



# INFORMATION FOR APPLICANTS

## Undergraduate Admissions to BA Jurisprudence BA Law with Law studies in Europe 2023/2024

### Law Admissions - Overall picture

**2125** applications were received for **241** undergraduate places this year (excluding – senior status applications). There were approximately **8.82** applicants per available place.

(**68** Senior status applications, applications are separate from other applications)

**598** were invited to interview for Law, equating to **2.48** per place.

**241** offers were made: **190** for Jurisprudence and **51** for Law with Law Studies in Europe.

*Broken down by course:*

**1777** applications for **Law alone** were received. **500** candidates were interviewed. **190** offers were made

**348** applications for **LSE alone** were received. **98** candidates were interviewed. **51** offers were made.

**14** Colleges participated in the Open Offer Scheme, making **16** offers between them. Colleges making Open Offers are:

College	Offers
Balliol	1
Brasenose	1
Corpus Christi	1
Exeter	1
Keble	1
Mansfield	2
Merton	1
Pembroke	2
Somerville	1
St Anne's	1
St Catherine's	1
St Hilda's	1
St John's	1
Trinity	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>

**Law/LSE** has an application to interview success rate of **28.16%**, an interview to offer success rate of **52.04%**, with an application to offer success rate of **14.65%**.



**Law alone** has an application to interview success rate of **28.24%**, an interview to offer success rate of **38%**, with an application to offer success rate of **10.69%**.

### Senior Status (not included in stats)

**68** Senior status applications were received. **25** were interviewed, **7** were made an offer.

Senior status candidates had an application to interview rate of **36.76%**, an interview to offer rate of **28%** and an application to offer success rate of **10.29%**.

**6 Senior status** candidates were second interviewed at another college. Of these, 2 were made an offer. **1** of these offers was made by College 2.

### Opportunity Oxford

- This year there were **399 Op Ox Eligible** and **272 Op Ox Flagged** candidates in the application pool.
- **123 Op Ox Eligible** and **92 Op Ox Flagged** candidates were invited for interview.
- Of these **54 Op Ox Eligible** and **39 Op Ox Flagged** candidates received offers.
- **Op Ox Eligible** candidates had an application to interview rate of **30.82%**, an interview to offer rate of **43.90%** and an application to offer success rate of **13.53%**.
- **Op Ox Flagged** candidates had an application to interview rate of **33.82%**, an interview to offer rate of **42.39%** and an application to offer success rate of **14.33%**.

### The Admissions Process

A College blind draft shortlist was produced by the Admissions Coordinators based on the Faculty and UAO-approved Shortlisting rules. This draft shortlist was then considered by the Faculty Selection Committee and candidates were added and subtracted from it in line with the shortlisting rules. This resulted in a list of 2.0 candidates per place. Colleges were then able to see the shortlist and reserve up to 1:1 category 1 candidates and 1:1 additional candidates from it. Category 1 candidates are the top ranked X candidates where X is the number of places available on course, typically 240. Colleges could then elect to:

- shortlist further candidates to fill up the remaining 0.5 interviews per place,
- Turn the further shortlisting over to the AdCos to continue to shortlist down the 3-point rank, 2-point rank and strong AB list in turn.
- Do some combination of the above.

Colleges could elect to interview more than 2.5 candidates per place by reserving or asking for more than 0.5 candidates per place at this last stage.

Colleges who had not reserved 1:1 cat 1 candidates per place and 1:1 FSC shortlisted candidates per place received enough candidates on reallocation to make up these numbers.

Reasons for shortlisting were recorded on ADSS for the first time and are included in the Appendix 1 analysis of admissions data.

### Second College Interviews

All colleges took part in 2<sup>nd</sup> interviews.



**157 Law/LSE** candidates received a second interview at another college. Of these, **73** were made an offer. **24** of these offers were made by College 2. Overall, **9.95%** of offers were made by College 2.

### *Faculty Selection Committee*

A Faculty Selection committee (FSC) comprised one representative from 15 of the 31 Colleges involved in the Law Admissions Process, and a further representative from Harris Manchester College. Next year the remaining 16 Colleges will provide 1 member each to sit on the committee.

### Centralised LNAT Marking

The LNAT was marked using No More Marking, a comparison marking system that anonymised LNAT essays and allowed markers to compare 2 essays at a time. The system created a numerical score once the essays were assessed.

### LNAT scores

*LNAT essays score of all candidates:*

- This year the lowest LNAT score for those invited for interview was 16/58.
- The lowest LNAT score for those made an offer was 20/61
- The average LNAT MCT score for those invited to interview was 29.46
- The average LNAT Essay score for those invited to interview was 64.43
- The average LNAT MCT score for those offered a place was 31
- The average LNAT Essay score for those offered a place was 64.94

### Use of contextual data

Distribution graphs of marks (separated into Access bands) for MC and essay were distributed to Law Admitting Tutors. These are also included in the Faculty and UAO approved shortlisting rules in the following ways;

- The 3-point rank incorporates a component of cGCSE for those candidates for whom this can be calculated (the 2-point rank exists precisely because not all candidates have a cGCSE)
- The bGCSE is used as a pull-in rule for more socio-economically deprived candidates with a reasonable LNAT mark who did not come in on the rank because of use of the cGCSE.
- The 'super LNAT' rule applies to contextualised LNAT scores.
- Individual contextual data is also used where candidates are shortlisted on the basis that mitigating circumstances or additional access factors suggest that their data, even contextualised, is not representative of their performance or potential.