

FORM OF REPORT ON EXAMINATIONS 2012/13

[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

Category	Number			Percentage		
	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11
MSc						
Distinction	1	1	0	7%	6.6%	0
Pass	13	13	18	93%	86.6%	100%
Fail	0	1	0	0	6.6%	0
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

(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 2012 and Hilary Term 2013, with an 'end-of-year' examination on 3rd September 2013. 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, and induction presentations and through presentations by the Course Director, (two 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 and at intervals during the year. There are informal discussions over the year. They are also accessible via Weblearn.

Part II

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

Michaelmas Term 2012

The critical essay results for this year were comparable to previous years. It was noted that marks had come down during the last three years which reflected a stricter marking regime. The External Examiner commented that in the viva voce examinations the candidates were capable of talking about their essays in detail.

The computer-based exam marks had a good range comparable to previous years. Questions that had been found to be easy in the two previous years had been replaced with more difficult questions. It was agreed that the candidates had performed well in the exam.

Hilary Term 2013

The Examiners noted that there was a greater divergence of marks this year for the Clinical Case Commentaries than in previous years. The examiners discussed whether the format of this assessment allows the students to excel. While it was acknowledged that there should be an element of the course assessment that challenges distinction level students, it was agreed that the format of the case commentaries should be changed and examiners should be encouraged to use the full range of marks available to them. The external examiner proposed, and the Examiners agreed, that students should be asked to complete three clinical case commentaries of 2000 words and that subsections should be removed. This will allow more creativity within each topic.

It was agreed that the computer-based exam marks were good, an indication of good teaching throughout the term although the examiners acknowledged that the knowledge-matching format used for the computerised exam may lead to higher marks in general. It was agreed that over time true/false questions would be replaced by more challenging formats. The External Examiner noted that this assessment would challenge second year RCPATH students, suggesting that our MSc students' performance is of a high standard in general.

Trinity Term 2013

The External Examiner noted there had been an interesting mix of dissertations, but felt that none were outstanding at either end of the mark range. The writing styles were excellent and in some cases markedly improved from the first written assessment. Overall the dissertations were at a similar standard to last year with a more level field across the group. He also noted that there were slightly more non-clinical dissertations than in previous years. Generally they were very good considering the students have two terms of lectures followed by a heavy lab project.

The Chair of Examiners agreed that none of the dissertations had failed and that the one receiving the lowest mark still covered all the necessary ground, but understanding of this would be addressed in the viva.

The Internal Examiner also felt they were of a good standard and agreed that the spread of marks was not as wide as previous years. She noted that the writing was of a consistently good standard and that some projects had involved particularly heavy workload. She agreed that all were at pass level.

Summary

Final Decisions of Examination Board

- MSc Integrated Immunology: 14 candidates passed with 1 distinction awarded.

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

	2012-2013		2011-2012		2010-2011		2009-2010		2008-2009		2007-2008	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total admitted	10	5*	5	10	7	11	7	15	10	7	10	7*
Distinction	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	2
Pass	9	4	3	10	7	11	6	12	8	6	7	5
Fail	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0

**One student suspended status*

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 SpLD statement of provision. There appear to be no obvious gender differences in exam performance but he acknowledges this is a small group of 14 students.

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

There were 14 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.

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. 13 candidates passed the examination at the first attempt and one failed to submit by the original deadline and passed on resubmission.
- 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
2011/12	64	51	74

This year's marks:

2012/13	66	56	72
---------	----	----	----

- Average marks per marking criteria (Out of 100)
Accessing the Literature – 65
Appraising the literature – 68
Integrating the literature – 66
Critiquing the literature – 65
Presentation of the literature – 65

Fundamental aspects of Immunology, Computer-based Examination:

- Computerised examination. 14 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
2011/12	72	56	86

- This year's marks:

2012/13	74	59	87
---------	----	----	----

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.
- 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
2010/11	61.5	52	71
2011/12	64	55	71

- This year's marks:

2012/13	61	52	69
---------	----	----	----

Average mark per Commentary by section (Out of 100)

Section 1 (Infectious diseases) – 61

Section 2 (Immune Deficiencies) – 61

Section 3 (Autoimmunity & Allergy) – 61

Section 4 (Cancer and Transplantation) – 60

Applied aspects of Immunology, Computer-based Examination:

- Computerised examination. 14 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
2011/12	70	60	80

- This year's marks:

2012/13	75	62	85
---------	----	----	----

Research Project Dissertation:

- All scripts were double-marked and the grades reconciled. 14 candidates passed the examination on the first attempt.

- 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
2011/12	65	60	70

- This year's marks:

2012/13	68	52	79
---------	----	----	----

Average marks by marking criteria (Out of 100)

Introduction – 69

Methods – 68

Results – 68

Interpretation – 67

Discussion – 67

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 P Klenerman, JM Austyn, Drs A Williams, L Dorrell