

Comments:

The average overall is very good. Most of the good students did not do as well as they should have. The mathematical part daunted students, and it seemed they were out of their depth. Part of solving problems is simplifying them. I think students are not used to tackling difficult problems, or problems whose solution is not at hand. You will have to learn to go about them systematically. First, try to simply the problem, break it down to simpler units, or interpret it in a way that it is simpler to solve (see the problem on the train tickets). The answers and discussion of how to go about them is given in a separate handout. Below are comments for students (only roll numbers are listed). I would recommend you read all the comments.

*The grades given are my best estimation as well as my recommendation. However, the school administration reserves the right to use its own grading scheme.

A is at 64% (total). B is at 57% (total).

103	23/30 (A);	Paper 1: You can do even better.
154	A: 17/30 (B); 38/50 (A);	Paper 1: Not so good. Same comment as 637. Paper 2: Good enough. But could be better.
243	C: 19/30 (B); 24/50 (C);	Paper 1: Poor show. You should have got at least 23. Irresponsible and non-serious. You didn't do your mid-term properly and barely passed, and now again you are performing way below your potential. I know you can do much better than this, but do not take the risk of entering the exam without going through sufficient number exams first. You should be scoring 80% in your practice tests. The worry is that your non-seriousness might get the better of you.
263	C: 11/30 (D); 35/50 (A);	Paper 1: You need to work on the basics, something that cannot be accomplished in class. Go through the paper, one question at a time, and discuss it with me. Paper 2: Satisfactory.
463	B: 18/30 (B); 29/30 (B)	Paper 1: Worrisome score. Too many mistakes. Need to practice till you are scoring more than 70%. You can manage, but only if you practice enough.
473	B: 20/30 (A); 30/50 (B);	Paper 1: Right on the borderline. Too risky. Have to do better to ensure an A. Paper 2: Answer to 1 not systematic. Not enough discussion. You gloss over the points which you correctly observed; but you did not discuss them

		<p>in any detail to get full credit for your observations. 2 was done well. But certain answers, such as to 2(5) were so off the point that it seems you just weren't paying attention. In the last question to 2 you had to state <i>further</i> reasons, not repeat what author had already stated. In 3 there are some good points but 80 percent of your response is just stating what the author said. The discussion (analysis and further analysis) should take up at least 50% of the space. In your case it is less than 20%.</p>
501	A: 21/30 (A); 40/50 (A)	<p>Paper 1: Careless. Reckless. I have said on more than one occasion that one should take the sceptical approach so as not to be undone by over-confidence. The sceptical approach is to assume that one has made mistakes and then look for those mistakes.</p> <p>Paper 2: 1 & 2 were impeccable. 3 was mediocre, otherwise you would have had a perfect score. You need to sustain the level of your responses throughout the exam, and not just first 2 questions. In 3 you simply said that A logically implies B, and B implies C, but that is the whole point. Does A really imply B, and on top of that does it <i>logically</i> imply B. (Logical is a technical term, use it properly). The whole point of the passage is to find gaps in the author's argument. Not simply state your opinion that the argument seems solid. That will earn you no points. If you think the argument is air-tight, then give reasons for it. If you think it is flawed, explain precisely how.</p>
525	A: 23/30 (A); 29/50 (B).	<p>Paper 1: Well done. Anything more than 21 is a sure A.</p> <p>Paper 2: Mediocre. Diction is not accurate (example: used <i>denied</i> instead of <i>refused</i>, semantically they are worlds apart). Language informal and insensitive. Rather than saying <i>the testimony is not reliable</i> you say <i>the person is lying</i>. <i>Lying</i> is serious business, and the formal way to say it is that that <i>testimony is not reliable, or perhaps the person might be exaggerating, or the person could be biased</i>. Unless, you can prove there is a lie, try to frame it differently. Your last question was done on 10-12 lines. This is not sufficient to discuss the passage. You have to discuss the reasoning used by the author and comment on where you find flaws, gaps, assumptions, generalizations and fallacies. Only that will earn marks and not mere restatement of</p>

		author's argument. Look at the model answers to appreciate what kind of language is appropriate to these questions.
553	A: 25/30 (A); 29/50 (B)	Paper 1: Excellent. Very good score. Just go through the questions you got wrong. Paper 2: Mediocre. Good approach in question 1 & 2. Good idea to write in point form. However, made mistakes of interpretation. So read carefully. Question 3 you merely rephrased the passage and restated the reasons. What you have to do is to discuss if the reasons offered are any good. You got 3 marks. The way you attempted question 3 after doing so well in 1 and 2 is a cause for concern. You completely ignored the instruction in bold that you will get no mark for merely rephrasing the passage. It seems you weren't paying attention. This will cost you your A.
557	A: 27/30 (A); 43/50 (A)	Paper 1: Excellent. It was a difficult paper, and 27 was more like an A+. Paper 2: Excellent. There is no reason why you shouldn't get an A in your exam. You made some very intelligent observations. The only concern will be your careless handwriting. Try to write legibly. Maybe if could try writing slowly.
561	A: 20/30 (A); 34/50 (A);	Paper 1: Not good. You should have got around 25. Given your aptitude for mathematical thinking this is a disappointing score. But, you can definitely do better. Just practice sufficient number of tests before you enter the exam. Ensure you are getting 80% right. Since the mistakes are so many, you need to seriously look into what got into you. You should score a high A to compensate for any shortfall in other papers. Paper 2: English needs to be worked on. Tenses incorrect. Makes for poor reading. Someone with your calibre should have fixed these things by now. It will be very difficult to score highly with the kind of sentence construction in your response. Uses of phrases like "a lot" instead of "a lot", "crime time" instead of "when the person was a criminal" or "was committing crime", "for because" instead of "for" or "because", and so on. You contested in 3 that people should be allowed to do whatever is legal. That <i>begs the question</i> : the legality of it is the very matter under debate; should the legal principle extend to

		indirect income? 561, this was not expected of you. Obviously, you were sleeping.
580	: 23/30 (A); 39/50 (U)	Paper 1: Satisfactory. Discuss your mistakes with me, or go over the solutions I have provided and see where you went wrong.
588	A: 17/30 (B); 43/50 (A);	Paper 1: You should see me to discuss why you can't score higher. Think about the questions you got wrong and see why you got them wrong. You shouldn't repeat your mistakes. There is something you are fundamentally missing because of which your score is not satisfactory. Think out aloud in my presence, and we'll see where you go wrong. You are supposed to ace this exam. Clearly that is not happening. Paper 2: The discussion questions 1 and 3 were brilliantly done. You have a knack for these questions. However in 2, the short answer type, you got some horribly wrong. You should seriously take a look at why you are getting the short answer questions wrong and why you are not performing as well in paper 1. From 1 and 3 it seems you have the potential to do exceptionally well, and yet!
637	A: 21/30(A); 40/50 (A)	Paper 1: Disappointing. You should have scored higher. The problem with your grade and some others is that when the problems are moderately difficult you have no problem and you excel, however as soon as they get really difficult, it seems you guys lose your resolve and start guessing. All of the questions were doable, within your reach, except the two I have pointed out in my remarks. All you had to do was patiently think about them to find an easier way out. Only a couple of students did that.
667	A: 19/30 (B); 37/50 (A);	Paper 1: Not bad. Paper 2: Question 1 & 2 were very well done. Question 3 was done poorly otherwise you would have had a very high score.
672	A: 26/30 (A); 36/50 (A)	Paper 1: No worries.
699	A: 27/30 (A); 31/50 (B);	Paper 1: Very well done. If you can get a 27 in this test, you can get much higher in a typical test. So no worries here.

710	U: 9/30 (U); 22/50;	Paper 1: It seems at best you will get a D. What is the point of appearing in an exam when you can't manage anything better than a D. Prepare for it properly and take this exam in November.
711	C: 13/30 (C); 24/50 (C);	Paper 1: This is dissatisfactory. I can't help you till you are willing to be helped.
716	A: 21/30 (A); 36/50 (A)	Paper 2: Well done. 1 was impeccable. 2 & 3 were done at B+ level. Your answers should be better organized. It might be a good idea to make a rough list first. Write down all you can think of: any gaps, assumptions, intermediate conclusions, fallacies etc. Then once having explained the basic course of the argument, as the author has expressed it, you go to your list and mention all your comments one by one, thus making sure you get full credit for (1) the exposition of author's argument, and for (2) your own analysis of that argument.
719	A: 25/30 (A); 46/50 (A)	Paper 2: That was the highest mark. Consistently good responses. Very organized and methodical. You did exactly as you were instructed in class: the response was clear, concise, structured, and each point was adequately discussed till all the relevant angles were mentioned. The thing I liked is that both the content and the form (its presentation) were equally good. The writing was readable. You scored perfectly in 2. The paper was done in a very organized fashion. Exactly the kind of stuff one is supposed to learn in a TS class: a systematic, and not haphazard, analysis of the content.
725	A: 19/20 (B); 41/50 (A)	Paper 1: You have to go through the mock exam with me. Have to discuss all the questions you got wrong. It would be unfortunately if you do not get an A, so it is better to work out any problem areas right away. Paper 2: Very good. No problems here.
842	A: 21/30 (A); 46/50 (A)	Paper 1: Careless. Just didn't go through with the reasoning. The worrisome aspect is the lack of consistency. You have to concentrate harder and with more determination. While paper 2 might be a piece of cake, paper 1 requires a lot of thought- I won't take it lightly. You can't relax. The idea is

		<p>to be perpetually suspicious of your answers. Paper 2: Excellent. Highest mark. Nothing less was expected. In 3 if you had looked hard you would have found further arguments for or against the author, and got more points. Remember according to the report, there are points for exposition of the author's argument, then points for analysis of author's argument, and then further points for your own analysis of the central claim. Paper 2 is probably a safe bet for you. The concern is paper 1.</p>
--	--	---