FORM OF REPORT ON EXAMINATIONS 2011/12

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

MSc Integrated Immunology

Part I

A. **STATISTICS**

Category		Number			Percentage)
	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10
MSc		1	1	I	1	1
Distinction	1	(0)	(2)	6.6%	(0)	(9%)
Pass	13	(18)	(18)	(86.6%)	(100%)	(82%)
Fail	1	(0)	(2)	6.6%	(0)	(9%)
Diploma						
Pass	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

(1) Numbers and percentages in each class/category

(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 2011 and Hilary Term 2012, with an 'end-of-year' examination on 3rd September 2012. 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, Case Commentaries and Dissertations 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, and two in the second term for clinical commentaries for the same reason) 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 2011

The Exam Board agreed that the standard was high for a first submission, and that the submissions were all very good. It was agreed that the 'critique' element of the assignment was especially successful throughout the class.

The Chair of Examiners confirmed there was a good spread of marks for the computerbased exam and that the spread was an improvement on previous years. He proposed introducing negative marking for next year. This would require further discussion at the next Steering Group meeting.

Hilary Term 2012

The external examiner confirmed that he felt that – apart from the clear fail – the candidates passed well, and that there were no borderline fail candidates. The internal examiner agreed that all but one were a clear pass, but felt that none of them were outstanding.

The Exam Board again explored the question of the standard of the computer-based exam since this was an assessment of core knowledge.. The marks from the students ranged between 60-80% and the ANOVA for each question reflected a fair spread of difficulty across the exam.

Trinity Term 2011

The external examiner felt that all dissertations were of a pass standard and the majority were of a high standard. He commented that the amount of work completed during the project was particularly high in some cases.

The Chair of Examiners stated that he and the assessor felt all the marks were at a reasonable level with no obvious outstanding or weak dissertations. The examiners agreed that there were no extremes this year compared to previous years that had a broader range of marks.

Summary

Final Decisions of Examination Board

• MSc Integrated Immunology: 1 candidate failed, 14 candidates passed with 1 distinction awarded.

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

	201	1-2012	201	0-2011	200	9-2010	2008	-2009	2007	'-2 008	2006	6-2007
	Male	Female	Male	Female								
Total admitted	5	10	7	11	7	15	10	7	10	7*	9	5
Distinction	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	2	2	1
Pass	3	10	7	11	6	12	8	6	7	5	7	4
Fail	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

The Chair of Examiners is not aware of any issues relating to questions of equality, diversity or special educational needs. One candidate was offered extra time in examinations because of a medical condition but declined to take the offer up. There appear to be no obvious gender differences in exam performance but he acknowledges this is a small group of 15 students.

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

There were 15 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 was one student who was required to resubmit their Hilary Term assessment and one student who failed to submit a dissertation in Trinity Term and did not attend the final viva voce examination (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. 15 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
2010/11	63	50	80

This year's marks:

2011/12	64	51	74

• Average marks per marking criteria (Out of 100)

Accessing the Literature – 63 Appraising the literature – 66 Integrating the literature – 65 Critiquing the literature – 66 Presentation of the literature – 65

Fundamental aspects of Immunology, Computer-based Examination:

- Computerised examination. 15 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
2010/11	75.5	55	90

• This year's marks:

2011/12 72 56 86

Applied aspects of Immunology, Clinical Case Commentaries:

• Each candidate chose one case from each of the four sections, a total of 44 cases. All commentaries were double-marked and the grades reconciled without the need for a third assessor. 14 candidates passed the examination on the first attempt, 1 candidate was asked to resubmit their case commentaries for an improved pass mark.

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
2010/11	61.5	52	71

• Previous marks:

• This year's marks:

2011/12 64	55	71
------------	----	----

Average mark per Commentary by section (Out of 10) Section 1 (Infectious diseases) – 63 Section 2 (Immune Deficiencies) – 64 Section 3 (Autoimmunity & Allergy) – 64 Section 4 (Cancer and Transplantation) – 64

Applied aspects of Immunology, Computer-based Examination:

- Computerised examination. All 15 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
2010/11	73	62	86

• This year's marks:

2011/12 70	60	80	
------------	----	----	--

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
2010/11	65	50	73

• This year's marks:

2011/12	65	60	70

Average marks by marking criteria (Out of 100) Introduction – 66 Methods – 65 Results – 66 Interpretation – 64 Discussion – 64

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

Professors A Williams, P Klenerman, JM Austyn, Helen Chapel