

**FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL OF ANCIENT AND MODERN HISTORY EXAMINERS'
REPORT 2023 FINAL**

Part I

A. Statistics

All candidates

Class	No						%					
	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018
I	7	8	10	13	11	13	38.9	32	58.8	59	52.4	68.4
II.1	10	16	7	9	10	6	55.6	64	41.2	41	47.6	31.6
II.2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
III	1	-	-	-	-	-	5.6	-	-	-	-	-

All candidates, divided by male and female

Class	Number										Percentage (%) of gender									
	2023		2022		2021		2020		2019		2023		2022		2021		2020		2019	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
I	5	2	4	4	8	2	9	4	8	3	50	25	30.	33.	72.	33.	60	57	61.	37.
II.1	4	6	9	7	3	4	6	3	5	5	40	75	69.	58.	27.	66.	40	43	38.	62.
II.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
III	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

NEW EXAMINING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

- B. Candidates were contacted directly in October and May with the agreed classification procedures for AMH. The ancient history sub-faculty confirmed its decision not to join the History Faculty in having the thesis supervisor as second marker, and all AMH theses were marked in the traditional way.

Part II

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

18 candidates (10 M, 8 F) took the examination. There were seven firsts (5 M, 2 F) ten upper seconds (4M, 6F), and one third.

This was a particularly testing year for the examiners, not through any actions of the candidates, but rather due to inaction on the part of markers as a result of industrial (in)action. The Ancient and Modern History examinations were, in the end, immune from the worst effects. This was very much due to the quick re-arrangements for marking that could be made within the History Faculty. The chair is particularly grateful to Professor Baxter and to Andrea Hopkins and their respective teams for working intensively to minimise this impact. He would also

record here is continued gratitude to Andrew Dixon in Classics for his calmness under fire and clear overview and explanations of process.

Even by the standards of this school, this was a small year, and neither generalisations nor specific comments about performances can carry much weight within any assessment of overall trends. In general, however, it can be said that the very high standard of scripts does match last year's experience, as is evinced in the percentage of first class degrees awarded (38.9%). Average marks on the ancient and modern side of the school seem to be broadly similar, suggesting no great difference in marking principles or practice exists.

B. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES AND BREAKDOWN OF THE RESULTS BY GENDER

Results were more equal this year than for several previous years: 4 (out of 10) men and 3 (out of 8) women achieved Firsts, or 40% of men and 37.5% of women.

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

All 18 candidates took the Disciplines of History paper. Their average mark was 66.6 (History main school average mark 66.3).

All candidates submitted a thesis, the average mark was 67.7, with marks ranging from 61 to 82. (Compared with History, where the average mark was 68.22)

Five candidates submitted three British History essays in year 2: the average mark was 63.8, with marks ranging from 65 to 67.

All 18 candidates took a Greek or Roman History paper, average mark 65.8, with marks ranging from 49 to 72.

Thirteen candidates took a European and World History paper; the average mark was 67, with marks ranging from 58 to 72.

Further Subjects: 8 candidates took a History Further Subject, and 10 took an Ancient Further Subject. The first group had an average mark of 66.4 and the second 67.

Special Subjects: 7 candidates took a History Special Subject, and 11 took an Ancient Special Subject. The first group had average marks of 67.7 for gobbets and 67.4 for the Extended Essay; the second group had average marks of 66.8 for Paper I and 67.6 for Paper II.

Only one candidate took an Ancient Language paper this year.

D. COMMENTS ON PAPERS AND INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

Numbers are too small for meaningful or anonymous comment.

E. COMMENTS ON THE PERFORMANCE OF IDENTIFIABLE INDIVIDUALS AND OTHER MATERIAL WHICH WOULD USUALLY BE TREATED AS RESERVED BUSINESS

On the administrative side, it should be noted that confusion persisted at the start of the marking period regarding the correct mark sheets to be used for papers originating in the Classics faculty. For future years I would note here simply that the procedure adopted this year was:

“Markers are now asked to complete Excel marksheets in the same way as for CAAH, Lit Hum and joint schools, and to upload these to the Classics Faculty’s Sharepoint site for undergraduate examinations. Markers are to use the standard comment sheet templates available in Sharepoint for scripts in all six FHS involving Classics. However, the marking conventions for History should be used when marking Ancient History scripts in AMH.”

F. Members of the Board of Examiners

Professor Andrew Meadows (Chair)

Professor Stephen Baxter

Dr Olivia Elder

Dr Monica Hellstrom

Dr Jon Parkin

Dr Grant Tapsell

Dr Hugh Doherty (External Examiner in History)

Professor Federico Santangelo (External Examiner in Ancient History)