

**FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL OF  
PHILOSOPHY, POLITICS AND ECONOMICS (PPE)  
INTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORT  
2019  
(Unreserved Version)**

This version was finalised on 7 November 2019. The report has two sections: part A (statistics) and part B (Chair's comments). For comments on individual papers, refer to the [Philosophy](#) or [Politics](#) or [Economics](#) examiners' report.

**PART A: Statistics**

**1. Class distribution**

Class	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013
1st	56 23%	39 17%	54 23%	38 16%	55 22%	51 21%	70 29%
2.1	173 72%	178 77%	170 71%	178 77%	183 73%	188 76%	153 64%
2.2	11 5%	12 5%	12 5%	16 7%	11 4%	6 2%	16 7%
3rd			2 1%			2 1%	
Honours Pass							
Fail							
<b>Total</b>	240	229	238	232	249	247	239

**2. Statistics by gender and ethnicity**

**a. Class distribution by gender**

Class	2019		2018		2017		2016		2015	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
1st	12 17%	44 26%	17% 17%		18% 25%		15% 17%		11% 28%	
2.1	55 77%	118 70%	82% 75%		72% 71%		79% 75%		86% 67%	
2.2	4 6%	7 4%	1% 7%		8% 4%		5% 7%		4% 5%	
3rd					1% 1%					
Pass										
Fail										
<b>Total</b>	71	169	79	151	76	162	82	150	84	165

**b. Total candidates, average mark and standard deviation by gender**

	2019		2018		2017		2016	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Average	64.6	66.1	64.9	64.6	64.3	65.2	65.1	65.5
St. Dev.	6.0	6.1	5.2	6.5	6.9	6.8	5.5	6.3

**c. Class distribution by ethnicity**

These statistics are taken from the Specialism Report in the Annual Programme Statistics. Unlike in the other tables in this report, the year refers to the year in which students commenced study, not the year in which the exams were taken.

Class	2015/16			2014/15			2013/14		
	White	BME	Unknown	White	BME	Unknown	White	BME	Unknown
1st	29 19%	8 16%	1 17%	41 24%	9 19%	1 9%	35 21%	9 14%	
2.1	122 79%	39 76%	4 67%	122 72%	34 72%	10 91%	126 74%	51 78%	2 100%
2.2	3 2%	4 8%	1 17%	6 4%	3 6%		8 5%	5 8%	
3rd					1 2%		1 1%		
<b>Total</b>	154	51	6	169	47	11	170	65	2

### 3. Statistics by Paper

No statistics are given for papers taken by 2 candidates or fewer. Only the mean and standard deviation are given for papers taken by 5 candidates or fewer.

Paper	Cands	>= 70	>= 60	>= 50	>= 40	>= 30	< 30	Q1	Median	Q3	Mean	St. Dev.	Max	Min
101. Early Modern Philosophy	42	19%	62%	14%	5%	0%	0%	67.0	64.5	61.0	63.8	6.7	78	47
102. Knowledge and Reality	76	20%	57%	22%	1%	0%	0%	68.3	65.0	60.0	64.2	6.0	78	47
103. Ethics	149	23%	68%	9%	0%	0%	0%	69.0	66.0	62.0	65.5	4.5	78	54
104. Philosophy of Mind	10	10%	60%	30%	0%	0%	0%	66.8	64.0	57.0	62.5	6.1	72	53
106. Philosophy of Science and Social Science	3										67.0	4.5		
107. Philosophy of Religion	36	22%	75%	3%	0%	0%	0%	69.0	67.0	65.0	67.3	4.2	77	55
108. The Philosophy of Logic and Language	15	33%	53%	13%	0%	0%	0%	70.5	65.0	63.5	66.3	6.1	78	55
109. Aesthetics and the Philosophy of Criticism	24	8%	71%	13%	8%	0%	0%	67.3	65.0	61.8	63.4	6.5	72	43
110. Medieval Philosophy: Aquinas	2													
112. The Philosophy of Kant	12	8%	83%	8%	0%	0%	0%	68.3	66.5	60.8	65.1	4.0	70	58
113. Post-Kantian Philosophy	16	31%	56%	6%	6%	0%	0%	70.3	67.0	65.5	66.1	8.0	78	42
114. Theory of Politics	20	25%	70%	5%	0%	0%	0%	69.3	66.5	62.8	66.4	4.5	75	55
114. Theory of Politics (old regs)	1													
115. Plato Republic	38	16%	68%	16%	0%	0%	0%	68.0	67.0	62.3	65.2	4.7	72	52
116. Aristotle Nicomachean Ethics	9	11%	78%	11%	0%	0%	0%	69.0	67.0	66.0	66.9	3.4	72	59
118. The Later Philosophy of Wittgenstein	5										66.2	5.6		
119. Set Theory, Logic	1													
122. Philosophy of Mathematics	2													
124. Philosophy of Science	1													
125. Philosophy of Cognitive Science	3										70.0	1.4		
127. Philosophical Logic	12	25%	50%	17%	8%	0%	0%	69.5	65.0	59.5	63.9	6.8	74	49
128. Practical Ethics	44	20%	73%	7%	0%	0%	0%	69.0	66.5	64.0	66.2	3.5	72	58

Paper	Cands	>= 70	>= 60	>= 50	>= 40	>= 30	< 30	Q1	Median	Q3	Mean	St. Dev.	Max	Min
150. Jurisprudence	5										66.4	1.9		
198. Special Subjects	4										68.0	6.2		
199. Thesis in Philosophy	12	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	0%	72.5	67.0	64.8	68.6	4.7	78	63
201. Comparative Government	44	20%	66%	14%	0%	0%	0%	68.0	65.0	63.0	65.3	4.7	75	56
202. British Politics and Government since 1900	81	27%	57%	14%	2%	0%	0%	70.0	66.0	63.0	66.1	7.0	80	44
202. British Politics and Government since 1900 (submission)	1													
203. Theory of Politics	98	31%	57%	12%	0%	0%	0%	70.0	65.5	63.3	66.4	4.8	78	58
203. Theory of Politics (old regs)	7	14%	57%	29%	0%	0%	0%	67.5	63.0	60.0	63.7	5.2	72	56
204. Modern British Government and Politics	13	38%	46%	15%	0%	0%	0%	72.0	68.0	66.0	68.1	4.9	76	59
205. Government and Politics of the United States	16	38%	44%	19%	0%	0%	0%	70.5	68.0	63.0	66.8	6.5	80	55
206. Politics in Europe	5										67.8	3.1		
207. Politics in Russia and the Former Soviet Union	8	25%	63%	13%	0%	0%	0%	68.5	66.5	64.8	66.3	4.0	72	58
208. Politics in Sub-Saharan Africa	14	43%	50%	7%	0%	0%	0%	70.8	68.0	65.0	67.3	4.2	73	57
209. Politics in Latin America	7	29%	43%	29%	0%	0%	0%	69.0	65.0	60.0	64.4	6.0	73	55
210. Politics in South Asia	9	44%	56%	0%	0%	0%	0%	70.0	68.0	67.0	68.3	5.0	78	60
211. Politics in the Middle East	35	34%	60%	6%	0%	0%	0%	70.0	68.0	65.0	67.2	4.5	76	55
212. International Relations in the Era of Two World Wars	10	30%	70%	0%	0%	0%	0%	71.8	66.5	65.0	68.0	3.9	74	64
213. International Relations in the Era of the Cold War	20	40%	55%	5%	0%	0%	0%	72.0	67.0	65.0	67.8	4.4	75	58
214. International Relations	120	28%	67%	5%	0%	0%	0%	70.0	66.0	64.0	66.8	4.5	80	54
215. Political Thought: Plato to Rousseau	17	24%	76%	0%	0%	0%	0%	69.0	65.0	64.0	66.8	5.1	78	60
216. Political Thought: Bentham to Weber	9	11%	89%	0%	0%	0%	0%	68.0	66.0	63.0	66.2	3.6	74	62

Paper	Cands	>= 70	>= 60	>= 50	>= 40	>= 30	< 30	Q1	Median	Q3	Mean	St. Dev.	Max	Min
217. Marx and Marxism	16	31%	69%	0%	0%	0%	0%	70.3	67.5	65.0	67.5	4.1	74	60
218. Sociological Theory	8	25%	50%	25%	0%	0%	0%	69.5	66.5	62.0	65.8	5.1	73	58
219. The Sociology of Post-Industrial Societies	10	30%	60%	10%	0%	0%	0%	69.3	66.0	64.0	65.4	4.8	72	55
219. The Sociology of Post-Industrial Societies (submission)	1													
220. Political Sociology	1													
220. Political Sociology	82	24%	65%	11%	0%	0%	0%	69.0	65.0	61.0	64.9	5.1	77	51
222. Labour Economics and Industrial Relations	2													
223. The Government and Politics of Japan	1													
224. Social Policy	23	22%	74%	4%	0%	0%	0%	68.0	66.0	64.0	66.3	4.0	76	58
224. Social Policy (submission)	1													
225. Comparative Demographic Systems	5										69.8	5.2		
227. Politics in China	16	31%	50%	13%	6%	0%	0%	70.0	65.5	61.5	64.9	6.8	75	47
228. The Politics of the European Union	6	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	72.0	71.5	68.8	70.5	3.2	75	65
229. Advanced Paper in Theories of Justice	30	23%	77%	0%	0%	0%	0%	69.0	66.0	65.0	67.6	4.8	84	62
297. Special subject in Politics	24	38%	58%	4%	0%	0%	0%	71.3	67.0	65.0	68.0	4.8	80	59
297. Special subject in Politics	44	14%	80%	7%	0%	0%	0%	68.0	67.0	64.0	66.1	3.5	73	58
299. Thesis in Politics	11	36%	55%	9%	0%	0%	0%	73.0	66.0	65.0	69.1	7.3	85	58
300. Quantitative Economics	132	29%	45%	20%	7%	0%	0%	70.0	65.0	58.0	64.0	9.1	86	40
301. Macroeconomics (old regs)	7	29%	57%	14%	0%	0%	0%	69.0	67.0	62.0	64.6	6.1	71	52
301. Macroeconomics	137	29%	58%	13%	0%	0%	0%	70.0	66.0	62.0	65.4	5.2	77	51
302. Microeconomics (old regs)	8	13%	50%	25%	0%	13%	0%	65.8	62.0	55.0	59.3	10.7	73	36
302. Microeconomics	135	23%	59%	17%	1%	0%	0%	68.0	64.0	60.0	64.4	6.7	81	49
303. Microeconomic Analysis	19	32%	42%	21%	5%	0%	0%	72.5	64.0	58.0	64.5	10.8	86	44
304. Money and Banking	15	47%	47%	7%	0%	0%	0%	70.0	68.0	65.0	67.1	4.2	73	57
305. Public Economics	15	13%	87%	0%	0%	0%	0%	66.0	65.0	62.0	64.5	3.0	70	60

Paper	Cands	>= 70	>= 60	>= 50	>= 40	>= 30	< 30	Q1	Median	Q3	Mean	St. Dev.	Max	Min
306. Economics of Industry	14	14%	71%	14%	0%	0%	0%	68.8	64.5	62.3	64.8	5.1	73	53
307. Labour Economics and Industrial Relations	4										69.8	4.9		
308. International Economics	4										67.3	3.6		
310. Economics of Developing Countries	21	24%	76%	0%	0%	0%	0%	68.0	67.0	64.0	67.2	4.1	81	62
311. Development of the World Economy since 1800	10	20%	60%	20%	0%	0%	0%	67.3	64.0	61.8	63.7	5.0	70	54
314. Econometrics	23	22%	39%	22%	9%	4%	4%	68.0	63.0	54.5	60.9	14.0	84	25
318. Finance	6	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	68.8	67.5	66.3	66.7	2.7	69	61
319. Game Theory	17	29%	53%	12%	6%	0%	0%	72.0	67.0	64.0	66.5	7.9	77	48
320. Behavioural and Experimental Economics	6	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%	0%	69.0	65.5	62.8	65.3	4.5	71	58
398. Special subject in Economics	3										70.3	3.1		

#### 4. Numbers offering each paper

##### a. Philosophy

Paper	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
101. Early Modern Philosophy	42	34	43	38	49	50	44	63
102. Knowledge and Reality	79	60	64	77	75	60	55	38
103. Ethics	152	134	151	145	154	158	152	155
104. Philosophy of Mind	10	10	6	20	14	21	18	14
106. Philosophy of Science and Social Science	3	3	9	7	1	8	3	6
107. Philosophy of Religion	36	25	25	26	38	46	32	32
108. Philosophy of Logic and Language	16	10	9	15	18	10	18	12
109. Aesthetics	24	12	26	26	17	15	15	22
110. Medieval Philosophy: Aquinas	2	0	1	0	2	2	3	1
112. The Philosophy of Kant	12	5	4	8	5	8	7	6
113. Post-Kantian Philosophy	16	9	24	11	22	25	21	19
114. Theory of Politics	21	28	37	31	34	37	38	38
115. Plato: Republic	38	36	39	38	39	40	39	56
116. Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics	9	13	24	9	28	20	19	30
117. Frege, Russell, and Wittgenstein	0	1	3	0	2	0	2	1
118. The Later Philosophy of Wittgenstein	6	6	15	11	9	9	10	16
119. Set Theory, Logic	1	0	1	1	0	-	-	-
120. Intermediate Philosophy of Physics	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
122. Philosophy of Mathematics	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	0
124. Philosophy of Science	1	2	5	1	4	2	5	2
125. Philosophy of Cognitive Science	3	4	0	5	4	4	2	1
127. Philosophical Logic	12	17	13	13	5	-	-	-
128. Practical Ethics	44	28	-	-	-	-	-	-
150. Jurisprudence	5	6	8	9	6	5	7	7
198. Special Subject: Feminist Philosophy	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
199. Thesis	12	6	12	10	9	8	8	4

## b. Politics

Paper	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
201. Comparative Government	44	58	51	64	67	88	69	78
202. British Politics and Government since 1900	82	69	72	60	67	57	48	47
203. Theory of Politics	119	85	93	95	98	108	114	109
204. Modern British Government and Politics	13	11	18	24	15	18	18	14
205. Government and Politics of the United States	16	17	23	20	17	27	24	24
206. Politics in Europe	5	5	5	5	7	10	15	15
207. Politics in Russia and the Former Soviet Union	8	12	9	5	12	11	9	6
208. Politics in Sub-Saharan Africa	15	23	22	28	24	36	34	42
209. Politics in Latin America	7	7	6	9	11	9	11	14
210. Politics in South Asia	9	6	9	7	9	12	9	13
211. Politics in the Middle East	35	31	32	35	32	38	31	38
212. IR in the Era of Two World Wars	10	17	8	3	16	15	14	19
213. IR in the Era of the Cold War	20	24	30	25	23	32	34	34
214. International Relations	120	127	120	115	135	135	124	143
215. Political Thought: Plato to Rousseau	17	14	22	19	22	20	18	29
216. Political Thought: Bentham to Weber	9	10	20	16	17	22	23	29
217. Marx and Marxism	16	8	20	9	15	14	18	15
218. Sociological Theory	8	3	13	21	10	24	14	21
219. The Sociology of Post-Industrial Societies	10	12	4	17	7	3	2	-
220. Political Sociology	82	67	62	76	61	58	61	71
223. The Government and Politics of Japan	1	5	4	0	3	2	0	1
224. Social Policy	23	23	16	28	33	27	16	14
225. Comparative Demographic Systems	5	3	3	6	4	3	4	8
226. Quantitative Methods in Politics and Sociology	-	-	1	5	6	3	2	4
227. Politics in China	16	15	14	18	13	20	23	24
228. The Politics of the European Union	6	9	4	2	11	8	10	8
229. Advanced Paper in Theories of Justice	30	26	16	-	-	-	-	-



Paper	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
297. Special subject: Comparative Political Economy	24	18	10	19	21	-	-	-
297. Special subject: International Security and Conflict	44	37	18	-	-	-	-	-
298. Supervised dissertation	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-
299. Thesis	11	16	21	23	15	24	18	30

### c. Economics

Paper	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
300. Quantitative Economics	134	144	143	138	150	141	144	151
301. Macroeconomics	137	156	152	144	156	146	150	151
302. Microeconomics	135	154	154	146	157	146	150	151
303. Microeconomic Analysis	19	19	11	-	-	-	-	-
304. Money and Banking	15	13	15	11	10	12	12	19
305. Public Economics	15	20	20	16	21	25	17	37
306. Economics of Industry	14	19	19	11	15	8	8	17
307. Labour Economics and Industrial Relations	6	4	13	7	13	13	13	14
308. International Economics	4	9	6	4	11	8	8	20
310. Economics of Developing Countries	21	18	34	29	23	27	32	32
311. Development of the World Economy since 1800	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
314. Econometrics	23	20	18	13	32	27	21	23
318. Finance	6	7	9	N/A	N/A	0	1	15
319. Game Theory	17	14	13	12	25	23	30	37
320. Behavioural and Experimental Economics	6	11	-	-	-	-	-	-
398. Special Subject: Environmental Economics and Climate Change	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
399. Thesis	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	0

## 5. Statistics by Branch

The three separate assessments for Jurisprudence candidates are counted as one Philosophy script. Set Theory and Logic are counted as one Philosophy script. 'Subjects' comprise scripts, theses, and supervised dissertations.

### a. Approximate percentages of subjects in each branch

Branch	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
Philosophy	28%	25%	28%	28%	32%	30%	31%	32%
Politics	41%	41%	40%	40%	41%	41%	39%	41%
Economics	30%	34%	32%	32%	27%	29%	30%	27%

### b. Average mark, standard deviation and total subjects in each branch

	2019				2018				2017				2016				2015			
	Phil	Pol	Econ	All	Phil	Pol	Econ	All	Phil	Pol	Econ	All	Phil	Pol	Econ	All	Phil	Pol	Econ	All
Average	65.3	66.5	64.7	65.6	65.1	66.2	63.1	64.9	65.1	65.7	64.1	65.0	65.8	65.8	64.6	65.4	65.6	65.5	64.5	65.2
St. Dev.	5.4	5.2	7.5	6.1	4.9	4.8	7.6	6.1	5.0	5.9	8.8	6.8	5.2	5.0	7.7	6.1	5.1	5.3	7.5	6.1
Total	543	789	578	1910	456	761	618	1835	524	761	616	1901	512	756	586	1854				

c. Classifications broken down by routes through PPE

	2019				2018				2017			
Class	Phil-Econ	Pol-Econ	Phil-Pol	PPE	Phil-Econ	Pol-Econ	Phil-Pol	PPE	Phil-Econ	Pol-Econ	Phil-Pol	PPE
1st	9 25%	23 25%	20 21%	4 21%	5 13%	17 18%	15 21%	2 9%	12 26%	19 21%	22 26%	1 6%
2.1	24 67%	64 70%	71 76%	14 74%	28 74%	73 75%	57 79%	20 91%	29 62%	67 74%	60 71%	14 88%
2.2	3 8%	4 4%	3 3%	1 5%	5 13%	7 7%			6 13%	3 3%	2 2%	1 6%
3rd										2 2%		
Total	36	91	94	19	38	97	72	22	47	91	84	16

## **6. Applications for Consideration of Mitigating Circumstances**

See Appendix A.

## **7. Supervised Dissertation and Thesis Titles**

### **a. Theses in Philosophy (12)**

- The value of efforts and human enhancement
- Adjudicating between external and internal conceptions of reason
- Could God justifiably punish us?
- The conception of the human soul in Aquinas, Aristotle and Averroes
- Can people agree on justice in a genuinely plural society?
- How are we to understand the attitudes and actions of the post internet generation as affected by social media and has this damaged the generation as a whole?
- Does the truth about the metaphysics of personal identity have any impact on what the morally significant unit is?
- Can Bayes meet Blaise? Bayesian decision theory and radical uncertainty
- Grounding intrinsic moral worth in the capacity for self-value: a new account
- Ethical beliefs count as scientific evidence

### **b. Theses in Politics (11)**

- How do offensive cyber operations challenge the practise of internal sovereignty in western liberal democracies?
- Why did not all humanitarian crises in the 1990s trigger external interventions?
- Activism through acting: a discussion of sex and citizenship in British suffrage plays 1907-1914
- Ideology matters: voter turnout and extreme candidates in the us house
- Strategic polarisation: how expectation of coalition influences party manifesto positions
- Did the family planning association have a greater influence on sexual health and sex education policy under labour or the conservatives between 1990 and 2005?
- Reconciling equality and hierarchy: Plato on relational equality and rule
- Political competition under non-competitive elections: contestability and responsiveness in Singapore
- Chasing rainbows? When and how does candidate sexuality matter in elections: evidence from the UK
- Must anarchist revolution be non-violent? A case study of British debate, 1970-1988
- Towards allyship: envisioning political community through allied relations

### **c. Theses in Economics (0)**

## **PART B: Chair's Comments**

### **1. Personnel**

#### **Internal Examiners**

Philosophy	Bill Child, Andreas Mogensen, Mark Wrathall (Convenor),
Politics	Edward Keene (Chair), Nick Owen, Tim Power, Stuart White (Convenor), Stephen Whitefield,
Economics	Alan Beggs (Convenor), Martin Ellison, Godfrey Keller (Chair of Subject Board).

#### **External Examiners**

Philosophy	Mike Otsuka (London School of Economics),
Politics	Stephen Hopgood (School of Oriental and African Studies),
Economics	Gianni de Fraja (University of Nottingham).

The External Examiners reviewed and commented on draft question papers. They read a selection of scripts from different classes. They attended the first meeting on the afternoon of Tuesday 9 July and the final meeting on Thursday 11 July 2019.

### **2. Marking conventions**

The scale of marks used and the classification conventions were the same as in the previous year.

### **3. Problems with exam papers**

Minor corrections were made to the following five papers during the exam: Plato: Republic, The Later Philosophy of Wittgenstein, Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics, The Politics of the European Union, and Game Theory. There was also a problem with question 2 on the Macroeconomics paper, which was identified and dealt with after the exam.

### **4. General Issues**

In general the examining process worked reasonably well, and I have no extremely critical or urgent issues. However I would like to make three recommendations to consider in the future.

#### **i. Handling mitigating circumstances applications.**

The Board felt that it was able to give proper consideration to all mitigating circumstances applications received this year, but it thought that it might be possible to improve procedure by centralising the initial part of the process more at the Divisional or University level. The issues that arise here do not seem to be especially subject specific, and Examiners often find themselves having to make judgements about the seriousness of health and welfare issues on which they have some knowledge, but are not experts. Moreover, there was a concern that other Boards would be handling essentially similar applications, and there was no obvious way in which their considerations could be coordinated with our own, leading to the possibility of differential treatment from one Board to another.

We wonder if it might be more efficient to create a centralised panel at a higher level to decide on at least the level of severity, and possibly the papers affected for each application across several Boards. The Boards could then be given that information, and be asked to decide on a suitable remedy in each of its cases. Since questions of academic judgement are often involved even in the early stages of consideration of the application, the centralised panel might well involve some co-

opted academics from the different Boards, but also people with more experience of the specific health and welfare issues that frequently arise. This would ensure the appropriate depth and range of expertise. It would also guarantee a systematic, coordinated procedure for judging each application across multiple Boards. Finally, it would allow Examination Boards to focus their time more productively on monitoring the academic integrity of the process and ensuring that individual candidates are treated fairly.

## ii. IT systems and administrative processes

Consideration could be given to how to simplify the IT systems and administrative processes around examining. From the start to the finish of examining there are a number of separate systems and processes: one for delivering rankings; another for inputting mitigating circumstances outcomes; another for delivering results; another for retrieving mitigating circumstances notices or alternative arrangements; another for transferring marks and exam papers; local systems for holding marks and generating classifications; email-based processes for complaints, appeals, dispensations, and late submissions; and other systems for nominating and paying markers. This means that Exam Board administrators spend much of their time learning how to use a system, retrieving information from that system, matching it with information from another, and inputting it into a third.

This in turn creates problems for markers (who are set earlier deadlines because of the time it takes for administrators to transfer information between systems), for internal and external examiners (who cannot easily be given access to all the information they need), for the Proctors Office (who must wait for administrators to transfer information to them in cases of complaints or appeals), and for the Data Protection Team (who likewise have to wait for information in cases of subject access requests). It also severely limits the capacity of Exam Boards to implement new education policy.

Examining would be a more efficient process if there were one unified database, like ADSS in undergraduate admissions, which held all the necessary information for each candidate.

## iii. Composition of the Exam Board

Given that PPE is a joint honours degree that also involves two Divisions, it is important that there is coordination across the three subject areas in determining the composition of the Board. There are three specific issues here. First, especially since there is now an Economics Subject Board, it would seem to be appropriate for Politics and Philosophy also to have their own Subject Boards. We would urge these Departments to give this consideration. Secondly, perhaps in part because of the absence of a Politics Subject Board, Politics usually nominates more Examiners than the other two subjects, and this appears unbalanced. Thirdly, and most importantly, the various Nominators or Nominating Committees in the three subject areas should coordinate their nominations to ensure that there is an appropriately diverse group of Examiners on the PPE Board. This is something that the PPE Committee might wish to review during the year, and certainly before the first meeting of the Exam Board for 2019-20.

Finally, I should like to record my deep gratitude to the PPE Administrator, Violet Brand. Violet has contributed an enormous amount to this year's examining process, and in my view she is a model of efficient and well-informed administration.