

MSc in CRIMINOLOGY and CRIMINAL JUSTICE

REPORT OF THE EXAMINERS 2012

General Remarks

The Chair of Examiners would like to thank all of those involved in the examination process for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice; those who served on the Board of Examiners, those who acted as Assessors, the Director of Examinations (Grant Lamond) and the Examinations Officer (Julie Bass) - who were available throughout the year for support and advice. Dedicated administrative support was received from a range of Criminology Graduate Studies Administrators, Mr Jonathan Gordon, Ms Kate Hoskin, Ms Sally Brewer, and Ms Tracy Kaye.

The Board of Examiners was supported by Professor Shadd Maruna, Queens' University, Belfast, who was enormously helpful in reading and commenting on essays, dissertations and examination scripts. The Board records its thanks to Professor Maruna for his assistance.

Structure of the Examination

The structure of the examination changed slightly from the previous year as we abolished the 'in term' essays in the compulsory methods option, Research Design and Data collection. The timing of the methods options was also different, with Research Design and Data Collection and Social Explanation and Data Analysis' offered in Michaelmas term, while Qualitative Methods and Statistical Methods for Social Sciences running in Hilary Term. The elements of the examination were as follows:

- **Option essays:** In each of Michaelmas and Hilary Terms, students were required to take *two* optional seminar-based courses (out of a choice of six in Michaelmas term and five in Hilary Term). In Trinity Term, students were required to take *one* of a choice of four optional seminar-based courses. All optional courses were examined by essays, the titles of which were posted at noon on Friday of Week 6, and the essays submitted by noon on Friday of Week 9. Each essay, with the exception of the two methods option courses (Social Explanation and Data Analysis and Qualitative Methods) was to be no less than 3,500 and no more than 5,000 words. In all options the candidates chose one essay question from a choice of three. The two methods options were assessed in the same way except that the essays were to be no less than 2,500 words and no more than 3,000 words and the candidates had to complete a number of assignments during the first six weeks of term, marked on a pass/fail basis, to the satisfaction of the course tutor.
- **Research Design and Data Collection 'in term' essays:** Since 2010-11 this option has become a compulsory research methods course for all students to

take in Michaelmas Term. It was examined by the successful completion of a pass/fail essay submitted in week 6 and one graded essay of 2500 – 3000 words to be submitted by week 9.

- **Examination:** Students were required to take two Core Courses; ‘Explanation and Understanding in Criminology’ in Michaelmas Term, and ‘Understanding Criminal Justice’ in Hilary Term. These two courses were examined by one unseen three-hour written paper on the Wednesday of Week 0 of Trinity Term (Wednesday 25 April 2012). Students were required to answer three questions from a choice of twelve; at least one of which was to be answered from each of the two parts of the exam paper.
- **Dissertation:** The students were required to submit a Dissertation of no less than 8,000 and no more than 10,000 words by noon on Friday of Week 9 of Trinity Term.

To pass the Examination

The degree of MSc is awarded to any candidate who achieves a mark of at least 50 per cent for (a) the five options and the ‘Research Design and Data Collection’ course, (b) the core course exam paper, and (c) the dissertation; and, in the case of candidates who have taken Social Explanation and Data Analysis and/or Qualitative Methods, have also satisfactorily completed the form of continuous assessment required for the relevant option. For this purpose, the individual marks of the five assessed essays and the average mark for the two pieces of coursework for ‘Research Design and Data Collection’, are aggregated and an average mark awarded for the assessments as a whole. The examiners award a distinction to any candidate who achieves marks of at least 70 per cent on at least six of the papers and, in the case of candidates who have taken ‘Social Explanation and Data Analysis’ and/or ‘Qualitative Methods’, have also satisfactorily completed the form of continuous assessment required for the relevant option): in this calculation, both the core course exam and the dissertation count as two papers and each assessed essay and the average mark for the two pieces of coursework for ‘Research Design and Data Collection’, counts as one.

Information given to candidates

The Edict (attached at Appendix 1) was sent out to candidates in Michaelmas Term 2011 in hard and electronic copy. The Edict was also available on the MSc Criminology intranet pages. Much of this information had already been available to candidates in the MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice handbook, and the programme specifications (all students received a hard copy of these documents upon enrolment and they are also available on the intranet).

Marking

All ‘Research Design and Data Collection’ essays, option essays, dissertations and core course examination papers were double-blind marked by two Examiners, or an Examiner and an Assessor, who then met to agree a mark (see Appendix 1, which contains the marking conventions at Appendix B and the Assessment Standards at Appendix C). In nearly all cases there was no substantial difference between the initial grades and so agreement was easily reached.

Following the Faculty of Law guidelines, a representative selection of coursework was sent to the External Examiner. The essays are selected at random, although care is taken that there is a spread of essays across all students as well as marks within the

ranges. All papers with a mark of 49% or below are sent to the External Examiner for review. During 2011-2012 there were five such papers. Altogether the External Examiner read 62 assessments (49 essays, seven Core Course examinations and six Dissertations). This was rather more than last and will be reduced in the coming year.

Procedures and Problems

During the academic year under review, the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice and the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice (Research Methods) together received six submissions to the Proctors under *Examinations Regulations*, Regulations for the Conduct of University Examinations, Part 11, clauses 11.8 to 11.10. Such submissions are made “[i]f it comes to the notice of a candidate’s college before, during or after an examination that the candidate’s performance in any part of a University Examination is likely to be or has been affected by factors of which the examiners have no knowledge” (Examination Regulations 2010, p 34) and, when approved by the proctors, allow the Board of Examiners to take “such action as the Examiners may think suitable”. In total there were six such submissions in relation to five individual candidates, a reduction from last year. These submissions were discussed by the Board in some detail and judgements made about the candidates’ results.

Plagiarism checks

This was the sixth year of routine plagiarism checks in criminology. Last year the plagiarism checks were extended to include dissertations, as well as assessed essays. Candidates were warned in the Graduate Student Handbook, in the Edicts, and at a plagiarism seminar as well as at a seminar on writing skills for assessments, that a random sample of essays and dissertations would be checked for plagiarism. Accordingly, they were asked to submit electronically a copy of each of their essays and of their dissertation to the Graduate Studies Administrator at the same time as they submitted a hard copy to the Examination Schools. Using the system of selecting a random sample of assessments and checking a selection of paragraphs and phrases using ‘Google’, developed and first used in 2006-2007, first assessors for each essay and for the dissertations checked a third of the submitted assessments, drawn randomly by the Chair of Examiners. This year this process revealed no cases of plagiarism.

The ‘random sampling process’ and subsequent correspondence between the administrator, Chair of Examiners and the assessors represented an extra administrative task. However, given the size of the sample, this was manageable. The Board of Examiners agreed, in a change of policy, in the coming year to switch to using Turnitin, provided that a small sample can be checked initially by the GSA, Ms Tracy Kaye, with any cases then forwarded to the examiners.

Medical certificates and other information about factors affecting performance

During the academic year under review the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice, and the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice (Research Methods) together had one candidate registered with the Disability Advisory Service for disability-related matters. The candidate received access to a word processor for their Core Course Examination in Trinity Term.

Moreover, the two MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice programmes together saw a welcome drop in the number of submissions to the Proctors for extensions to submission deadlines. In total, we had 6 requests from 5 students compared to last year when eleven such permissions were made for eight individual candidates. These extensions were requested (and all granted) for health reasons.

- One candidate received extensions for their assessments in both Hilary and Trinity Term due to a recurring medical problem.
- One candidate received an extension for one of their Hilary Term essays due to health reasons.
- Three candidates received an extension for their Trinity Term dissertation due to health issues. One of these candidates had failed to submit their dissertation in 2011 and that candidate missed the extended deadline in 2012, and subsequently failed the course

Changes to the Examination Rubric

Change approved during 2010-2011 and enacted during 2011-2012

Changes to course option 'Statistical Methods for Social Scientists'

From the academic year 2011-2012, this course will be offered by the Centre for Criminology, replacing the statistics course offered to previous MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice (Research Methods) cohorts by the Department of Politics and International Relations. This new 'in-house' course will also be available as an option to the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice students.

Overall Results of the Examination

There were twenty-seven candidates registered for for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice in 2011-12, one of whom was a candidate from the previous year's cohort who had failed their dissertation in 2010-11. That candidate failed to submit their dissertation in Trinity term 2012 and subsequently failed the degree. One other candidate failed their dissertation, but passed all the other components of the degree and will resubmit their dissertation in Trinity Term 2013. Everyone else passed the degree. Five gained a distinction.

The candidate with the highest average achieved 75.1% with seven components at distinction level, was awarded the Roger Hood Prize, designed to recognize the best performance on the MSc at distinction level. The recipient of the *proximae* prize obtained a distinction (with five components at distinction level and a weighted average of 70.0%). Overall the performance of the candidates was very good. Attached at Appendix 2 is the numbers of entrants, passes, distinctions and fails, broken down by gender, as well as the range of marks for each component of the course.

Core course examination

Twenty-nine students (including the three RM students) sat the exam, which had two sections, each comprising six questions. Students had to answer at least one question from each section and a third one from either section. All questions were attempted by at least one student apart from B6 (on parole) which no-one answered. Only one student answered A5 (on emotions and law-breaking). Marks ranged from 54% to 80%. Five students were awarded distinction marks. 20 students were awarded marks in the 60s. Two students were awarded 54%.

Optional Courses

Michaelmas Term

Research Design and Data Collection (Dr Jane Donoghue)

All MSc students (plus one DPhil student) completed one essay marked as pass/fail and one graded essay from a choice of three for this compulsory option. Six students received marks below 60% for the graded essay. There were seven distinctions awarded. One candidate failed this course.

Death Penalty (Dr Carolyn Hoyle)

Twelve students submitted assessed essays; all but one passed, three with distinction. All but one candidate answered question 1 – ‘What are the benefits and dangers of the recent focus on innocence in the US?’

The final candidate answered question 3 – ‘how do politics, on the global or national stage, help us to understand the retention and administration of the death penalty?’

The best papers developed sophisticated critiques of the concept of innocence as well as exploring the dangers as well as the benefits of the innocence movement and discourse. They drew on the relevant legal and social scientific literature as well as the evolving US Supreme Court jurisprudence. Those candidates who received marks in the low 60s and 50s tended not to develop the themes adequately; describing the arguments, rather than critically engaging with them. A few of the papers were at the lower end of the word count and perhaps inevitably these candidates did not fully develop their arguments.

All of the essay questions were cross-cutting, requiring students to draw on the literature from many weeks of the course. By and large, all of the students managed to do this, with those who reached a high pass or a distinction doing it very well.

Restorative Justice (Dr Carolyn Hoyle)

Fourteen students submitted assessed essays.

Three students answered the first question about the gap between RJ theory and practice; nine candidates answered the second question about the role of the state and the community in restorative processes; and two answered question three about how well equipped RJ is to deal with the power imbalances.

The three candidates who answered the first question received very good marks, two at distinction level and submitted very sophisticated papers which included coherent normative frameworks. There was a greater spread of marks for candidates answering the second question, one of which received a fail, and the two candidates who answered the third question passed – one with a distinction.

Most of the papers were reasonably strong on the theoretical debates within the literature and the empirical data presented in the readings. Those awarded a distinction produced theoretically sophisticated, wide-ranging and beautifully written papers, which went beyond both the literature and the issues discussed in class.

All of the essay questions were, to a greater or lesser extent, cross-cutting, requiring students to draw on the literature from more than one week of the course. Most students achieved this.

However a small number of candidates submitted papers that were only just above – and in one case below – the minimum word count. This is the first year that this has happened. Not surprisingly these candidates did not manage to develop their arguments fully and their papers lacked the depth and sophistication of those who had produced work at the higher end of the word limits.

Crime and the Family (Dr Rachel Condry)

Ten candidates were assessed in this course. Students were able to choose one from three questions;. The mark range spanned 61% to 80%. Three candidates were awarded distinction marks (80%, 78% and 72%). The rest of the marks ranged from 61% to 69%.

Sentencing (Prof Andrew Ashworth / Prof Julian Roberts)

Seventeen candidates were assessed in this course. Students were able to choose one of three questions. Marks ranged from 75% to 45%. There were six distinctions awarded, and other than one mark of 45% all other marks were between 60% and 68%

Hilary Term

Prisons (Dr Mary Bosworth)

All fifteen of the students submitted their papers on time. The papers were of generally of good quality with a few outstanding. We agreed two distinction marks and one just on the cusp (69). Four others were in the high 60s and three were in the 50s.

Students answered each of the questions. Three wrote answers to question 1, five answered question 2 and six selected question 3. Three essays were checked for plagiarism using google. None was found.

Crime, Political Ideologies and Political Culture (Prof Ian Loader)

14 candidates were assessed in this option. They had to select one from three set questions. 8 chose question 2; 6 selected question 3. No one chose to answer question 1.

The marks profile was as follows:

70-74 – 2 candidates
65-69 - 7 candidates
60-64 - 3 candidates
55-59 - 2 candidates

Qualitative Research Methods (Dr Mary Bosworth)

All students submitted their papers, one obtained an extension.

All essay questions were answered, with two selecting question 1, three selecting question 3 and the rest (four) answering question 2. Marks ranged from 58 – 66. We gave no distinctions. Two DPhil students also took this course and their essays were marked pass/fail. Both passed. I have done the plagiarism check on google. No plagiarism was detected.

Social Explanation and Data Analysis (Dr Rachel Condry)

Five essays were submitted. One was marked as a distinction with 76%, one marked at 49% and the other 3 between 66% and 68%

Victims (Dr Carolyn Hoyle)

The standard of assessed essays this year was high.

Sixteen students submitted assessed essays. One failed, the others passed, five with distinction.

Ten students answered question 1 on the prospects for justice when the offender has considerable power over the victim. Two candidates gave a rather imaginative interpretation of this question, considering victims of miscarriages of justice, when the state abuses its position of power and engages in misconduct that leads to a wrongful conviction. Other candidates took the power imbalance in abusive intimate relationships at its point of focus, while other students focused on the power imbalances in atrocities committed by the state, drawing on examples from Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, among others.

Four candidates answered question 2 on the helpfulness of the victim label in responding to harms done by crime. And two candidates answered the third question on the Ministry of Justice consultation paper, one seeking to understand it within the context of Garland's theoretical work on punishment. Those candidates who achieved distinctions (2 answered question 1; two answered question 2; 1 answered question 3) presented sociologically sophisticated analyses of the topics and their writing was clear, coherent, elegant, with the papers very well structured. Candidates who attracted solid passes covered the main ground but either didn't write as well as other candidates or failed adequately to relate the points made back to the question, or, in some cases, failed to fully develop the points made. Two papers were very thin, with one candidate going below the 3,500 lower word limit and another only just crossing it. Neither of these papers were awarded high marks as the candidates had failed to develop the points to a sufficiently detailed level.

All of the essay questions were cross-cutting, requiring students to draw on the literature from more than one week of the course. Almost all of the students rose to this challenge

Statistical Methods for Social Sciences (Dr Ben Bradford)

6 students took this course. Of the three exam questions four chose question 3 (ideas about the extent of local and national crime rates) while one each chose question 1 (victimization) and question 2 (contact with and trust in the police). The quality of the answers was generally very good – the main aim of the course was to enable students to produce and interpret meaningful statistical analysis, and all proved able to do so (while not, of course, getting every aspect of the statistical analysis right every time). Most, in fact, moved beyond simple analysis and introduced some interesting theoretical or conceptual twists to their work. This was the first time this course was run ‘in-house’ by the Centre and the students seem to have stood up to being the first to take it very well.

Trinity Term

Risk, Security and Criminal Justice (Prof Lucia Zedner)

Thirteen candidates took this option. Only one candidate answered the first question, eleven answered the second question, and two answered the third. The essays were generally of a very good standard. The weaker essays were less well written with the result that they were, at times, difficult to follow. The quality of argument was also variable and occasionally simply unclear. Most essays engaged well with the readings set. Some went well beyond the readings but some relied too heavily upon readings from other disciplines that had little relationship to the course reading list and the seminars held. Another slightly worrying aspect of some essays was a tendency to rewrite the question substantially or to focus on only part of it. Several essays would have benefitted from greater use of substantiating evidence and illustrative examples to back up the arguments and claims made. Inadequate, incomplete, and inaccurate references were also a feature of several essays and several had very short bibliographies, which did not suggest sufficiently wide-reading.

The better essays drew very effectively on readings set for the course to address the question directly. These essays were clearly argued, well-structured, and coherent. They were backed up by a wealth of data, relevant references and good scholarly apparatus, including a full and accurate bibliography.

The best essays were very impressive: they answered the question directly in a creative and insightful manner that demonstrated close reading of the texts set, and a high level of knowledge and good understanding. They were characterized by excellent critical analysis of the issues, sophisticated insights, and sustained and persuasive arguments. Clear organization and structure, attention to detail, and full scholarly apparatus were also welcome features of the best essays.

Comparative Criminal Justice (Prof David Nelken,

All three questions set for this course were chosen 2, 2, and 3 answers to each. The questions were mainly answered well, though this year there was more of a difference between the best papers and the weaker ones.

I would also mention that one essay title was mistakenly given to the students as 'Initially assess... rather than 'Critically assess...' No harm was done but it should not have happened

Youth Justice (Dr Jane Donoghue)

The quality of the essays was very good indeed. Half of the essays received a distinction, with the highest mark being a 78. The remaining essays were all marked as good passes and no essays failed. The content of the essays was consistently very good and students all demonstrated excellent understanding of the course aims and objectives. Students had read widely and had showed high levels of skill in being able to critically analyse the readings that we had covered in seminars.

Public and Private Policing (Dr Ben Bradford)

Six students took the assessment. Three selected question 2 (Does the growth of the private security industry represent a major shift in the way in which social control is exercised in developed countries?) and three selected question 3 (Is the symbolic role of the public police as important as its instrumental activities?). The essays were generally of a good quality – the lowest final mark was 60 – and there was one distinction and one near miss. Most displayed some genuine insight. Writing and presentation were generally good, although many of the essays also seemed to reveal some end of year pressures via a little clunkiness and lack of real clarity.

Dissertations

One candidate failed to submit a dissertation having deferred submission from 2011. Two candidates submitted their dissertations a few weeks late, with agreement from the Proctors. All others submitted on time.

The range of topics was wide and interesting. Most candidates presented well-researched and well-written papers. One candidate submitted an abbreviated dissertation which was marked at 20% and this candidate will resubmit the dissertation in 2013. All other students passed, with five obtaining distinctions. No student was awarded a grade in the 50s, with the lowest mark being 60%.

S. MARUNA (External)
M. Bosworth (Chair)
I. Loader
R. Condry
20 September 2012

**IMPORTANT – TO BE RETAINED FOR FUTURE
REFERENCE**

**FACULTY OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD**

**MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice
NOTICE TO CANDIDATES 2011-2012**

This document (traditionally known as the Examiners' Edict) is the means by which the Examiners communicate to the candidates information about the assessment and examination process. It is very important that you should read it carefully and retain this copy for future reference. A copy is also to be found on the Centre for Criminology website at <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/current/1112MScEdict.pdf>. If you believe that it may contain an error, please notify the Chair of Examiners (Dr Mary Bosworth) without delay.

Examination Entry details – the Examination Schools will inform you that your options have been entered into the examination system. Compulsory papers will automatically be attached to your academic record on registration. It is **your responsibility to ensure your examination entry details are correct** via the Student Self Service in OSS. See <http://www.ox.ac.uk/students/studentselfservice/?path=studentselfservice>.

A. Information for Candidates regarding the Papers for the Methods Courses and the Assessed Essays for the Options

1. Timing

Michaelmas Term 2011

Friday 18th November 2011 (Noon): Essay titles shall be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by email.

Friday 9th December 2011 (Noon): Candidates must submit the required work to the Clerk of Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

Hilary Term 2012

Friday 24th February 2012 (Noon): Essay titles shall be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by email.

Friday 17th March 2012 (Noon): Candidates must submit the required work to the Clerk of the Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

Trinity Term 2012

Friday 1st June 2012 (Noon): Essay titles shall be posted on the Graduate Student Noticeboard at the Centre for Criminology and circulated to candidates by email.

Friday 22nd June 2012 (Noon): Candidates must submit the required work to the Clerk of the Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

2. Method of Assessment

All courses (other than ‘Research Design and Data Collection’, ‘Social Explanation and Data Analysis’, ‘Statistical Methods for Social Scientists’ and ‘Qualitative Methods’) shall be examined by means of an assessed essay of 3,500 – 5,000 words (*inclusive of footnotes, but excluding bibliography and appendices*). A selection of three titles will be given from which students must choose one. For Marking Conventions see **Appendix B** and for Assessment Standards see **Appendix C** attached.

‘Research Design and Data Collection’, ‘Social Explanation and Data Analysis’, ‘Statistical Methods for Social Scientists’ and ‘Qualitative Methods’ are examined by means of an assessed essay of no less than 2,500 and no more than 3,000 words (inclusive of footnotes, but excluding bibliography and appendices). For each of these four courses a selection of three titles will be given, from which students must choose one. In addition, candidates taking any of these courses shall be required to complete to the satisfaction of the option course leader any assessments set during the term, which will be approved by the Board of Studies and the details of which will be given to the students at the start of the term.

3. Submission of Written Work

Candidates shall be required to submit **two typewritten copies** of each essay. Assessed essays must be typed or printed on one side of A4 paper only, with a margin of 3 to 3.5 centimetres on the left-hand side of each page. The text should be double-spaced and the footnotes and quotations should be single-spaced. Pages should be numbered and **EACH page should record your examination number, the course title and the essay question title in a header or footer box**. Candidates must **not** write their name or College anywhere on the essays or envelope. Essays should be bound or stapled, not held together by a paper clip. All written work must be submitted in English.

Each essay should have a cover sheet attached to it containing the title and examination number. It should also state the Oxford term and year of submission and the number of words (inclusive of footnotes, but excluding bibliography and appendices). You will find copies of these cover sheets for your use on the MSc website: <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/current/assessedessays.php>. In addition, each essay must be accompanied by a declaration that ‘This essay is the candidate’s own work. No part of it has already been accepted, nor has it been currently submitted, for a degree of this University or elsewhere.’ To assist you, this declaration has been incorporated into the **Declaration of Authorship** you are required to submit (see further A.5. below). Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors’ Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2011, pages 46-47, Part 16.8.(6)).

Two copies of each of the essays must be delivered in an envelope to the Clerk of Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford. Each envelope should be addressed to:

“The Chair of Examiners for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice,
c/o The Clerk of Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford”

In the bottom left-hand corner of the envelope you should print “Assessed Essay for the [name of option] for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice”; and your examination number should be printed in the top right hand corner of the envelope.

At the same time as you submit a hard copy to the Examination Schools, you must also submit electronically a copy of each essay to the Criminology Graduate Studies Administrator, Jonathan Gordon (jonathan.gordon@crim.ox.ac.uk) for the Examiners. A random sample of essays will be checked for plagiarism (see further A.5. below).

Application to the Proctors for permission for late submission of essays should be made by the candidate’s college, on the candidate’s behalf, before the submission date. Written work submitted late (even 10 minutes past the deadline) will not be released to the Examiners, but will be held by the Examination Schools and the Proctors will be informed. The candidate’s college, on the candidate’s behalf, may write to the Proctors explaining the reason for late submission. The Proctors may permit the candidate to remain in the examination and to submit the work late, but will impose a late presentation fee (to cover administrative costs). In addition, the Proctors may give leave to the Examiners to impose an academic penalty, which will take the form of a reduction in the mark by up to one class (or its equivalent). In determining the amount of the reduction, the Examiners will be guided by the evidence forwarded to them by the Proctors and (insofar as the following matters are dealt with by such evidence):

- (1) the degree of advantage gained by the extra time made available to the candidate relative to the time that was available to complete the assessed essays by the original deadline;
- (2) the weight to be attached to the excuse given, if any, for late submission;
- (3) the candidate’s performance in the assessed essays submitted late relative to his or her performance in the assessed essays submitted by the deadline, the Core Course examination paper and the dissertation;
- (4) the effect of any proposed reduction on the candidate’s degree result as a whole.

Factors (2) – (4) may require a final decision on penalty to be delayed until all the marks for the degree examination are known. See further Examination Regulations 2011, pp. 46-47, para. 16.8. Candidates should consult their College Advisor if any of these provisions apply to them. See also Section B.5 below (third paragraph).

A candidate who fails to apply for or to obtain permission from the Proctors for the late submission of any assessed essays, or non-submission (i.e. withdrawal from this examination unit (see Section B.5. below)), will be deemed to have failed the unit(s) in question. Non-submission includes where the Examiners refuse to examine work which exceeds the word limit (see Section A.4. below). Candidates are reminded that they must pass in all assessment areas in order to pass the degree (see Section D Overall Assessment and Publication of Results, below).

4. Length

Candidates should take seriously the word limits imposed (both upper and lower). If a candidate exceeds the word limit, the examiners may decide not to proceed with the examination of the work. If they do proceed, they may reduce the mark by up to one class (or its equivalent). See further Examination Regulations 2011, pp. 44-45, para. 16.6.

5. Plagiarism

Plagiarism is “the wrongful appropriation or purloining, and publication as one’s own, of the ideas, or the expression of the ideas of another” (OED). All published and unpublished material, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, is covered under this description. The Proctors’ Disciplinary Regulations concerning conduct in examinations (see Examination Regulations 2011, Part 19.4. and 19.5, p. 52) state that ‘No candidate shall present for an examination as his or her own work any part of the substance of another person’s work. In any written work (whether thesis, dissertation, essay, coursework, or written examination) passages quoted or closely paraphrased from another person’s work must be identified as quotations or paraphrases, and the source of the quoted or paraphrased material must be clearly acknowledged.’ In all written work students must be vigilant in citing the work they have referred to or quoted from. (Please see further **Appendix D**). Examples of plagiarism and detailed advice as to how to avoid it are given on <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/edc/goodpractice/>; you are strongly advised to consult this website. Academic supervisors can provide practical guidance on providing references and bibliographies for your work. The University reserves the right to use software applications to screen any individual’s submitted work for matches either to published sources or to other submitted work. Any such matches respectively might indicate either plagiarism or collusion. In this connection, you are required to complete and submit with each essay a **Declaration of Authorship**, including acknowledgement of the University’s right to check for plagiarism or collusion. A blank Declaration of Authorship for your use is on the MSc website: <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/current/assessedessays.php> .

Candidates are also reminded to abide by the declaration they are required to make upon submitting the essays namely: ‘This essay is the candidate’s own work. No part of it has already been accepted, nor has it been currently submitted, for a degree of this University

or elsewhere.’ For convenience, this declaration has been incorporated into the **Declaration of Authorship**.

Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors’ Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2011, pages 46-47, Part 16.8.(6)).

Candidates are warned that each term a random sample of submitted work is subject to plagiarism checks and they may be penalized if they are found guilty of plagiarism, which includes substantial use of the same material in more than one essay or in the dissertation.

6. Results

The Examiners hope to be able to publish the results of the Michaelmas Term essays by Friday 20th January 2012, the results of the Hilary Term essays by Friday 27th April 2012 and the results of the Trinity Term essays by Friday 20th July 2012 (i.e. the date upon which the Final Results are to be published).

B. Information for Candidates regarding the Core Course Examination

1. Time of Examination

This year the MSc written examination for the Joint Core Course ‘Explanation and Understanding in Criminology and Understanding Criminal Justice’ is scheduled to take place in Week 0 of Trinity Term, provisionally on **Wednesday 18th April 2012**. The date and time will be confirmed in the Examination Timetable, to be published online at <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/schools/oxonly/timetables/index.shtml>, no later than five weeks prior to the examination. Hard copies of each candidate's personal timetable will be sent to their college by the Examination Schools shortly after the full timetable appears on the website.

2. Place of Examinations and Time of Arrival

The Examination will take place in the Examinations Schools in the High Street. *Subfusc.* must be worn. You are advised to reach the Schools no less than ten minutes before the stated time of the examination. A bell will be rung some minutes before the Examination to give candidates time to move from the entrance of the building to the Examination Room. Notices in the Schools will direct candidates to the appropriate room. Seating in the examination room will be by desk number only. Seating charts will be displayed throughout the Examination Schools reception areas in each examination location, displaying candidate and desk numbers, as well as outside individual examination rooms. The Examination Schools will send you an individual timetable listing your candidate number and the time and dates of the examination. This will be sent to you no later than two weeks before the examination begins. Please bring this note with you to the examination room or devise some way of remembering your examination number. Please also bring with you your University Card; this must be placed face up on the desk at which you are writing.

3. Materials in the Examination Room

(i) Reference materials

No books, papers or dictionaries may be taken into the examination room.

(ii) Rough work

If you wish to write plans or rough drafts, you may do this either in the same booklet as your answers (but cross out the rough work) or in a separate booklet (indicating that this is rough work) which must be handed in along with your answer booklets.

(iii) Water and medication

Candidates are allowed to take into examination rooms (a) water in a spill proof bottle (not screw top bottles) and (b) certain prescription medications and/or conventional medical treatments (for asthma and Type 1 diabetes).

4. Scripts

(i) Anonymity

The Examination is marked anonymously. Candidates must write their EXAMINATION NUMBER ONLY in the appropriate place in each answer book they use. Candidates must not write their name or college on any scripts, even if an answer book contains a box labelled "name and college" (that box must be left blank).

(ii) Legibility

Candidates must not write in pencil. Candidates submitting illegible scripts will be required to have them typed after the examination, under invigilation, at their own expense.

(iii) Handing in scripts

It is **the candidate's responsibility** to place their scripts in the box corresponding to their examination number before leaving the examination room. Any candidate who does not hand in a script **must** inform an invigilator.

5. Leaving the examination room and failing to hand in any written work on time

No candidate may leave the Examination Room within half an hour of the beginning of the Examination and, to avoid disturbance to other candidates, candidates may not leave the Examination Room within half an hour of the end of the Examination. For further details, see the Examination Protocol at **Appendix A**.

A candidate who is taken ill while sitting a written paper may (with an invigilator's permission) leave the room and return while the examination is in progress to resume the paper on one occasion only (and no extra time shall be allowed). If the candidate is unable to complete the paper concerned because they have been taken ill a second time, they should inform an invigilator so that the incomplete script can be handed in. It is the candidate's responsibility to obtain a medical certificate explaining how their performance in the paper concerned may have been affected by illness. The Examiners

will only be made aware of any difficulties suffered by a candidate in the examination room if the candidate subsequently obtains a medical certificate and that, plus any other relevant information, is submitted to the Proctors and passed by them to the Examiners. For the procedures to be followed see paragraph B.10 below.

Candidates who fail to attend a written examination paper without having obtained the prior permission of the Proctors are deemed to have failed the entire examination (not just that particular unit of the examination) unless the Proctors give instructions to the Examiners about reinstating them (Examination Regulations 2011, pp. 39-40, Part 14). This means that the names of such candidates have to be included on the results list under 'fail'. For the procedure for late submission and the consequences of failure to hand in written work, see Section A.3 above (assessed essays) and Section C.4. below (dissertation). For the procedures for withdrawal before the examination and after the examination has started, see the Examination Regulations 2011, pp. 39-40, Part 14.

6. Special remarks concerning the paper

There will be twelve questions on the Core Course paper, which is divided into two sections. Candidates must answer **THREE** questions, at least one from each section.

7. Marking

It is essential that candidates follow the instructions on the paper. Failure to do so will result in a penalty. Failure to answer fully any question or questions will constitute short weight and will lead to a reduction in the overall mark. For Marking Conventions see **Appendix B** and for Assessment Standards see **Appendix C** attached.

8. Results

The Core Course paper will be marked, alongside the Trinity Term essays and the Dissertation, in June. The Examiners hope to be able to publish the results by Friday 20th July 2012.

9. Protocol

The Examination Protocol (**Appendix A**) gives practical guidance on the conduct of the examination. A copy of the Protocol is appended and you should read it before the day of the examination. Please note, this document will not be placed on desks in the examination room. The Protocol also refers you to the Proctors' Disciplinary Regulations and Administrative Regulations for Candidates in Examinations (See also Section E below.)

10. Illness or other Causes affecting Candidates for Examinations

The Proctors have authority to authorise special arrangements for candidates who for medical or other sufficient reasons are likely to have difficulty in writing their scripts or completing the examination in the time allowed. Such arrangements must be made **by Friday 4th November 2011 (Week 4, Michaelmas Term)**. If this applies, you should consult the appropriate college officer, usually the Senior Tutor. Where a candidate's

performance in any part of an examination is likely to be, or has been, affected by factors such as illness or disability, of which the Examiners have no knowledge, the candidate may, through the appropriate college officer, inform the Proctors of these factors, and the Proctors will pass this information to the Chair of Examiners if, in their opinion, it is likely to assist the Examiners in the performance of their duties. Candidates are advised to check with the appropriate college officer that any medical certificate for submission is complete (eg covers each paper where the candidate was affected by illness). See further the Examination Regulations 2011, pp. 32–35, part 11. The Examiners cannot take account of any special circumstances other than those communicated by the Proctors. See also Section B.5 above.

C. Information for Candidates regarding the Dissertation

1. Timing

Hilary Term

Wednesday 22nd February 2012 (noon): Candidates must submit the title of their proposed dissertation to the Graduate Studies Administrator by email.

Friday 9th March 2012: Candidates will be informed by this date whether their titles have been approved and will be given the name of their Dissertation Supervisor.

Trinity Term

Friday 22nd June 2012 (Noon): Candidates must submit the Dissertation to the Clerk of the Schools, Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford.

2. Change of Title

A request to change the title agreed by the Examiners must be approved by the Dissertation Supervisor and the Chair of Examiners. See further the Examination Regulations 2011, pp. 44-45, para. 16.6.

3. Method of Assessment

The Dissertation shall be between **8,000 and 10,000 words** (*inclusive of footnotes and appendices, but excluding the abstract, table of contents, table of cases, table of statutes, the bibliography, any headers and footers and index*). The Dissertation title must be approved by the Board of Examiners (see timetable above). For Marking Conventions see **Appendix B** and for Assessment Standards see **Appendix C** attached.

4. Submission of Dissertation

Candidates shall be required to submit **two typewritten copies** of the Dissertation. The Dissertation must be typed or printed on one side of A4 paper only, with a margin of 3 to 3.5 centimeters on the left-hand side of each page. The text should be double-spaced and the footnotes and quotations should be single-spaced. Pages should be numbered and

EACH page should record your examination number and the dissertation title in a header or footer box. Candidates must **not** write their name or College anywhere on the Dissertation or envelope. The Dissertation should be bound or stapled, not held together by a paper clip. All written work must be submitted in English. For definitive guidance on the correct format for a dissertation please refer to **Appendix E**, and see also Section 7.7 of the Graduate Student Handbook 2011-2012 for further details.

The Dissertation should have a cover sheet attached to it containing the title, subtitle (if any) and examination number. It should also state the Oxford term and year of submission and the number of words (inclusive of footnotes and appendices, but excluding the abstract, table of contents, table of cases, table of statutes, the bibliography, any headers and footers and index). You will find copies of these cover sheets for your use on the MSc website: <http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/current/assessedessays.php>. In addition, the Dissertation must be accompanied by a declaration that ‘This Dissertation is the candidate’s own work. No part of it has already been accepted, nor has it been currently submitted, for a degree of this University or elsewhere.’ To assist you, this declaration has been incorporated into the **Declaration of Authorship** you are required to submit (see further C.6. below). Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors’ Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2011, pages 46-47, Part 16.8.(6)).

Two copies of the Dissertation must be delivered in an envelope to the Clerk of Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford. The envelope should be addressed to:

“The Chair of Examiners for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice,
c/o The Clerk of Examination Schools, High Street, Oxford”

At the same time as you submit a hard copy to the Examination Schools, you must also submit electronically a copy of each dissertation to the Criminology Graduate Studies Administrator for the Examiners. A random sample of dissertations will be checked for plagiarism (see further A.5. below).

In the bottom left-hand corner of the envelope you should print “Dissertation for the MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice”; and, your examination number should be printed in the top right hand corner of the envelope.

Application to the Proctors for permission for late submission of the dissertation should be made by the candidate’s college, on the candidate’s behalf, before the submission date. Written work submitted late (even 10 minutes past the deadline) will not be released to the Examiners, but will be held by the Examination Schools and the Proctors informed. The candidate’s college, on the candidate’s behalf, may write to the Proctors explaining the reason for the late submission. The Proctors may permit the candidate to remain in the examination and to submit the work late, but will impose a late presentation fee (to cover administrative costs). In addition, the Proctors may give leave to the Examiners to impose an academic penalty, which will take the form of a reduction in the mark by up to one class (or its equivalent). In determining the amount of the reduction, the Examiners will be guided by the evidence forwarded to them by the Proctors and (insofar as the following matters are dealt with by such evidence):

- (1) the degree of advantage gained by the extra time made available to the candidate relative to the time that was available to complete the dissertation by the original deadline;
- (2) the weight to be attached to the excuse given, if any, for late submission;
- (3) the candidate's performance in the thesis or other exercise relative to his or her performance in written papers or other exercises;
- (4) the effect of any proposed reduction on the candidate's degree result as a whole.

See further Examination Regulations 2011, pp. 46-47, para. 16.8. Candidates should consult their College Advisor if any of these provisions apply to them. See also Section B.5. above (third paragraph).

A candidate who fails to apply for or to obtain permission from the Proctors for the late submission of the dissertation, or non-submission (i.e. withdrawal from this examination unit (see Section B.5. above)), will be deemed to have failed the entire degree examination (not just the dissertation unit). Non-submission includes where the Examiners refuse to examine work which exceeds the word limit (see Section C.5. below) or where the title is different from that agreed by the Examiners (see Section C.2 above).

5. Length

Candidates should take seriously the word limits imposed (both upper and lower). If a candidate exceeds the word limit, the examiners may decide not to proceed with the examination of the work. If they do proceed, they may reduce the mark by up to one class (or its equivalent). See further Examination Regulations 2011, pp. 44-45 para. 16.6.

6. Plagiarism

Plagiarism is “the wrongful appropriation or purloining, and publication as one's own, of the ideas, or the expression of the ideas of another” (OED). All published and unpublished material, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, is covered under this description. The Proctors' Disciplinary Regulations concerning conduct in examinations (see Examination Regulations 2011, Part 19.4 and 19.5. p. 52) state that ‘No candidate shall present for an examination as his or her own work any part of the substance of another person's work. In any written work (whether thesis, dissertation, essay, coursework, or written examination) passages quoted or closely paraphrased from another person's work must be identified as quotations or paraphrases, and the source of the quoted or paraphrased material must be clearly acknowledged.’ In all written work students must be vigilant in citing the work they have referred to or quoted from (please see further **Appendix D**). Examples of plagiarism and detailed advice as to how to avoid it are given on <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/edc/goodpractice/>; you are strongly advised to consult this website. Academic supervisors can provide practical guidance on providing references and bibliographies for your work. The University reserves the right to use software applications to screen any individual's submitted work for matches either to published sources or to other submitted work. In this connection, you are required to complete and submit with the Dissertation a **Declaration of Authorship**, including acknowledgement of the University's right to check for plagiarism or collusion. A blank

Declaration of Authorship for your use is on the MSc website:
<http://www.crim.ox.ac.uk/current/assessedessays.php>.

Candidates are also reminded to abide by the declaration they are required to make upon submitting the dissertation namely:

‘This dissertation is the candidate’s own work. No part of it has already been accepted, nor has it been currently submitted, for a degree of this University or elsewhere.’ To assist you, this declaration has been incorporated into the **Declaration of Authorship**.

Late submission of this Declaration may lead the Proctors’ Office to recommend an academic penalty (see Examination Regulations 2011, pages 46-47, Part 16.8.(6)).

Candidates should stand forewarned that they may be penalized if they use substantially the same material in their dissertation as they have used in an assessed essay.

7. Results

The Examiners hope to be able to publish the dissertation results by Friday 20th July 2012 (i.e. the date upon which the Final Results are provisionally due to be published).

D. Overall Assessment and Publication of Results

The degree of MSc shall be awarded to any candidate who achieves a mark of at least 50 per cent for (a) the five options and the ‘Research Design and Data Collection’ course, (b) the core course paper, and (c) the dissertation, as well as satisfactorily completes the continuous assessment element of ‘Research Design and Data Collection’, and, where relevant, those of ‘Social Explanation and Data Analysis’, and/or ‘Statistical Methods for Social Scientists’ and/or ‘Qualitative Methods’. The examiners award a distinction to any candidate who achieves marks of at least 70 per cent on at least six of the papers, as well as satisfactorily completes the continuous assessment element of ‘Research Design and Data Collection’, and, where relevant, those of ‘Social Explanation and Data Analysis’, and/or ‘Statistical Methods for Social Scientists’ and/or ‘Qualitative Methods’. In this calculation, both the core course and the dissertation shall count as two papers and each assessed essay shall count as one.

The Examiners hope to publish the final results by Friday 20th July 2012. Once the results have been released online, candidates will be sent an automatic e-mail to say their results are available to view. Candidates can then access their results via their Student Self Service. The Academic and Assessment Results page within Student Self Service details all assessment results (examination papers and/or submissions) and the final classification (if applicable) on this page. For further information candidates are referred to <http://www.ox.ac.uk/students/studentselfservice/?path=studentselfservice>. Informal individual transcripts (giving the breakdown of marks) will be mailed direct to candidates at their colleges once the final marks are published.

F. Proctors' and Assessor's Memorandum

Essential Information for Students (known as the Proctors' and Assessor's Memorandum) contains much useful information and is available on <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/proctors/pam/index.shtml> Sections 9, 10, 11 and 13 have relevance for examinations.

S. Maruna (External Examiner)

M. Bosworth (Chair)

R. Condry

I. Loader

10 October 2011

Appendix A

MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice 2011-2012

EXAMINATION PROTOCOL

NB This is an unofficial practical guide to conduct and procedures in the Examination Schools. In addition, you should before the examination familiarize yourself with the Proctors' Disciplinary Regulations for Candidates in Examinations (see Examination Regulations 2011, Part 19, pages 51-53) **and the Proctors' Administrative Regulations for Candidates in Examinations** (see Examination Regulations 2011, Part 20, pages 53-54).

1. Please check that you are seated at the right seat in the examination room.
2. In order to prevent impersonation of examination candidates, during every written paper you must display your University Card face up on the desk at which you are writing.
3. Do not turn over the examination paper or begin writing until you are told you may do so.
4. You may remove gowns, jackets and ties during the examination, but you must be correctly dressed in *subfusc.* before you leave the examination room.
5. Do not put your name or college on any answer book. Write only "MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice", the title of the paper ("Core Course") and your examination number in the spaces provided.
6. Please read the instructions on the front of your answer book and observe them.
7. You may not leave the examination room before 30 minutes after the beginning of the examination, nor in the last 30 minutes of the examination.
8. Water in spill-proof bottles (not screw top bottles) is the only refreshments allowed into the examination room.
9. Do not bring mobile telephones or any other electronic devices into the examination room.
10. Do not bring any papers, dictionaries or personal belongings, such as coats and bags, into the examination room. All articles or equipment to be used in an examination must be carried into the examination room in a transparent bag. Non-transparent bags must be offered for inspection and, unless special permission is given by an invigilator, must be deposited at the place designated for the deposit of bags and other personal belongings.
11. If you require more paper, raise your hand (preferably with a piece of paper in it) and it will be brought to you.

12. Shortly before the end of the examination, you will be given an oral notice of the time remaining. At the end of the examination you will be orally notified to stop writing. If you have used more than one answer book, you must tag the books together using the tag provided.

13. At the end of the examination, you will be called upon, a row at a time, to deposit your script in the boxes provided.

14. At the end of the examination, please go directly to your college. In order to avoid nuisance to other members of the public, the Proctors' rules clearly prohibit you from assembling for any purpose in the entrance of the Examination Schools or on the streets outside. The Proctors' Code of Conduct for post-examination celebrations is available on <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/proctors>.

Appendix B

MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice 2011-2012

MARKING CONVENTIONS

1. It is important to appreciate that the classification conventions set out here are not inflexible rules. The examiners retain discretion in dealing with unusual cases and circumstances. Subject to that caveat, the conventions that will normally be applied are as follows.

2. The University requires scripts to be marked on a scale from 1 to 100. Marks of 70 and above are Distinction marks and marks of 50 to 69 are pass marks. Marks of 49 or below are fail marks.

(a) The degree of MSc shall be awarded to any candidate who achieves a mark of at least 50 per cent for (a) the five options and the 'Research Design and Data Collection' course, (b) the core course paper, and (c) the dissertation, as well as satisfactorily completes the continuous assessment element of 'Research Design and Data Collection', and, where relevant, those of 'Social Explanation and Data Analysis', and/or 'Statistical Methods for Social Scientists' and/or 'Qualitative Methods'. (b) The examiners award a distinction to any candidate who achieves marks of at least 70 per cent on at least six of the papers, as well as satisfactorily 4 completes the continuous assessment element of 'Research Design and Data Collection', and, where relevant, those of 'Social Explanation and Data Analysis', and/or 'Statistical Methods for Social Scientists' and/or 'Qualitative Methods'. In this calculation, both the core course and the dissertation shall count as two papers and each assessed essay shall count as one.

(c) In the Core Course Examination, a mark will be given for each question out of 100 and the total divided by three to achieve the mark for that paper. A paper will be deemed not to have been fully answered if a whole question has been omitted, or, where part of a question is separately numbered or lettered, part of a question has been completely omitted. The precise degree of the penalty incurred will depend upon the extent to which the script is short weight. For example, If a candidate completes two questions marked at 70 and 70 in a paper which requires 3 answers, the overall mark is recorded as '70/2' ('70 over 2 answers', to indicate the extent of the short weight relative to the requirements of the paper) and 13 marks deducted, making a total overall mark of 57 for the script. If a candidate completes two-and-a-half questions marked at 70, 70 and '70/ ½' ('70 over half an answer') in a paper which requires 3 answers, the overall mark is recorded as '70/ 2 ½' ('70 over 2 ½ answers', to indicate the extent of the short weight relative to the requirements of the paper) and 7 marks deducted, making a total overall mark of 63 for the script.

Appendix C

MSc in Criminology and Criminal Justice 2011-2012

Assessment Standards

70-100: Distinction level

Papers which are awarded a distinction will be well structured, well argued and comprehensive. They will be analytical, rather than merely descriptive and will go beyond the most obvious sources of knowledge. The candidate will have demonstrated an unusually clear grasp of most of the issues (including all the more important ones), used an unusually wide range of material, and displayed very good skills in evaluating the material and using it to construct arguments which deal with the issues.

80-100: Superb work showing fine command of intellectual debates and making a creative contribution to them.

75-79: Excellent work, intellectually stimulating argument.

70-74: Fine work showing powerful analysis, a distinctive argument, and full awareness of the secondary literature and critical engagement with it.

50-69: Pass

Papers which are awarded a pass mark will demonstrate a competent grasp of most of the more important issues, a familiarity with and understanding of a reasonable range of relevant materials, and good skills in evaluating the material and using it to construct arguments which deal with the issues.

65-69: Strong pass: Strong and well-developed independent critical analysis that moves beyond issues discussed in seminars. Clear and logical arguments and an awareness of nuances and complexities in debates. Strong evidence of independent research drawing on a wide range of literature. Some indication of distinction potential; no significant errors of fact or interpretation.

55-64: Good pass: Sound analytical standard with most points developed rather than stated. Some evidence of independent critical analysis and evaluation and synthesis of material. Addresses the question and provides a reasonably focused answer. Some awareness of nuances and complexities in debates.

50-54: Pass: Basic analytical skills apparent from identification of intellectual problems with some structured discussion of them. Partially addresses the question but lacks focus. Broadly satisfactory grasp of key issues. Arguments appropriate, but underdeveloped.

Candidates are expected to pay attention to academic style, grammar, use of referencing and citation conventions and clarity of expression, as these will be taken into account in the assessment process.

0-49: Fail

An unsatisfactory piece of work. At best, the answer will simply describe the most relevant research and debates but will not demonstrate any skill at analysis or argumentation. It is likely that this candidate will not have clearly demonstrated much understanding of the question or the issues it raises. Some of the most relevant material is likely to have been ignored and irrelevant material included.

45-49: Marginal fail: inadequate development of points made.

0-44: Outright fail: inadequate coverage and inadequate analysis.

‘Research Design and Data Collection’, ‘Social Explanation and Data Analysis’, ‘Statistical Methods for Social Scientists’ and ‘Qualitative Methods’

To pass these research methods courses candidates must satisfactorily complete assignments during the term. A satisfactorily completed assignment is one that demonstrates the candidate's

- ability to follow accurately the procedures required for the project, as set out in the assignment instructions
- understanding of the processes involved in the project
- ability to write a sensible, accurate and illuminating report on the outcomes
- diligent application to the assignment.

A candidate will not fail an assignment solely on the ground that the results obtained in the course of the project are incorrect.

Appendix D

Academic Integrity: Good practice in citation and the avoidance of plagiarism

What is plagiarism?

Plagiarism is the copying or paraphrasing of other people's work or ideas into your own work without full acknowledgement. All published and unpublished material, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, is covered under this definition. Collusion is another form of plagiarism involving the unauthorised collaboration of students (or others) in a piece of work. Cases of suspected plagiarism in assessed work are investigated under the disciplinary regulations (<http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/proctors/info/pam/section9.shtml>) concerning conduct in examinations. Intentional or reckless plagiarism may incur severe penalties, including failure of your degree or expulsion from the university.

Why does plagiarism matter?

It would be wrong to describe plagiarism as only a minor form of cheating, or as merely a matter of academic etiquette. On the contrary, it is important to understand that plagiarism is a breach of academic integrity. It is a principle of intellectual honesty that all members of the academic community should acknowledge their debt to the originators of the ideas, words, and data which form the basis for their own work. Passing off another's work as your own is not only poor scholarship, but also means that you have failed to complete the learning process. Deliberate plagiarism is unethical and can have serious consequences for your future career; it also undermines the standards of your institution and of the degrees it issues.

What forms can plagiarism take?

- **Verbatim quotation of other people's intellectual work without clear acknowledgement.** Quotations must always be identified as such by the use of either quotation marks or indentation, with adequate citation. It must always be apparent to the reader which parts are your own independent work and where you have drawn on someone else's ideas and language.
- **Paraphrasing the work of others by altering a few words and changing their order, or by closely following the structure of their argument,** is plagiarism because you are deriving your words and ideas from their work without giving due acknowledgement. Even if you include a reference to the original author in your own text you are still creating a misleading impression that the paraphrased wording is entirely your own. It is better to write a brief summary of the author's overall argument in your own words than to paraphrase particular sections of his or her writing. This will ensure you have a genuine grasp of the argument and will avoid the difficulty of paraphrasing without plagiarising. You must also properly attribute all material you derive from lectures.
- **Cutting and pasting from the Internet.** Information derived from the Internet must be adequately referenced and included in the bibliography. It is important to evaluate

carefully all material found on the Internet, as it is less likely to have been through the same process of scholarly peer review as published sources.

- **Collusion.** This can involve unauthorised collaboration between students, failure to attribute assistance received, or failure to follow precisely regulations on group work projects. It is your responsibility to ensure that you are entirely clear about the extent of collaboration permitted, and which parts of the work must be your own.
- **Inaccurate citation.** It is important to cite correctly, according to the conventions of your discipline. Additionally, you should not include anything in a footnote or bibliography that you have not actually consulted. If you cannot gain access to a primary source you must make it clear in your citation that your knowledge of the work has been derived from a secondary text (e.g. Bradshaw, D. Title of book, discussed in Wilson, E., Title of book (London, 2004), p. 189).
- **Failure to acknowledge.** You must clearly acknowledge all assistance which has contributed to the production of your work, such as advice from fellow students, laboratory technicians, and other external sources. This need not apply to the assistance provided by your tutor or supervisor, nor to ordinary proofreading, but it is necessary to acknowledge other guidance which leads to substantive changes of content or approach.
- **Professional agencies.** You should neither make use of professional agencies in the production of your work nor submit material which has been written for you. This includes translation services and services that improve and edit your written English. It is vital to your intellectual training and development that you should undertake the research process unaided.
- **Autoplagerism.** You must not submit work for assessment which you have already submitted (partially or in full) to fulfil the requirements of another degree course or examination.

Not just printed text!

The necessity to reference applies not only to text, but also to other media, such as computer code, illustrations, graphs etc. It applies equally to published text drawn from books and journals, and to unpublished text, whether from lecture handouts, theses or other students' essays. You must also attribute text or other resources downloaded from web sites.

Appendix E

Format for Theses and Dissertations in the Faculty of Law

The following guidance is taken from the Law Faculty Handbook for Graduate Students

1 'Thesis' here includes not only the writing submitted for the DPhil, MLitt, MPhil, or MSt, but also the essay which is submitted by a Probationer Research Student for a Qualifying Test, and dissertations offered in the examination for the BCL, MJur, or MSc. It does not include essays set by way of examination for the BCL, MJur, or MSc.

2 Every thesis must include an abstract not exceeding 300 words. The abstract must contain no footnotes. The abstract must appear immediately after the title page. Its format is governed by regulations 7 to 10 below.

3 Every thesis must contain a table of contents. The table of contents must state the titles of the chapters and their principal sub-divisions. The table of contents must be indexed to the pages where the chapters and first-level sub-headings begin.

4 Every thesis which mentions cases and statutes must contain separate tables of cases and statutes. Those tables must be indexed, so that each entry shows on what pages the case or statute in question is mentioned. The tables must appear at the beginning of the thesis, after the title page, the abstract, and the table of contents (in that order).

5 A bibliography must appear at the end of the thesis. It need not be indexed.

6 An index is not required. If there is one, it must come after the bibliography.

7 All footnotes and appendices are included in the word count. The abstract, the table of contents, the table of cases, the table of statutes, the bibliography, any headers or footers, and any index are not included in the word count.

8 The thesis must be written in English.

9 The thesis must use A4 paper.

10 The thesis must be word-processed using size 12 font on one side of the paper only, with a margin of 32 to 38 mm on the left hand side. Variations of font size may be used for headings, sub-headings, and footnotes.

11 The lines in the main text must be double spaced (8mm).

12 The first line of every paragraph must be indented unless the paragraph immediately follows a heading or sub-heading, or an indented footnote.

13 Quotations must use single inverted commas, saving double inverted commas for use for quotes within quotes. Quotations longer than two lines must be presented as a

double-indented, single-spaced paragraph with no further indentation of the first line. Such double-indented quotations must not use quotation marks.

14 Endnotes must not be used. Footnotes must be internally single spaced with double spacing between the notes.

15 The thesis must comply with OSCOLA (the Oxford Standard for Citation of Legal Authorities: <http://www.law.ox.ac.uk/publications/oscola.php>), or another useful standard for citation. You should consult your supervisor if you wish to depart from OSCOLA.

16 The thesis must be bound in a soft or hard cover.

17 Where the thesis is offered as part of an examination which is assessed anonymously, it must not at any point divulge the identity of the candidate or the candidate's college.

18 The word limits for theses:

	Minimum	maximum
DPhil	75,000	100,000
MLitt	40,000	50,000
MPhil and MSt	25,000	30,000
QT Part B (for DPhil)	8,000	10,000
QT Part B (for MLitt)	5,000	6,000
MSc dissertation	8,000	10,000
MSc (Research Methods) dissertation	13,000	15,000

Appendix 2.

MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice

Table 1. Degree Results by Gender. 2011-2012 Academic Year

		FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL
Grade	Pass	11	9	20
	Distinction	5	0	5
	Fail	1	0	2
	Deferred	1	0	1
Total		18	9	27

Table 2. Degree Results by Gender. 2001-2011 Academic Years

	FEMALE	MALE
<i>2010 -11 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	2	0
Pass	8	7
Fail	0	0
Deferred	1	0
<i>2009-10 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	12	2
Fail	0	0
Deferred	0	0
<i>2008-9 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	5	9
Fail	0	0
Deferred	2	0
<i>2007-8 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	10	5
Fail	0	0
<i>2006-7 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	3
Pass	7	5
Fail	0	1
<i>2005-6 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	3	3
Pass	6	4
Fail	2	0
<i>2004-2005 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	2	2
Pass	6	4

Fail	0	0
<i>2003-2004 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	1	2
Pass	4	4
Fail	0	0
<i>2002-2003 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	2	1
Pass	6	5
Fail	0	0
<i>2001-2002 Academic Year</i>		
Distinction	4	1
Pass	2	4
Fail	0	1

Table 3. Option results, showing the range of marks and averages

Option	Number of candidates	Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average mark
Death Penalty	12	47	74	65
Crime and the Family	8	65	78	69
	<i>Including RM students:10</i>	61	80	69
Prisons	15	55	70	64
Crime, Political Ideology and Political Culture	14	56	73	65
Research Design and Data Collection	26	53	74	65
	<i>Including RM students: 29</i>	53	74	65
Social Explanation and Data Analysis	2	66	68	67
	<i>Including RM students: 5</i>	49	75	65
Qualitative Methods	4	58	66	63
	<i>Including RM students: 7</i>	58	67	64
Restorative Justice	14	46	80	66
Sentencing	16	45	74	65
	<i>Including RM students:17</i>	45	74	66
Victims	16	48	80	65
Youth Justice	6	64	78	69
Risk, Security and Criminal Justice	10	59	72	65
	<i>Including RM Students: 13</i>	59	75	66

Option	Number of candidates	Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average mark
Statistical Methods	3	61	64	63
	<i>Including RM Students: 6</i>	61	72	66
Comparative Criminal Justice	6	50	75	64
	<i>Including RM Students: 7</i>	50	75	66
Policing	4	60	71	66
	<i>Including RM Students: 6</i>	60	71	66

Table 4. Core Course Exam results, showing the range of marks and average (including the three RM students)

Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average
54	80	65

Table 5. Dissertation results, showing the range of marks and average

Lowest mark	Highest mark	Average
20	75	65

6 July 2012

External Examiner's Report
University of Oxford MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice

I have now had the opportunity to review samples of 13 coursework essay assignments, 7 student exam responses for the Core Course module, and 6 dissertations submitted during the Trinity Term. These samples covered a range of assigned marks from across the spectrum, from fails to firsts, as agreed with the Chair of the Examinations Board at the beginning of my reign as External Examiner. I have also reviewed the spread of the agreed marks for the different modules, and previously approved module essay titles and examination questions and reviewed the module handbooks for the Course.

As in previous terms, I am very impressed by the very high standard of work that students on the Course are producing. All of the work I reviewed was clearly appropriate for the Master's level at a top-rated institution like Oxford. Indeed, the best of the module assignments that I read were substantial (5000 word) essays written at a publishable level. I should note, there was some disparity in the word count of the essays I was asked to review, ranging from a low of around 2000 (estimation, not recorded by student) to just over 5000 words. Perhaps some loose standardisation across or certainly within modules might be worth considering.

The range of marks within and across the different modules all appeared to be consistent and reflected the high standards of recruitment and selection of students (and of course the high levels of teaching in the modules). I counted 10 final marks in the distinction range for optional modules and five on the Core Course. Comparatively, there were only two marks in the lowest "Pass" category (between 50 and 54).

The dissertations were equally impressive. Dissertation topics are wide ranging and contribute to an array of issues from "theorising feigned apology in restorative justice" to "a criminological analysis of Mexico's drug problem." In contrast to the course essays, which feel long to me at 5000 words, the dissertations (almost all around 9,500 words) felt rather slight by comparison. Substantively, however, I was impressed with the students' abilities to apply core criminological insights and research to specific topics (e.g., the analysis of the Mexican drug problem drew widely on theory from Felson and others written for a very different context). There was also considerable creativity

and originality on display (e.g., the importation of Sustain's "nudge" concept into the context of prison reform). The high quality of these theses overall (with one exception, see below) is reflected in the range of marks, with a majority of students receiving marks in the range of "Strong Pass" or "Distinction." This is an important achievement and clearly the level of supervision for these projects is very high.

The process of internal double-marking of essay and exam responses for the Term has been rigorous and thorough. I am very impressed with the level of feedback provided to students on their essays. I appreciate (indeed envy) the visually-oriented likert scales used to assess the essays on dimensions such as originality, argument, etc. These are clear, easily understood, and provide specific areas for students to work on. For most of the modules and all of the dissertations, these indicators are then supplemented with a paragraph or more of useful qualitative feedback as well. For a small number of the assessed work, this qualitative feedback is limited to one line only. For cases in which the mark is a distinction, I think this is probably fine (one need not gush endlessly about outstanding work). However, for those in receipt of lower marks, this limited level of feedback may not provide enough individualised detail for explaining the marks and advice for improving future work. On a much less important point, there are also a rather high number of typographical mistakes in the typed feedback students receive. Although basically harmless (in all cases, I could detect what the authors meant), since the students themselves are marked on presentation skills, this might be seen as somewhat contradictory.

I did not receive any feedback provided on the in-class examinations for the Core Course this Term, and in the future a line or two of explanation for these marks might be useful for students (and myself as Examiner). Overall, the range of marks and the quality of the sample essays for this Core Course module suggests that the exams provide a sufficient means of assessing student performance in the course. However, it should be noted, the hand-written exam is a somewhat anachronistic and unusual assessment method for the Master's Level. Scores on this module tended to be somewhat lower than on the optional modules. One wonders how accustomed the contemporary generation of students are to the old-fashioned method of composing their thoughts with pen or pencil.

Overall, I am very impressed with the level and standard of the MSc Course and am completely satisfied that the students are receiving a world-class education in criminology and criminal justice issues. One small point in this regard: Outside of the Core Course, all of the module offerings in the Trinity Term involve criminal justice topics (Youth Justice, Policing, etc) rather than criminological ones (Sex Offending, Aetiology of Criminality, Criminal Psychology, etc). I am aware that this imbalance has been noted before, but it is worth revisiting for a world-class master's degree in Criminology and Criminal Justice.

Perhaps experts from outside the Centre could be called upon to contribute subjects that may be somewhat lacking in the current curriculum.

Finally, I would like to thank the Chair of the Examinations Board and the Board of Examiners for their flexibility in the scheduling of the Exam Board meeting (and hopefully future meetings).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Shadd Maruna', written in a cursive style with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Professor Shadd Maruna, Ph.D.
Director, Institute of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Queen's University
Belfast External Examiner