2026-27 Examining Conventions for the degree of MSt. in Yiddish Studies

1. Introduction

This document sets out the examination conventions applying to the MSt. in Yiddish Studies for the academic year 2026-27. The supervisory body for this course is the Graduate Studies Committee in the Faculty of Medieval and Modern Languages.

Examination conventions are the formal record of the specific assessment standards for the course to which they apply. They set out how examined work will be marked and how the resulting marks will be used to arrive at a final result and classification of an award.

2. Rubrics for individual papers

Submitted work must demonstrate that candidates have specialist knowledge of the relevant language(s) (e.g. by quoting primary and secondary sources in the original language(s)) in one or more elements of the Masters programme.

The papers to be examined are:

i. **Compulsory Subjects**: History of the Yiddish Language and Modern Yiddish Literature, 1864-1939, are examined by take-home open-book examination. For each examination, candidates submit two essays from a choice of four questions to total 5,000-7,000 words. (The word count includes footnotes, but excludes bibliography.) The essays must be typed; they need not be presented in the full scholarly form expected of a dissertation, but they should be followed by a list of primary and secondary literature used. An electronic copy of the essay should be submitted via Inspera. Students must clearly state the word count on the first page of their submission.

ii. **Special Subject***: For a special subject chosen from the MSt in Modern Languages, candidates submit an essay between 5,000-7000 words (the word count includes footnotes, but excludes bibliography). The essay must be typed, and include a bibliography of works consulted. An electronic copy of the essay should be submitted via Inspera. Students must clearly state the word count on the first page of their submission. Each page should be numbered, preferably at the top right-hand corner, where numbers are most easily seen.

iii. **Dissertation**: MSt. dissertations should be submitted in a scholarly form, acknowledging primary and secondary sources, making sensible use of the bibliographical resources available in Oxford, and with an appropriate critical apparatus. The length of the dissertation is 10,000-12,000 words. The approach which a candidate adopts will depend upon the subject that has been chosen. An

electronic copy of the dissertation should be submitted via Inspera. Students must clearly state the word count on the first page of their submission.

**Special Subject courses available in 2026-27 are set out in the student handbook.*

3. Marking conventions

3.1 University scale for standardised expression of agreed final marks [EAF 11.1]

Agreed final marks for individual papers will be expressed using the following scale:

70-100	Distinction
65-69	Merit
50-64	Pass
0-49	Fail

3.2 Qualitative marking criteria for different types of assessment

Descriptors of the qualities that are expected in the assessed work for each category of paper (see also the descriptors for work in each of the standard marking bands, in section 4.1):

i. **Compulsory Subjects**: To be of passable standard, the essays should show an ability to understand and explicate complex theoretical issues and, where relevant, to compare different theories. To attain a Merit standard, the work will show a greater control of ideas and their implications. To attain a Distinction standard, candidates will be expected also to draw upon wide independent reading and to adopt distinctive analytical and critical positions in respect of the topics they are discussing. This might entail a detailed reading and critique of the work of one theorist, a well-informed survey of different positions adopted in respect of a given theoretical issue, or a comparison of the work of two or more theorists working in related fields which lucidly accounts for the strengths and weaknesses of their respective views.

ii. **Special Subject:** For a special subject chosen from the options for the MSt. in Modern Languages, candidates will follow the requirements detailed in the Examining Conventions for the MSt. in Modern Languages. An essay submitted as part of a portfolio will have been written in the course of the student's work on the Special Subject, but may also be revised in the light of the supervisor's comments. A general norm might be for the supervisor to comment on a piece of work and for the student to incorporate the revisions into the finished essay without further input. A passable essay will represent the work of a student of good 2:1 standard at the appropriate level of development; an essay given a Merit mark will show evidence of independent critical thought and research beyond the reproduction of the relevant material; an essay given a Distinction mark will show clear evidence of an ability to analyse complex material, or interpret difficult texts in astute and insightful ways, in a manner that gives signs of potential for doctoral research. When assessing portfolio essays, examiners shall take account of the stage at which each essay was completed.

iii. **Dissertation**: A dissertation judged worthy of a Distinction will be expected to display a high level of proficiency in intellectual and scholarly skills which might include some of the following: nuanced close reading of complex literary texts; lucid, detailed accounts of historical and theoretical contexts for the object of enquiry; a readiness to analyse and engage with the views of earlier scholars and critics; a sound grasp of the linguistic, methodological or scholarly tools required for the successful completion of the dissertation. A dissertation judged worthy of Merit will show elements of distinction standard work, but strong individual insights might not be followed through or connected; the implications of insights might not be fully grasped or elaborated, suggesting the candidate does not yet demonstrate potential for doctoral research. A dissertation will normally be of passable standard if, despite showing little aptitude for advanced independent research, it nevertheless represents in the examiners' judgement a suitable level of attainment for a diligent and able student of good second-class standard within one year of graduation. An electronic copy of the dissertation should be submitted via Inspera. Students must clearly state the word count on the first page of their submission.

3.3 Verification and reconciliation of marks [EAF 11.2]

Each submission will be marked by two markers. The marks will fall within the range of 0 to 100 inclusive.

All submitted work is independently (double-blind) marked by either two members of the panel of examiners, or specialist assessors appointed in the subject area. They will each complete a marksheet with their comments on the work and an individual mark, before meeting to agree on a final mark for the work. The marksheet should subsequently be completed to include: an explanation of how the final mark was arrived at, and how any discrepancies between the initial marks were resolved.

Should there be disagreement of 10 marks or more between the two markers that cannot be resolved, a third marker will be appointed (with the approval of the Chair of Examiners), and an explanation of how marks have been reconciled included at paper level. In exceptional circumstances the Chair of Examiners will adjudicate.

3.4 Scaling [EAF 11.9]

Scaling is not used in the assessment of this course.

3.5 Short-weight convention and departure from rubric in examinations

There are no direct penalties for going under the word limit. However, work that is significantly under-length is likely to be inadequate in its coverage and content, in the context of the marking criteria described in section 4.1, and will be so marked. As a rough guideline, less than three-quarters of the maximum word limit is likely to be inadequate.

3.6 Penalties for late or non-submission of submitted work [EAF 8.2; ER 14]

The scale of penalties agreed by the Board of Examiners in relation to late submission of assessed items is set out below. Details of the circumstances in which such penalties might apply can be found in the Examination Regulations (Regulations for the Conduct of University Examinations, Part 14).

Lateness	**Cumulative mark penalty**
After the deadline but submitted on the same day	-5 marks
Each additional calendar day	-1 mark
Max. deducted marks up to 14 days late	-18 marks
More than 14 calendar days after the deadline	Fail

Failure to submit a required element of assessment within 14 days of an approved deadline without permission will result in the failure of the assessment. Students are entitled to one resit attempt for each failed assessment, and the mark for a resit of an assessment will be capped at the pass mark.

3.7 Penalties for over-length work and departure from approved titles or subject-matter [ER 16]

The Board has agreed the following tariff of marks which will be deducted for over-length work:

Percentage by which the maximum word count is exceeded:	**Cumulative mark penalty** (up to a maximum of -10)
Up to 5% over word limit	-1 mark
Up to 10% over	-2 marks
Up to 15% over	-3 marks
Each further 1% - 5% over	-1 further mark

Students are required to state the word count on the first page of all submissions.

3.8 Penalties for poor academic practice [EAF 8.4.3]

Candidates are not permitted to use AI-generated content or AI tools in work submitted for assessment. Candidates are advised to consult the University guidelines on plagiarism and the Faculty's Guidance on AI.

If examiners suspect plagiarism and the material concerned accounts for no more than 10% of the whole piece of work, it is likely that this can be dealt with by the examiners as an instance of poor academic practice (e.g. web sources with no clear authors; incomplete or shoddy referencing). Markers will grade the work on its merits. The board of examiners will then use its judgement to deduct up to a maximum of ten points depending on the gravity and extent of the poor academic practice reported to the Chair of Examiners by

the markers in question. If the consequence of the deduction would result in an overall Fail, the case will be referred to the Proctors.

If the material affected concerns more than 10% of the whole piece of work or more than poor academic practice, or where a candidate has previously had marks deducted for poor academic practice or has been referred to the Proctors for suspected plagiarism, the Chair will refer the case to the Proctors.

4. Progression rules and classification conventions

4.1 Qualitative descriptors of Distinction, Pass, Fail

85 and over: work which displays unusual originality, engages decisively and imaginatively with the problem identified, demonstrates strong analytical and conceptual power, sustains a coherent argument, and deploys evidence skilfully and effectively. Such work should be critically adventurous, clearly and engagingly written and presented in an impeccably lucid, correct and scholarly manner. The assessors should feel confident that work of this level might be published, with only minor revisions, in a good scholarly journal.

80-84: work which demonstrates all the qualities stipulated above, but which contains some relative weakness in one of the areas of coverage, originality, deployment of evidence, presentation or style. Work at this level should be highly professional and show unequivocal potential for doctoral research.

75-79: work which demonstrates outstanding qualities of intellectual engagement with the material, coherence and control of argument, and impressive scope, but may show some relative weakness in coverage, originality, deployment of evidence, presentation or style. Work should suggest strong potential for doctoral research.

70-74: low distinction: work which shows clear evidence of independent thought and research, and a firm command of the subject, with coherence of argument and clarity of presentation, such as to suggest that the candidate has potential for doctoral research.

65-69: merit: work which shows evidence of independent critical thought and research beyond the reproduction of relevant material, a firm command of the subject. Some local deficiencies in knowledge, coverage, coherence or form may be overlooked if the essay as a whole presents a convincing, informed and broadly coherent argument.

60-64: high pass: work which shows clear evidence of independent thought and research, a firm command of the subject. Some local deficiencies in argument or research may be overlooked if the essay as a whole presents a coherent argument and/or individual insights.

50-59: pass: work which shows basic competence in understanding the subject, mounting a broadly coherent argument, and adequate style and presentation, but only slight evidence of independent thought and research.

49 or under: fail: work which shows inadequate knowledge of primary texts; offers an analysis that is seriously flawed, or excessively derivative; shows a meagre knowledge and/or poor understanding of secondary literature; fails to present a coherent argument; or is notably poor in its style and/or presentation.

4.2 Final outcome rules

An average of 50 is required to pass. An average of 65 is required for a merit. And an average of 70 is required for a distinction.

The compulsory subjects and the special subject will each account for 20% of the total mark, while the dissertation will account for 40% of the total mark. No candidate who has

failed any of the components will be awarded the degree. Candidates who have initially failed any element of the examination, but who have passed them at resit will not be eligible for the award of a Distinction or Merit.

Final marks of 0.5 or higher will be rounded up, and final marks of 0.4 or lower will be rounded down.

4.3 Progression rules

Not applicable to this course.

4.4 Use of vivas [EAF 10]

Vivas are not used in relation to this course.

5. Resits [EAF 13]

Should a candidate fail any element of the examination, that element may be re-submitted once, and once only. Candidates may resubmit that element by noon on the final Monday of September following their first examination. The highest mark that may be awarded for resubmitted work is 50% (i.e. it is capped at the pass mark).

Resubmitted work may be a reworked version of the original submission or a completely new submission.

6. Consideration of mitigating circumstances [EAF Annex E]

A candidate's final outcome will first be considered using the classification rules/final outcome rules as described above in section 4. The exam board will then consider any further information they have on individual circumstances.

Where a candidate or candidates have made a submission under Part 13 of the Regulations for Conduct of University Examinations, that unforeseen circumstances may have had an impact on their performance in an examination, a subset of the board (the 'Mitigating Circumstances Panel') will meet to discuss the individual applications. The Panel will evaluate, on the basis of the information provided to it, the relevance of the circumstances to examinations and assessment, the strength of the evidence provided in support, and the extent of the impact. The Panel will also note whether all or a subset of papers were affected, being aware that it is possible for circumstances to have different levels of impact on different papers.

The board of examiners will separately consider whether and how to adjust a candidate's results as a result of the mitigating circumstances, taking into account both the Panel's considerations of the notice(s) and the submissions and marks. Further information on the procedure is provided in the Examination and Assessment Framework (Annex E), and information for students is available on the problems completing your assessment web pages.

7. Rules on communicating with examiners

Candidates should not under any circumstances seek to make contact with individual internal or external examiners.