

FORM OF REPORT ON EXAMINATIONS 2010/11

[In compiling their reports, examiners are asked to have regard to the Education Committee's Policy and Guidance on Examinations and Assessment (available at: <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/epsc/guidance/examsass.pdf>), and any applicable divisional/subject guidance.]

MSc Integrated Immunology

Part I

A. STATISTICS

(1) Numbers and percentages in each class/category

(a) Classified examinations

N/A

(b) Unclassified Examinations

Category	Number				Percentage			
	2010/11	2009/10	2008/9	2008/7	2010/11	2009/10	2008/9	2007/8
Total Admitted	16	22	17	16				-
MSc								
Distinction	0	2	3	3	0	9%	18%	20%
Pass	16	18	14	12	100%	82%	82%	80%
Fail	0	2	0	0	0	9%	0%	0%
Diploma								
Pass	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fail	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

(2) If vivas are used:

Please include numerical detail of any vivas which were held, with an indication of the effect of any vivas on classes or results.

Three viva voce examinations were held over the year: one each at the end of Michaelmas Term 2010 and Hilary Term 2011, with an 'end-of-year' examination on 8th September 2011. These were not formally marked, although the Internal and External Examiners agreed an informal 'score' for each performance to provide feedback, for formative purposes, to each student. As last year, the principle adopted by the Examiners was that excellent performance in the vivas could be taken into consideration, but only to consider

passing an otherwise below borderline candidate for any element of summative assessment in the respective term, or for consideration of eligibility for distinction to a candidate whose summative assessment results otherwise indicated a pass grade. In such cases, the original mark would nevertheless stand.

(3) Marking of scripts

Please give details of scripts which are not double-marked.

All scripts for the Extended Essay and Case Commentaries were double marked. In the event of any significant difference between the two sets of marks after reconciliation, a third assessor is normally asked to adjudicate (the External or Internal Examiner, Assessor or Chair of Examiners). This was not required in this academic year.

The computer based examinations were marked automatically by the computer against a series of answers checked prior to the examination by the Examination Board.

B. NEW EXAMINING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

N/A

C. Please list any changes in examining methods, procedures and conventions which the examiners would wish the faculty/department and the divisional board to consider.

N/A

D. Please describe how candidates are made aware of the examination conventions to be followed by the examiners (Please attach to the report a copy of the conventions and any other relevant documentation).

Candidates are made aware of the examination conventions via the Course Handbook, through five presentations by the two Course Directors (three in the first term for the critical essay as some students have not written essays previously) as well as by the MSc Administrator in the first week of the course; there are informal discussions over the year. They are also accessible via Weblearn.

Part II

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

Michaelmas Term 2010

The Exam Board agreed that the standard of essays was high this year. One thing to note was that it was not possible to award higher marks to otherwise excellent essays if they did not address the title appropriately. Overall, the board confirmed that the essays were of an acceptable standard, with no concerns. The first and second assessors required little reconciliation of essay marks this year.

Regarding the exam, a significant number of students scored over 70%. Based on marks data across the seven years of the course, the committee agreed there was no rationale for rescaling MT 2010's marks.

Hilary Term 2011

The board agreed that the commentaries were of an acceptable standard, and that overall they were an improvement on last year. The marks range was tighter than last year, despite the three commentaries at the bottom of the class that gave the Exam Board cause for concern.

The Exam Board agreed the exam results were of an acceptable standard.

Trinity Term 2011

The External Examiner noted that a number of dissertations were extremely good, and that those at the top of the range were an improvement on last year. None were very poor, but the range was healthy. The average was expected to be higher than 2009/2010 (it is 4% higher). It was noted that changing the marking system from 'out of 5' to a percentage scale allowed for a wider range.

Summary

Final Decisions of Examination Board

- MSc Integrated Immunology: 0 candidates failed, 16 candidates passed with 0 distinctions awarded.

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

	2010-11		2009-10		2008-9		2007-8		2006-7	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total admitted	6	10	7	15	8	7	10	7*	8	7
Distinction	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	1	1	3
Pass	6	10	6	12	7	6	8	6	7	4
Fail	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

There were 16 candidates entered for the overall MSc Examination. The overall standard of the candidates was good and their performance over the year was of a solid standard, however there were three students who were required to resubmit their Hilary Term assessment (see Section E).

Fundamental aspects of Immunology, Critical Essay:

- Each candidate chose one title from 51 options; care was taken to ensure that each candidate chose a different title. All essays were double-marked and the grades reconciled. 16 candidates passed the examination at the first attempt.
- Previous marks:

Essay	Average mark	Low mark	High mark
2004/5	73	42	91
2005/6	76	50	96
2006/7	77	66	94
2007/8	80	66	98
2008/9	79	64	94
2009/10	70	40	88

This year's marks:

2010/11	63	50	80
---------	----	----	----

- Average marks per marking criteria (Out of 100)
 - Accessing the Literature – 65
 - Appraising the literature – 62
 - Integrating the literature – 63

Critiquing the literature – 61
Presentation of the literature – 63

Fundamental aspects of Immunology, Computer-based Examination:

- Computerised examination. 16 candidates passed the examination on the first attempt.
- Marks: Averages and Ranges

MT Exam	Average mark	Low mark	High mark
2004/5	71	53	82
2005/6	71	52	88
2006/7	69	53	90
2007/8	72	51	88
2008/9	75	66	89
2009/10	76	48	91

- This year's marks:

2010/11	75.5	55	90
---------	------	----	----

Applied aspects of Immunology, Clinical Case Commentaries:

- Each candidate chose one case from each of the four sections, a total of 45 cases. All commentaries were double-marked and the grades reconciled without the need for a third assessor. 16 candidates passed the examination on the first attempt, 3 were asked to resubmit their case commentaries for an improved pass mark.
- Previous marks:

CC	Average mark	Low mark	High mark
2004/5	69	58	79
2005/6	68	53	80
2006/7	63	43	81
2007/8	67	44	81
2008/9	69	55	83
2009/10	68	38	86

- This year's marks:

2010/11	61.5	52	71
---------	------	----	----

Average mark per Commentary by section (Out of 10)

Section 1 (Infectious diseases) – 62

Section 2 (Immune Deficiencies) – 63

Section 3 (Autoimmunity & Allergy) – 58

Section 4 (Cancer and Transplantation) – 61

Applied aspects of Immunology, Computer-based Examination:

- Computerised examination. All 16 candidates passed the examination on the first attempt.
- Previous marks:

HT Exam	Average mark	Low mark	High mark
2004/5	74	58	87
2005/6	68	55	83
2006/7	68	50	80
2007/8	78	64	88
2008/9	77	63	90
2009/10	78	58	90

- This year's marks:

2010/11	73	62	86
---------	----	----	----

Research Project Dissertation:

- All scripts were double-marked and the grades reconciled.
- Previous marks:

Dissertation	Average mark	Low mark	High mark
2004/5	80	62	92
2005/6	77	58	94
2006/7	73	51	94
2007/8	76	52	96
2008/9	78	59	94

2009/10	61	46	74
---------	----	----	----

- This year's marks:

2010/11	65	50	73
---------	----	----	----

Average marks by marking criteria (Out of 100)

Introduction – 66

Methods – 66

Results – 65

Interpretation – 64.5

Discussion – 65

D. COMMENTS ON PAPERS AND INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

[This part (which is likely to be the longest part of the report) should be physically separate. Together with the preceding sections, it will be scrutinised by teaching committees and examination committees, and made available to Joint Consultative Committees with Undergraduates and to college and departmental libraries. It must not therefore contain any material which would usually be treated as reserved business.]

N/A

E. NAMES OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Professor C Kinnon, Dr P Klenerman, Professor JM Austyn, Professor Helen Chapel