaches in creative new ways</p>
Merit	65-69	<p>A very good piece of work</p> <p>The question is well-defined</p> <p>Features competent and accurate reproduction of received ideas and good, broad-based engagement with and understanding of the <i>core</i> relevant theoretical and/or methodological approaches and material; relevant archaeological case studies are used comparatively</p> <p>The work is regularly sophisticated in analysis, with impressive display of relevant knowledge and originality</p> <p>Conclusions are linked well to the research question</p> <p>The work is clearly organised, argued and well-illustrated</p>	<p>The work may have <i>Distinction</i> qualities in places, but less consistently so, and may be less comprehensive or sophisticated in critique</p> <p>The work makes good use of archaeological evidence and the essay is well-illustrated with appropriate material that adds to the arguments in effective ways</p>
Pass	60-64	<p>A consistently competent and good piece of work</p> <p>Features competent and accurate reproduction of received ideas and good, broad-based engagement with and understanding of the <i>core</i> relevant material; some archaeological case studies are used comparatively</p> <p>The work is sometimes sophisticated in analysis, and displays relevant knowledge and some originality</p> <p>It is possible there are some minor errors of fact or omissions of relevant material</p> <p>There may be some use of relevant illustrations</p> <p>Not all sections may be well-focused on the question</p>	<p>Ideas, critical comment or methodology may in places be under-developed or over-simplified; arguments may be less sophisticated and coherent than is the case in the 65-69 mark range</p> <p>Archaeological evidence is present but less than sufficient for the topic, or is not always appropriate; theoretical approaches are not sufficiently engaged with or not always appropriate</p> <p>Some illustrations may be poor or unhelpful</p> <p>The work may otherwise be of <i>Merit</i> quality but show some <i>Distinction</i>-level inspiration</p>

	50-59	<p>A piece of work which is competent in places or in some respects but weak in others</p> <p><i>Positive</i></p> <p>The work exhibits some knowledge and understanding of the chosen topic and the relevant evidence and ideas</p> <p>The work is competent and broadly relevant</p> <p><i>Negative</i></p> <p>Research question is overly narrow or too broad</p> <p>Some important information and references are lacking</p> <p>There may be poor use of archaeological case studies or evidence in the answer</p> <p>The work displays weaknesses of understanding and superficiality</p> <p>There is poor or no engagement with relevant theoretical and/or methodological approaches</p> <p>Some arguments are lacking in focus, development or coherence</p> <p>The work may feature some significant factual errors</p> <p>There may be considerable proportion that is irrelevant or doesn't address the question</p> <p>There may be insufficient use of illustrations</p>	<p>The work may have Merit quality in places but be too short, rushed, unfinished, badly organised or may not adequately address the question</p> <p>May include insufficient archaeological evidence to support the argument</p> <p>To be awarded marks in this band the work must feature the positive traits identified (left); placement within this mark band depends upon the extent to which the positive traits are undermined by the negative traits</p>
Fail	40-49	<p><i>Positive</i></p> <p>The work exhibits rudimentary knowledge and analysis of relevant material</p> <p>There is evidence of some basic understanding</p> <p><i>Negative</i></p> <p>There is no clear question posed</p> <p>There is little evidence of awareness of essential literature, evidence or arguments</p> <p>Archaeological materials are inadequately discussed, misrepresented or misunderstood</p> <p>There are significant factual errors and/or incoherent arguments</p> <p>The work is poorly organised</p>	<p>The candidate may have interpreted the question in an unconvincing way with little or no reference to key terms in the question</p> <p>The work may be unduly brief</p> <p>The work may include few or no references to archaeological evidence</p> <p>An otherwise competent candidate who has fallen seriously short of time may fall into upper end of this category</p>
	1-39	<p>There is some attempt at the exercise, but it is seriously lacking in planning, content and presentation</p> <p>The work may show a modicum of relevant elementary knowledge but be largely irrelevant, superficial and incoherent with significant misunderstanding and errors</p>	<p>Marks at the top end of this scale may include superficial knowledge of some relevant points</p> <p>Marks at the bottom end of this scale include virtually nothing, or nothing of relevance in the answer</p>
	0	Work not submitted.	

4.1.2 Marking Criteria for Submitted Dissertations & Theses

	Mark Range	Core Criteria	Ancillary Observations
Distinction	80-100	<p>An exemplary piece of work, of publishable standard</p> <p>Evidence of novel ideas in conceiving the project and in the originality of approach</p> <p>Clear aims, appropriate method, and appreciation of any limitations</p> <p>Features comprehensive, excellent, well-documented knowledge of relevant theoretical and/or methodological approaches, and archaeological material case studies, going well beyond core literature</p> <p>The work shows evidence of outstanding synthesis and sustained high level of critical analysis of evidence and major issues</p> <p>Features originality of approach and/or discussion, and is thought-provoking</p> <p>Novel conclusions are drawn, based firmly in evidence and placed within the wider context</p> <p>Clear directions for future research are identified based on the conclusions</p> <p>The work is meticulously organised and presented</p> <p>The work features well-presented illustrations that are excellently utilised in the discussion.</p>	<p>The work may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding</p> <p>The work may be highly sophisticated or incisive</p>
	70-79	<p>An excellent piece of work, that is well-focused</p> <p>Clear aims, appropriate method, and appreciation of any limitations</p> <p>Features close engagement with the question and provides a full answer to the research question(s) posed</p> <p>Demonstrates excellent understanding of an extensive range of relevant theoretical and/or methodological approaches, and archaeological material case studies, going beyond core literature</p> <p>Demonstrates thorough knowledge of current major issues in the field</p> <p>Features excellent synthesis, analysis and critique of relevant evidence and theories</p> <p>Arguments are well-structured, clearly and persuasively made</p> <p>Features originality of approach and/or discussion</p> <p>Well-founded and well-reasoned conclusions that answer the research questions(s)</p> <p>The work features well-presented illustrations that are excellently utilised in the discussion.</p>	<p>The work may feature a wealth of relevant information showing excellent knowledge and understanding</p> <p>The work may be highly sophisticated or incisive</p> <p>The work may show new and worthwhile ways of considering the material, especially combining approaches in creative new ways</p>
Merit	65-69	<p>A very good piece of work</p> <p>The conception of the project is clear and well defined</p> <p>Clear aims, appropriate method, and appreciation of any limitations</p> <p>Features competent and accurate reproduction of received ideas and good, broad-based engagement with and understanding of the core relevant theoretical and/or methodological approaches and material; relevant archaeological case studies are used comparatively</p> <p>Good methodological insight and application</p> <p>The work is regularly sophisticated in analysis, with impressive display of relevant knowledge and originality</p> <p>Conclusions are linked well to both the main body and research question(s)</p> <p>The work is clearly organised, argued and well-illustrated</p>	<p>The work may have <i>Distinction</i> qualities in places, but less consistently so, and may be less comprehensive or sophisticated in critique</p> <p>The work makes good use of archaeological evidence and the essay is well-illustrated with appropriate material that adds to the arguments in effective ways</p>
Pass	60-64	<p>A consistently competent and good piece of work, with a focus on the research question(s)</p> <p>Clear aims and appropriate method used</p>	<p>Ideas, critical comment or methodology may in places be under-developed or over-simplified; arguments may be less sophisticated and coherent than is the case in the 65-69 mark range</p>

		<p>Features competent and accurate reproduction of received ideas and good, broad-based engagement with and understanding of the <i>core</i> relevant material; some archaeological case studies are used comparatively</p> <p>The work is sometimes sophisticated in analysis, and displays relevant knowledge and some originality</p> <p>It is possible there are some minor errors of fact or omissions of relevant material</p> <p>There may be some deviation in focus</p> <p>There may be some use of relevant illustrations</p>	<p>Archaeological evidence is present but less than sufficient for the topic, or is not always appropriate; some illustrations may be poor or unhelpful</p> <p>The work may otherwise be of <i>Merit</i> quality but show some <i>Distinction</i>-level inspiration</p>
	50-59	<p>A piece of work which is competent in places or in some respects but weak in others</p> <p><i>Positive</i></p> <p>The work exhibits some knowledge and understanding of the chosen topic and the relevant evidence and ideas</p> <p>The work is competent and broadly relevant</p> <p><i>Negative</i></p> <p>Aims may not be clear</p> <p>Method may not be sufficiently appropriate</p> <p>Lack of appreciation of limitations</p> <p>Some important information and references are lacking</p> <p>There is poor or no engagement with relevant theoretical and/or methodological approaches</p> <p>There may be poor use of archaeological case studies or evidence in the answer</p> <p>The work displays weaknesses of understanding and superficiality</p> <p>Some arguments are lacking in focus, development or coherence</p> <p>The work may feature some significant factual errors</p> <p>There may be considerable proportion that is irrelevant or doesn't address the question</p> <p>Not all aspects of the research question(s) are adequately addressed</p> <p>Conclusions contain some degree of ambiguity or fail to sufficiently answer the question(s)</p> <p>There may be insufficient use of illustrations</p>	<p>The work may have <i>Merit</i> quality in places but be too short, rushed, unfinished, badly organised or may not adequately address the question</p> <p>May include insufficient archaeological evidence to support the argument</p> <p>To be awarded marks in this band the work must feature the positive traits identified (left); placement within this mark band depends upon the extent to which the positive traits are undermined by the negative traits</p>
Fail	40-49	<p><i>Positive</i></p> <p>The work exhibits rudimentary knowledge and analysis of relevant material</p> <p>There is evidence of some basic understanding</p> <p><i>Negative</i></p> <p>No clear aims and poor planning</p> <p>There is little evidence of awareness of essential literature, evidence or arguments</p> <p>Material is inadequately discussed, misrepresented or misunderstood</p> <p>There are significant factual errors and/or incoherent arguments</p> <p>The work is poorly organised and written</p> <p>Conclusions indicate evidence of poor judgement</p>	<p>The candidate may have interpreted the question in an unconvincing way with little or no reference to key terms in the question</p> <p>The work may be unduly brief</p> <p>The work may include few or no references to archaeological evidence</p> <p>An otherwise competent candidate who has fallen seriously short of time may fall into upper end of this category</p>
	1-39	<p>There is some attempt at the exercise, but it is seriously lacking in planning, content and presentation</p> <p>The work may show a modicum of relevant elementary knowledge but be largely irrelevant, superficial and incoherent with significant misunderstanding and errors</p>	<p>Marks at the top end of this scale may include superficial knowledge of some relevant points</p> <p>Marks at the bottom end of this scale include virtually nothing, or nothing of relevance in the answer</p>
	0	Work not submitted.	

4.2 Final outcome rules

MSc

The final marks received on the course are broken down as follows:

- Where all three main modules are taken, each written exam carries 15% of the mark, the 10,000 word essay 15%, and the dissertation 40%.
- Where another option is taken in lieu of a main module, each written exam carries 15% of the mark, the numerical average of the two pre-set essays for the third option carries 20%, the 5,000 word pre-set essay carries 10%, and the dissertation 40%.

Candidates whose average mark across the course is 50 or above will be awarded a pass.

Candidates whose average mark across the course is 65 or above will be awarded a Merit.

Candidates whose average mark across the course is 70 or above will be awarded a Distinction.

Candidates who have initially failed any element of the examination will not be eligible for the award of a Distinction or Merit.

MSt

The final marks received on the course are broken down as follows:

- Where all three main modules are taken, each written exam carries 20% of the mark, the 10,000 word essay 20%, and the practical report 20%.
- Where another option is taken in lieu of a main module, each written exam carries 20% of the mark, the numerical average of the two pre-set essays for the third option carries 30%, the 5,000 word pre-set essay carries 10%, and the dissertation 20%.

Candidates whose average mark across the course is 50 or above will be awarded a pass.

Candidates whose average mark across the course is 65 or above will be awarded a Merit.

Candidates whose average mark across the course is 70 or above will be awarded a Distinction.

Candidates who have initially failed any element of the examination will not be eligible for the award of a Distinction or Merit.

4.3 Progression rules

In the case of failure in just one part of the examination (written papers, extended essay, dissertation), the candidate will be permitted to retake that part of the examination on one further occasion, not later than one year after the initial attempt. Written papers would be retaken the following year. If the candidate passes all parts of the examination except the dissertation, the dissertation may be considered as a practical report as defined in the schedule for the MSt and, if of a sufficiently high standard, the candidate may be granted permission to supplicate for the degree of MSt; however, candidates will not be eligible for an overall award of Merit or Distinction.

An average mark of at least 65 on the written exam and essay is normally expected for those wishing to continue directly on to the DPhil course in Archaeological Science.

4.4 Use of vivas

All MSc and MSt students must be available for *viva voce* examination if required by the examiners. This usually is restricted to borderline cases (pass/fail, merit/Distinction).

4.5 Resits

In the case of failure in one part of the examination, the candidate will be permitted to retake that part of the examination on one further occasion, not later than one year after the initial attempt. Unseen written examination papers would be retaken the following year.

A candidate who is not judged to have reached the standard required for the degree of Master of Science in Archaeological Science but whose examinations fulfil the requirements of the MSt in Archaeological Science may be granted permission to supplicate for the degree of MSt in Archaeological Science, and candidates will be eligible for an overall award of Merit or Distinction.

Where a candidate has failed an assessment unit as a result of poor academic performance the mark for the resit of the assessment unit will be awarded on the merits of the work.

Where a candidate has failed an assessment unit as a result of non-submitting an assessment item or as a result of non-attendance at a timed examination the mark for the resit of the assessment unit will be capped at a pass.

In this context, an 'assessment unit' can refer to a single timed examination, a submission, other exercise, or a combination of assessment items. Where the assessment unit consists of more than one assessment item, for example a submission and a timed examination, if the candidate passes the submission but fails the timed examination, they are only required to resit the failed assessment item (in this example the timed examination) not all the assessment items for the assessment unit.

4. Mitigating circumstances notices to examiners

Where a candidate or candidates have made a submission, under Part 13 of the Regulations for Conduct of University Examinations, that unforeseen circumstances may have had an impact on their performance in an examination, a subset of the board (the 'Mitigating Circumstances Panel') 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. The Panel will evaluate, on the basis of the information provided to it, the relevance of the circumstances to examinations and assessment, and the strength of the evidence provided in support. Examiners will also note whether all or a subset of papers were affected, being aware that it is possible for circumstances to have different levels of impact on different papers. The banding information will be used at the final board of examiners meeting to decide whether and how to adjust a candidate's results. Further information on the procedure is provided in the *Examinations and Assessment Framework, Annex E* and information for students is provided at www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/exams/guidance.

5. Details of examiners

The external examiner for the MSc Archaeological Science for the 2019-20 academic year is Prof. Oliver Craig (University of York). The internal examiners are Prof. Thomas Higham (Chair), Prof. Greger Larson, and Dr Nathaniel Erb-Satullo.

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