REPORT ON EXAMINATIONS 2017-18

M.Sc. in Mathematical and Computational Finance

Part I

A. STATISTICS

(1) Numbers and percentages in each class/category

(a) Classified examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) If vivas are used:

No candidates were examined viva voce.

(3) Marking of scripts

The four written examinations were set and marked by lecturers on examined courses, and checked by a D.Phil. student.

Mini projects were double marked by two Assessors independently and discrepancies were reconciled by Assessors/Examiners.

The two C++ practical exams were marked by a lecturer and checked by a D.Phil student.

All dissertations were read and marked independently by one Examiner and one Assessor with discrepancies resolved by the Examiners. Each presentation of a dissertation was assessed by the Examiner who marked the dissertation.

B. NEW EXAMINING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

There were no changes to the examining methods and procedures.
Please list any changes in examining methods, procedures and conventions which the examiners would wish the faculty/department and the divisional board to consider.

None

Part II

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

The exams went smoothly on the whole, and scripts were provided in typeset form for the External Examiner in good time.

One student from the previous cohort had to sit papers a and b in order to complete their MSc. This candidate successfully completed with a Pass.

B. EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES ISSUES AND BREAKDOWN OF THE RESULTS BY GENDER

There were 8 female candidates and 25 males. Among the 8 females, 1 received a distinction. While among the 25 males, 13 received distinctions. (These figures don’t include the student sitting papers A and B, from the previous cohort).

C. DETAILED NUMBERS ON CANDIDATES’ PERFORMANCE IN EACH PART OF THE EXAMINATION

The written papers required some small amount of scaling from raw marks to USMs. Papers A and B were sat in January, papers C, D1 and D2 in April. The standard of papers was comparable to past years.

Paper A: 11 Distinction level performances
Paper B: 11 Distinction level performances
Paper C: 13 Distinctions
Paper D1: 5 Distinctions (15 of the 33 candidates took this paper)
Paper D2: 7 Distinctions (18 of the 33 candidates took this paper)

One student from the last cohort sat papers A and B again and completed with a Pass.

One mini project offered to the students, Quantitative Risk Management in addition to the compulsory C++ course.

There were 16 dissertation distinctions, the highest USM being 77.4

D. COMMENTS ON PAPERS AND INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

There was an error in Paper C. This was spotted during the exam and fixed. The error had no impact on the marks.
F. NAMES OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Professor Alvaro Cartea (Chairman)
Dr Jeff Dewynne
Prof Michael Monoyios
Prof Kostas Kardaras (External, LSE)