# Annex F: Form of report on examinations

*[In compiling their reports, examiners are asked to have regard to* the [*Examinations and Assessments Framework*](https://academic.admin.ox.ac.uk/files/eaf2021-22dec20211formatfixpdf)*, and any applicable divisional/subject guidance. All parts of this report, with the exception of Section E of Part II, should be shared as a matter of course with joint consultative committees (or equivalents) and made available to students.]*

**MSt International Human Rights Law**

**Part I**

**A.** **STATISTICS** [In each case please give the figures for the preceding two years in brackets.] [Statistical data should not be provided for cohorts comprising five or fewer students.]

(1) a) Classified examinations – students completing the award

Numbers and percentages in each class/category

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Class | Number | Percentage (%) |
|  | 2021/22 | 2020/21 | 2019/20 | 2021/22 | 2020/21 | 2019/20 |
| Distinction | 8 | (5) | (10)  | 25 | (26) | (46)  |
| Merit[[1]](#footnote-1) | 17 | (9) | (8)  | 53 | (47) | (36)  |
| Pass | 5 | (3) | (4)  | 16 | (16) | (18)  |
| Fail | 0 | (1) | (0)  | 0 | (5) | (0)  |
| Withdrawn | 2 | (1) | (0)  | 6 | (5) | (0)  |

b) Unclassified examinations – students on course

Numbers and percentages in each class/category

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Class | Number | Percentage (%) |
|  | 2021/22 | 2020/21 | 2019/20 | 2021/22 | 2020/21 | 2019/20 |
| Pass | 36 | (29) | (26) | 68 | (53) | (67) |
| Fail | 1 | (0) | (0) | 2 | (0) | (0) |
| Incomplete[[2]](#footnote-2) | 0 | (6) | (1) | 0 | (11) | (3) |
| Suspended2 | 16 | (20) | (12) | 30 | (36) | (31) |

(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.

No vivas were used.

(3) Marking of scripts

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

Please state whether qualitative checks were used where scaling has been employed.

The only scripts that were not double-marked were for the two sets of summative assignments submitted towards the Fundamentals course.

All Fundamentals assignments were single marked (blind) and a sample was moderated both by the Internal Moderator and the External Examiner. The Internal Moderator moderates all fails, and a sample of borderlines 64s (for borderline merit) and 69s (borderline Distinctions), and determines the representative sample of assignments to be passed to the External Examiner for external moderation. The External Examiner confirms that the marking of the scripts conformed with the conventions and regulations applicable to the course and were consistent and fair throughout and across individual markers. The External Examiner urged all markers to use the full scale of marks as much as possible, with an emphasis on using the lower end where appropriate. They further emphasised that the feedback across assignments between tutors could be made more consistent in length. Likewise, the Internal Moderator suggested not using the phrase plagriasm where the candidate was not in fact penalised despite being investigated for poor academic practice. The Chair confirmed that the reference was only in respect of the University course on plagiarism which the students should be encouraged to take if their assignments are raising concerns early on, especially keeping in mind the dissertations that they are to write in the second year of the programme.

All exam scripts were double marked with the markers conferring on their approaches before marking as well as during moderation of scripts.

As agreed by the previous Exam Board, scaling (up) of two marks was employed for dissertation marks under the ‘Assessment Support Package’ for those finishing under the Regulations for the previous academic year.

**B. NEW EXAMINING METHODS AND PROCEDURES**

 [Please state here any new methods and procedures operated for the first time in the current academic year with any comment on their operation in the examination and on their effectiveness in measuring the achievement of the stated course objectives.]

No new methods or procedures were adopted for the first time this year.

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

None applicable this year.

**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 examination conventions and any other relevant documentation, including the relevant standing orders – see *Examination Regulations*, Regulations for the Conduct of University Examinations, <https://academic.admin.ox.ac.uk/files/eaf2021-22dec20211formatfixpdf> ).

All examination conventions are brought to the students’ notice through the Course Handbook.

**Part II**

[i.e. the remainder of the report containing discussion of individual papers etc.] Examiners are asked to ensure that any comments that they do not wish to have transmitted to students are indicated clearly and are kept within the separate *Section E* of this report. The report should include the following sections:

**A. General comments on the examination**

[*excluding* comments on identifiable individuals and other material which would usually be treated as reserved business. This section should include any matters which the examiners wish to draw to the particular attention of the responsible body, including any comment on statistical trends as shown in section A. It is especially helpful to have a comment on the overall standard of performance in the examination, including any trends in results or in relation to particular areas of the curriculum, and on any developments or changes to the existing course which might have been suggested by the examination process.]

The three components examined under the MSt IHRL programme for the 2020-22 cohort are: two assignments for the Fundamentals course (10% each) + four exams (12.5% each) + dissertation (30%).

This was a particularly strong year for graduants, i.e. the cohort of 2020-22. The number of both distinctions and merits both confirm the strong performance of the graduating cohort (including those from previous years who had suspended). The two new courses that were introduced for the summer residential both reflect a median mark of high merit and further confirm that the students have performed at a very high level. Unlike previous years, fewer plagiarism concerns were raised.

**B. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES AND Breakdown of the results by gender**

[Chairs of examiners should include in the reports of their boards a commentary on any general issues relating to questions of equality and diversity, and of special educational needs (comments which might identify individual candidates should be confined to section E).

A breakdown of the results by gender for both the current year, and at least the previous 3 years should always be supplied, so that it is possible to track systematically gender differences in examination performance. In small cohorts this breakdown by gender may be omitted to maintain confidentiality. Where there is a noticeable gap in attainment between genders, boards are encouraged to place the breakdown of results by gender in Section E of the report, to avoid the risk that the data reinforces negative stereotypes regarding gender performance, in a context where students are using examiners’ reports as part of their examination preparation.

This section of the report should also include comments on the effect of different methods of assessment (e.g. problem questions, extended essays, essay papers) on any observed differences.]

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2021/22 | 2020/21 | 2019/20 | 2018/19 |
| Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male |
| Distinction | 5 | 3 | 3  | 2  | 5  | 3  | 4  | 2  |
| Merit[[3]](#footnote-3) | 13 | 4 | 4  | 5  | 4  | 5  | 0  | 0  |
| Pass | 3 | 2 | 1  | 2  | 3  | 2  | 17  | 8  |
| Fail | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| Withdrawn | 2 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incomplete[[4]](#footnote-4) | 0 | 0 | 2  | 4  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| Suspended4 | 13 | 3 | 9  | 11  | 6  | 6  | 5  | 3  |

**C. Detailed numbers on candidates’ performance in each part of the examination**

[This section should include the numbers taking any optional papers. Where appropriate, and where the information is likely to be useful, it should also include the number of attempts and a breakdown of the marks on each individual question. This will help towards a judgement about whether candidates are achieving a balanced coverage of the syllabus.]

There are no optional papers for the MSc in IHRL.

**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.]

The students on the MSc in IHRL have a wide choice in picking from a range of topics when it comes to assessment across Fundamentals, Exams and Dissertation. On the Fundamentals, the students participate in all three streams for each of the six modules covered on the online Discussion Forums. This has the benefit of them appreciating the module as a whole and the links between the streams within the module, before choosing a topic for the summative at the end of each of the two teaching terms (Michaelmas and Hilary Terms). Students are given a choice of six questions in each of the two assessments for the Fundamentals summative and the students are meant to write an essay on one of them. The students thus have a wide range of choice. While some options are more popular than others (in the case of 2021-22 cohort for example, the universality question was popular in one of the summatives, while few write their assignments in response to the question on Marxist approaches to international human rights law). The choice thus speaks to the varied interests of the cohort (as part-time students and full-time practicing human rights advocates) and plays an important role in this part of the programme.

The choice for courses on the summer residential – which is different from the Fundamentals in that it comprises of specialised intensive courses over three weeks in the summer – is even wider. For the first time, we offered 14 (not 12) courses in the summer. Students chose two courses from the 14 and were assessed on those by way of a traditional timed examination at the end of the residential (taken in person at the Exam Schools). The Exam Board considers the individual exam papers for each of the courses carefully to ensure consistency in the level, framing and type of questions proposed by individual examiners, who are often based at Universities around the world. To ensure consistency between courses and their assessment at this stage is thus crucial.

The dissertation topic is chosen by students themselves, with the only constraint is that the topic be closely a topic within the field of ‘international human rights law’ and that supervision can be secured for it from within a wide range of supervisors available.

Across these components of the programme, the coverage of IHRL provided is extensive, while making sure the basics, ‘Fundamentals’, are fully studied and examined.

**E. comments on the performance of identifiable individuals and other material which would usually be treated as reserved business**

[This part must be physically separate, and must be detached from the version of the report sent to JCCs and to college and departmental libraries. It should be retained for **one year** only after the final exam board.

Include in this section the total number of mitigating circumstances notices to examiners received and the number of candidates for whom the notice had a material impact on their results and/or classification.]

TEXT REMOVED

**F. NAMES AND POSITIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS**

Prof Sir Malcolm Evans, University of Bristol, External Examiner;

Prof Nazila Ghanea, University of Oxford, Internal Examiner and Course Director;

Dr Shreya Atrey, University of Oxford, Chair of Examiners.

1. For PGT courses this classification applies to students commencing from MT 2018 only, for UG courses it applies to all students commencing from MT 2017 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Incomplete and suspended are rolling totals and show the position as at the date of the BoE [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For PGT courses this classification applies to students commencing from MT 2018 only, for UG courses it applies to all students commencing from MT 2017 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Incomplete and suspended are rolling totals and show the position as at the date of the BoE [↑](#footnote-ref-4)