LAW MODERATIONS – HILARY TERM 2023

MODERATORS' REPORT

Part I

A. STATISTICS

Number of candidates in each class

	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019
Distinction	40	42	42	42	30
Pass	174	185	198	162	189
Incomplete	5				
Fail	1	1	2	-	-
Total	220	228	244	205	221

Percentage of candidates in each class

	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019
Distinction	18.18	18.42	17.21	20.49	13.57
Pass (without Distinction)	79.10	81.14	81.15	79.02	85.52
Fail	0.45	0.44	0.82	-	-

Number of vivas held

Vivas were not held in these examinations.

Number of scripts second marked

Scripts in this examination are not automatically double marked. Instead, scripts are double marked during the first marking process to decide prize winners, and when a fail mark has been awarded. Further double marking takes place during the first marking process if the marking profiles of those marking a particular paper appear misaligned, or if a profile contains an unusually large number of very high or very low grades.

Once first marks are returned, the following classes of script are second marked:

- Where a candidate has an average below 60
- Where a candidate is borderline in terms of getting a distinction: where a candidate has 2 marks at or above 68 but does not yet have 2 marks at or above 70, scripts with marks at 68 and 69 will be remarked.
- Where a script is 4 or more marks below the candidate's average.

B. EXAMINATION METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Online examinations

Law Moderations took place in 9th week of Hilary Term. As in 2021 and 2022, the examinations were open book and took place online. Candidates were given 3 hours to complete their answers.

Word limits and rubrics

A word limit of 2000 words was applied for each question. Given that most scripts were submitted in a PDF document, checking the word count for any answer was not straightforward. Markers were asked to notify Francesca Padley of any script that seemed unduly long.

Mitigating circumstances

41 candidates submitted mitigating circumstances applications. At the Board's final meeting, the Moderators assessed the seriousness of each application and then used those assessments to determine whether to adjust the results of each candidate. The results of 3 candidates were adjusted on the basis of their application.

Late penalties

The possibility of late submission was eliminated in 2021/22.

Examination conventions

The Notice to Candidates was uploaded to the BA Jurisprudence Mods Courses Canvas page on 27/01/2023 and the Examination Conventions were uploaded to Canvas on 27/01/2023.

Part II

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

This was the fourth year in which Law Moderations took place online.

Plagiarism

All of the exam scripts were run through plagiarism software, and a number of instances of plagiarism were identified. A range of penalties was imposed, with many at the most minor end but, in some instances, a significant reduction in marks was imposed and no cases were referred to the Proctors. Candidates should be aware that plagiarism is now routinely identified and punished.

The Turnitin Similarity Index for each question of each script was reviewed and a sample of scripts was then further investigated to look at the extent to which the candidate's script matched with text already held in the Turnitin and other online databases. Six penalties were applied for poor academic practice. 2 Criminal Law paper received penalty of 5 marks from the Exam Board and 2 Criminal Law

paper received a penalty of 3 marks. 3 Constitutional Law papers received a penalty of 3 marks from the Board, and 2 received a penalty of 5 marks.

Almost all of the plagiarism identified looked, to the Moderators, to be negligent rather than deliberate, the consequence of sections of textbooks, lecture handouts, or judgments, being cut and pasted into notes, and then uploaded in the exam. The examiners suspected that this was inadvertent: the result of poor notetaking rather than a deliberate attempt to cheat. But it was plagiarism, nevertheless, and penalties were imposed. The Moderators urge candidates to be aware of the risk of cut and pasting in exams. If candidates wish to do this - and the best scripts that that the Moderators saw plainly avoided this practice entirely - extreme care should be taken to ensure that what is uploaded is the candidate's own work, not material drawn from another source.

B. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY

Breakdown of results by gender for Course 1 and Course 2 combined.

	2023		2022		2021		2020		2019	
Result	**No**	**Gender**	**No**	**Gender**	**No**	**Gender**	**No**	**Gender**	**No**	**No**
Distinction	24	F	23	F	19	F	23	F	19	17
	16	M	19	M	23	M	19	M	23	17
Pass	101	F	114	F	126	F	114	F	126	104
	73	M	72	M	72	M	72	M	72	62
Fail	1	M			2	F			2	0
			1	M			1	M	0	0

The percentage of male students obtaining Distinctions was lower than 2022, and the percentage of female students obtaining Distinctions marginally increased. 17% of male students obtained Distinctions in 2023, compared to 20.65% in 2022. 19.2% of female students obtained Distinctions in 2023, compared to 16.97% in 2022.

Appendix A of this report contains a gender breakdown by paper.

C. COMMENTS ON PAPERS AND INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

A Roman Introduction to Private Law

The overall standard in the Roman Introduction to Private Law paper was high, with several scripts that were hugely impressive. On the whole, candidates sought to tackle the questions asked, rather than engaging with questions hoped for or encountered on a previous occasion. Although there was some evidence that material had been carried across from other source material (in particular in responses to Q1 and Q8), the large majority of responses were focused and avoided reference to extraneous material.

In the gobbet question (Part A), texts (a), (c) and (d) were the most popular, with few responses to text (f). Candidates were rewarded for discussion, with appropriate supporting material, of points directly related to the text and for efforts to bring discrete points together.
In Part B (problem questions), Q2 and Q3 were more frequently chosen than Q4, although all three questions were answered by a significant number of candidates, with many choosing to answer more than one problem question. In Q2 and Q3, there was an observed tendency to leave contractual aspects at the margins, with delictual issues (Q2) and property issues (Q3) being prioritised. In Q3, some candidates lost marks as a result of a failure to address all of the events of proprietary significance. Responses to Q4 showed a wide variety of approaches to the transactional problem and some innovative insights and suggestions.

In Part C (essays), the essays centred on the law of delict (Q6, Q9) and property (Q8) were more popular than those addressing other topics. The strongest responses to Q5 paid heed to the direction to refer to Institutional texts, and those to Q7 made effective use of examples from across the syllabus and range of sources to illustrate the way in which the Roman legal system balanced certainty with the need for justice in individual cases. For Q6, many candidates were able to deploy selected Digest texts to illustrate the development of the elements of the delict furtum addressed in the quote. Q8 was less well handled, with a significant proportion of candidates attempting to force pre-prepared analysis of Praetorian innovations into a question that had a broader focus. For Q9, there were some impressive answers from candidates who took the time to analyse the specific propositions being advanced by the discussants. Few candidates answered Q10, with some interpreting the question narrowly as referring only to Justinian's Institutes.

A Roman Introduction to Private Law Exam Paper Error

The Roman Introduction to Private Law exam contained in several questions a significant error which resulted from the use of BCE to define given dates where CE was intended. This error had a serious impact on questions 2, 3, and 4, where the students were asked to answer problem questions as of a particular date, and a less serious impact on questions 6 and 9, which misdated quotations from scholars of the period. The error in the problem questions was especially serious as a candidate could attempt to answer the question as of the BCE date, though such an answer would be very difficult, given the material studied.

The examiners apologise to the candidates for this error, and recognise the problems and distress it caused.

Having realised the error, the Moderators and examiners decided that the scripts would be marked as submitted, whilst ensuring that every possible credit would given to those who may have been misled or confused by the error.

On the day of the exam, an email was sent to all the candidates in relation to the error questions 2, 3, and 4, with a later email adding questions 6 and 9, when it was realised the error had also impacted those questions. The emails apologised for the error, made clear that the Roman Law marking team was aware of it, promised that any scripts impact by the error would be reviewed by the marking team and graded in such a way as to avoid disadvantaging candidates affected by the error, and, finally, that all affected scripts would be flagged up to the Moderators for consideration. Candidates were also invited to notify the examiners whether and how they had been affected. This allowed candidates to flag affected scripts and, also, gave the Moderators a sense of the scale of the problem.

The candidates were also invited to submit formal MCE forms if they believed that their performance had been significantly affected by the error.

The Roman Law team was informed of the candidates who notified the examiners that they had been affected, but, to preserve confidentiality, was not given sight of any additional information provided about the nature of the impact. The Roman Law team then reviewed all scripts that had been flagged up by candidates, and, also, reviewed any scripts that seemed to the marker or the reviewers to have been affected, even if not flagged.

The Roman Law examiners adopted and applied the following guidelines:

1. For all PQs (Q2-Q4), if a candidate seeks to answer a problem question (PQ) with reference to the law as at 230 CE (not BCE) or the law as at 535 CE (not BCE), we should mark it as if the question had referred to those dates, giving all due credit for knowledge of the sources referred to and application of that knowledge to the problem facts. This includes a candidate who assumes, without significant further analysis, that the law at 230 BCE or 535 BCE is the same as the classical law (principally Gaius).

2. If a candidate seeks to answer a PQ by undertaking some additional analysis to deduce the law as at 230 BCE or the law as at 535 BCE with reference to other sources (including sources from a later period, such as but not limited to the Institutes of Gaius), we should mark it in a way that (i) gives all due credit for knowledge of the sources referred to and application of that knowledge to the problem

facts, and (ii) does not mark a student down for giving what may appear to be an inaccurate account of the law as at those dates.

3. An incomplete or confused problem answer should be given a mark based on the information provided, giving all due credit for knowledge of the sources referred to and application of that knowledge to the problem facts.

4. For the essay questions containing a date error (Q6 and Q9), the quotations are intended as prompts to discuss the law on furtum and iniuria. We should mark it in a way that is sensitive to the possibility that students may have been misled by the quotation, and should not expect them to put the quote in historical context. Credit should be given for knowledge of any sources referred to. Markers should note answers to Q6 and Q9 that are incomplete or are confused by reason of the date error.

5. Markers should note scripts falling within the descriptions at points 2, 3 and 4 above on the mark sheet, identifying the relevant question number(s) (eg Q2, Q6).

6. The Board of Examiners has asked students who consider that they were affected by the error to notify the Exams Administrator. The candidate numbers of those students will be notified to markers, to assist in following points 1 to 5 above (and any scripts already marked should be checked). Any additional information given by candidates will be provided to the Board to consider in approving final marks, but will not be communicated to markers.

7. (a) After each marker has completed first marking, all of their scripts will be reviewed by another member of the marking team (other than the person who would second mark the script) to identify possible impacts of the errors. Particular attention will be paid to answers to Q2-4, 6 and 9, although rushed or incomplete answers to all questions will also be noted.

(b) Following that review, (i) if the reviewer has identified that the errors may have affected a candidate's performance or (ii) if the marker has noted any impact under points 2, 3 or 4 or (iii) if the candidate is one who has notified the Faculty that they consider themselves to have been affected, then the marker and reviewer will discuss the script. The marker will explain to the reviewer the nature of the impact(s) (if any) that they identified and how they took account of them in marking. The marker will discuss with the reviewer any impacts that they identified. The reviewer will consider the script again to check whether they agree with the marker's approach to assessment. (If neither the marker nor the reviewer has identified any impacts, no further action need be taken.)

(c) If the reviewer is happy with the marker's approach in addressing the impacts of the error, the marker should then disclose the first marks for each question and the script overall. The reviewer will consider whether those marks seem to be fair and reasonable in view of the discussion of the script. If so, the marker and reviewer will agree the first marks for the script and the reviewer will note that agreement as well as recording the questions discussed.

(d) If the reviewer has any concerns or doubts concerning marker's approach in addressing the impacts of the error, or with the first marks given by the marker, the reviewer and the marker will discuss those concerns and will seek to agree the first marks in light of that discussion. Any adjustments to the original marks will be upwards only. If they cannot agree, the script will be second marked in the normal way by another member of the marking group. The reviewer will briefly note the discussion and outcome.

8. Markers should raise any queries with the Roman Law Moderator or the Chair of Examiners.

All of the scripts which the candidates notified the examiners as affected and those scripts that, though not notified as affected, appeared to the examiners to be affected were reviewed. As noted at point 7 above, the reviewer discussed with the first marker their approach in handling the impacts of the error, and considered the marks given for all questions answered. Where appropriate, upwards adjustments were made to the first marks.

Once the first marks were gathered in, and prior to the second marking round, the Chair of Mods, the Examinations Officer, and the Academic Administrator, reviewed the marks submitted for Roman Law in light of the spread of the candidates' performance. It seemed that the marks for Roman Law were, in broad terms, in line with those given for other papers. The second marking round includes a provision for the second marking scripts that fall four or more marks below the candidate's average. It was decided that this rule would catch any Roman Law scripts that were out of line with other papers, and, given the review process that had already been undertaken, that it was not necessary to alter the criteria for second marking.

In the Moderators meeting the Roman Law script marks were once more examined, this time by the Moderators. The MCE process was followed in the usual manner, but the Moderators also paid especial attention to Roman Law scripts that left a candidate on the borderline between fail and pass, and between pass and distinction, reviewing the operation of the MCEs and checking whether there was evidence these scripts had been impacted by the errors in the paper. In two cases, a candidate had submitted a comment on the impact of the error in response to the initial email, but had not then submitted a formal MCE, the Moderators treated these comments as applications for an MCE where

this had the potential to impact on a borderline grade. As a result of this review, the final classifications for a small number of candidates were adjusted.

At the end of the Moderators meeting, the overall response to the error was reviewed. It seemed to the Moderators that the grades for Roman Law were broadly in line with what might have been expected, given the marks awarded to the candidates' other papers and the spread of marks in previous years. Though it was impossible to rectify the error, the Moderators concluded that the extensive mitigations put in place had avoided unfairness to candidates, so far as this could be achieved.

Criminal Law

The quality of the scripts in criminal law this year was reasonably good. As in previous years, problem questions were generally addressed more successfully than essay questions. The most obvious reason for this will be familiar to anyone who has troubled themselves with previous such reports. Answers to problem questions almost invariably addressed the question asked. Answers to essay questions all too often addressed a question candidates would prefer to have been asked.

1. This question was reasonably popular. Most candidates focused on the definition of recklessness, and on whether awareness of a risk ought to be a necessary condition thereof. The best answers identified alternative possibilities and were clear about the standards relative to which rival definitions were being judged.

2. This was not a particularly popular question. Those who answered it often asserted the importance of distinguishing between justification and excuse but struggled to explain why this distinction would be of interest to criminal courts. The best answers were clear about the nature of the distinction and drew on relevant literature in constructive ways.

3. This question was reasonably popular. For the most part, it was not answered well. A surprising number of candidates equated intending something as a means with foreseeing that thing to be virtually certain. As a result, they failed to see that signing up to the position taken in the quotation amounts to denying the existence of a distinct category of oblique intent.

4. This was not a particularly popular question. The answers it did attract suggest that the requirements of secondary liability remain poorly understood post-Jogee. In particular, the distinction between (i) S's mens rea with respect to S's assistance/encouragement of P, and (ii) S's mens rea with respect to P's commission of the substantive offence, was too often ignored.

5. A very popular question. The best answers were clear about what they took the requirements of the rule of law to be, and about the respects in which the decisions in Gomez, Hinks and Ivey might be thought to bring the law of theft into conflict with those requirements.

6. This was not a particularly popular question. Candidates were invited to explore the conditions under which those who freely choose to engage in harmful activities can give legally valid consent to harm those activities cause. The best answers engaged sensitively with the competing arguments in Brown, and with the relationship between that decision and later cases such as Dica, Slingsby or Meachen.

7. This was a difficult question, which invited candidates to explore the relationship between causal and moral responsibility. Few took up the invitation. Natural candidates for discussion included the insistence in Hughes that causation requires an element of fault, and the rule in Kennedy (No.2) according to which free, deliberate and informed interventions break the chain of causation.

8. This question also attracted few takers. It invited candidates to consider a remoteness principle for the inchoate offences. According to that principle, the broader the actus reus requirements of an inchoate offence prove to be, the narrower its mens rea requirements ought to be. Working out whether English law conforms to the principle required carefully comparing the inchoate offences on the syllabus with one another. This was not a comparison many candidates chose to undertake.

9. This problem question was very popular. It was generally answered well, though few candidates noted the relevance of the rule in Dadson. Even fewer recognised that the householder provisions in the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 are inapplicable to the defence of property.

10. A reasonably popular problem. Many candidates saw the relevance of Kirk to Eve's conditional offer. A surprising number failed to mention Lawrance and/or Assange when discussing Dinesh. The best candidates faced up to the difficult question of whether failing to disclose professional qualifications is capable of vitiating consent to sexual activity.

11. This was a tricky question which attracted relatively few takers. It involved possible liability for a number of property offences, as well as questions of secondary liability for commission of those offences. The best candidates grappled with the conditions under which S can be secondarily liable despite P lacking the mens rea for the substantive offence, as well as with the conditions under which S remains secondarily liable despite the actions S contemplates differing from those P performs.

12. This problem question was unpopular. It was rarely answered well. Too many candidates assumed that causing Kimmy to become moderately depressed could be an offence under s 47

OAPA 1861, despite the absence of an assault or battery. Too few considered whether Leo might be liable under s 20 OAPA 1861 for contributing to Kimmy becoming severely depressed. The best candidates avoided such mistakes and were able to apply the intoxication rules successfully to Kimmy's use of force against Mandy.

13. This problem question proved popular and was answered reasonably well. The best candidates saw the relevance of both best interests and lesser evils necessity. They considered which species of involuntary manslaughter was more appropriate to the facts and engaged carefully with possible breaks in the chain of causation.

Constitutional Law

The quality of scripts produced in response to the Constitutional Law paper this year was generally good. Most candidates were able to produce answers of a solid 2i quality or higher. Candidates awarded a first- class mark produced excellent, thoughtful work.

There were not many scripts in relation to which the examiners had concerns students had copied and pasted tutorial essays or alike, with minimal amendments. That said, candidates too often offered general and descriptive accounts of the subject matter of the question, with too little attention to the precise question set.

All questions on the paper attracted answers. Some, however, were more popular than others. The questions on conventions, House of Lords reform, prerogative/delegated legislative powers and the Human Rights Act were answered with particular frequency.

Question 1

This question had two parts. The first required candidates to consider the extent to which important conventions in the UK constitutional have already been codified. Many candidates did well to identify significant instances of codification (the Ministerial Code, the Sewel Convention being placed on a legislative footing in the devolution Acts, etc) and to explore the different forms that "codification" can take. The second required candidates to consider whether there continue to be uncodified conventions which ought to be codified. Many candidates here were able to discuss broad advantages of leaving convention uncodified/difficulties with codification. Some strong answers identified specific instances of uncodified conventions and make a case for or against codification.

Question 2

This question required candidates to consider what legal effect (if any) an Act of the UK Parliament purporting to abolish the Scottish Parliament without a referendum would have, in light of s.63A of the Scotland Act 1998. Answering this question primarily required candidates to engage with the materials on parliamentary sovereignty. Strong answers considered the language and proper interpretation of s.63A, the implications of important cases including Jackson and Miller 1 on the scenario and/or considered the compatibility of recognising the legal effect of the Act with prevailing

theories of sovereignty. Weaker answers failed to engage sufficiently closely with the legal problem, instead offering more general description of the principle of sovereignty and/or devolution arrangements.

Question 3

This question invited candidates to discuss a quotation from the introductory text to the Parliament Act 1911, evidencing a future intention to constitute the House of Lords on a popular basis. Candidates took a range of successful approaches. Relevant matters included the extent to which reform of the House of Lords has taken place since 1911, difficulties in realising House of Lord reform and the case for/against electing (in some form) members of the House of Lords. Strong answers engaged closely with the quotation and its premises and demonstrated a good understanding of the context of the 1911 Act.

Question 4

This question required candidates to either or both consider whether it is possible to justify the extent of the executive's (a) prerogative powers and/or (b) powers to enact delegated legislation. Most candidates choose to focus on one option, rather than addressing both. Despite the question being very clearly worded, a handful of scripts unfortunately misread the exam paper and gave answers to (a) and (b) as if they were separate questions, rather than components of Q4. This should highlight to candidates sitting exams in the future the importance of very carefully reading the exam paper.

Candidates addressing (a) generally showed a good grasp of the nature and criticisms of prerogative powers and the main mechanisms (both legal and political) for overseeing their exercise. Weaker scripts simply stated that as some form of legal and/or other limitations exist, the extent of the executive's freedom to exercise them must be justified. Stronger answers more rigorously explored whether the strength of those forms of oversight is adequate to overcome concerns.

Candidates addressing (b) tended to focus the extent to which modern legislation takes the form of Statutory Instruments, as opposed to primary Acts, and the weaknesses of Parliamentary scrutiny of secondary legislation. Some answers also considered the existence of and possible constitutional objections to Henry VIII clauses and the availability of judicial review in relation to delegated legislation (as evidenced in cases such as UNISON).

Question 5

This question invited candidates to consider the extent to which they agreed with a well-known quotation from the speech of Lord Mustill in Fire Brigades Union. The quotation offers a view on the proper relationship between the courts and Parliament, in ensuring that the executive exercises delegated functions appropriately. Strong answers directly engaged with the various aspects of the quotation and considered, for example, whether courts are limited to "interpret[ing] the laws and see[ing] that they are oberyed" and whether it is appropriate to regard Parliamentary oversight as the primary mechanism for "check[ing] executive error." Answers successfully drew on a range of materials from the reading lists on the separation of powers and political/legal constitutionalism. Weak answers provided a generic overview of some debates about the separation of powers (such as whether the separation of powers is "pure" or "partial") without adequate attention to the quotation.

Question 6

This question invited candidates to consider whether recourse to Hansard as a guide to statutory construction is consistent with constitutional principle. Candidates did well to identify a range of constitutional principles – the rule of law, the separation of powers, parliamentary privilege and Art.9 of the Bill of Rights – which bore on the issue, as well as the relevant case law. It was, however, disappointing to see that some candidates had not engaged sufficiently closely with the outcome of, or reasoning, in the leading case Pepper v Hart.

Question 7

This question asked candidates whether reflection on constitutional principles is of assistance when courts interpret the devolution statutes. Candidates were generally able to discuss a range of important cases and to consider the extent to which courts drew on constitutional principles such as parliamentary sovereignty (e.g. in Legal Continuity and the UNCRC case) and the rule of law (e.g. AXA) in the course of interpretation. Strong answers considered whether the emphasis placed on certain constitutional principles in the decided case law is justifiable and/or whether the courts' approach to interpretation of devolution legilsation has changed over time.

Question 8

This question asked candidates whether there is a case for either repealing or amending s.3 and s.4 of the Human Rights Act 1998. Candidates generally showed a good understanding of these sections, the leading case law and the pros and cons of them as mechanisms of rights protection. Candidates made a range of successful arguments for or against reform. Strong answers advocating reform often made a reasoned case for a specific recommendation, going beyond general criticisms of the law as it stands. Strong answers arguing against reform offered reasoned responses to specific criticisms of the existing law and identified difficulties with specific reform proposals.

Question 9

This section asked candidates whether they agreed with Lord Reed's description of the role of the domestic courts in the interpretation of ECHR rights in a quotation from the recent AB case. Although a quotation from a specific and recent case, the quotation connects with a well-established debate about the extent to which domestic courts should "mirror" the case law of the Strasbourg court. Good answers carefully explored, by drawing on the broader case law and literature, the normative case for the position adopted by Lord Reed, and the extent to which that case is convincing. Strong answers showed appreciation of the relationship between the quotation with other decided cases considering this issue, including Ullah and the recent Elan Cane case.

Question 10

This question asked candidates to consider whether Brexit, if at all, has changed the UK Constitution. This thematic question required candidates to look across the course, and candidates generally did a good job of drawing on relevant materials from different topics. A popular approach was to consider (at least for part of the question) whether in joining the European Union the UK Parliament undermined or limited its sovereignty and, in turn, whether the effect of the UK leaving the European Union has been to restore it. Candidates also covered a range of further topics including the constitutional implications of the two Millller decisions, the effect(s) of the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 and the implications of Brexit for the relationship(s) between the UK Parliament, the UK executive, and the devolved institutions.

Board of Examiners

Nick Barber (Chair)

Kate Greasley

Andrew Dickinson

Appendix A

Breakdown of results by individual paper and by gender

Criminal Law	Student Count	75 – 79	71 – 74	70	68 - 69	65 – 67	61 – 64	60	58 – 59	50 - 57	48 - 49	40 - 47	39 or less
	Number												
Criminal Law - All	215		7	32	18	70	52	6	7	12	3	4	3
Female	126		5	20	7	43	30	4	4	5	3	3	2
Male	90		2	12	11	27	22	2	3	7		1	1
	Percentages												
Criminal Law - All													
Female	58.60		3.97	15.87	5.55	34.13	23.81	3.17	3.17	3.97	2.38	2.38	1.59
Male	41.86		2.22	13.33	12.22	30	24.44	2.22	3.33	7.77		1.11	1.11

A Roman Introduction to Private Law	Student Count	75 – 79	71 – 74	70	68 - 69	65 – 67	61 – 64	60	58 – 59	50 - 57	48 - 49	40 - 47	39 or less
	Number												
Roman Law - All	215	3	18	25	27	70	49	7	7	5	1	1	2
Female	125	2	11	14	21	36	29	3	4	3		1	1
Male	90	1	7	11	6	34	20	4	3	2	1		1
	Percentages												
Roman Law - All													
Female	58.14	1.6	8.79	11.2	16.8	28.79	23.2	2.4	3.2	2.4		0.8	0.8
Male	41.86	1.11	7.77	12.22	6.66	37.77	22.22	4.44	3.33	2.22	1.11		1.11

Constitutional Law	Student Count	75 – 79	71 – 74	70	68 - 69	65 – 67	61 – 64	60	58 – 59	50 - 57	48 - 49	40 - 47	39 or less
	Number												
Constitutional Law - All	213		7	31	8	47	82	19	8	9			2
Female	124		5	18	4	28	46	10	7	6			
Male	89		2	13	4	19	36	9	1	3			2
	Percentages												
Constitutional Law - All													
Female	58.22		71.43	58.07	50	59.57	56.1	52.63	87.5	66.67			
Male	41.78		28.57	41.93	50	40.43	43.9	47.37	12.5	33.33			100