Examiners' Report
Oxford Masters in Mathematical Sciences (OMMS)
Trinity Term 2025

Part I

A. STATISTICS

- **Numbers and percentages in each class.**
  See Table 1, page 1.

Table 1: Numbers in each class

	Number							Percentages %						
	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019
Distinction	28	20	22	24	21	27	16	50	32.79	46.81	42.86	40.38	65.85	50.0
Merit	14	13	11	18	9	7	6	25	23.40	32.14	21.31	17.31	17.07	18.8
Pass	11	25	13	13	21	5	9	19.64	27.66	23.21	40.98	40.38	12.2	28.1
DDM	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.88	-
Fail	3	3	1	1	1	0	1	5.36	2.13	4.92	1.79	1.92	0	3.1
Total	56	61	47	56	52	41	32	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

- **Numbers of vivas and effects of vivas on classes of result.**

  Not applicable.

- **Marking of scripts.**

  All Mathematics examination scripts were, as is the normal practice, single-marked according to carefully checked model solutions and a pre-defined marking scheme which is closely adhered to. The Mathematics dissertations and mini-projects were double-marked. A comprehensive independent checking procedure is also followed. (See the Part C Mathematics Examiner Report for details.)

B. Exam errors affecting groups of students.

Three examinations were delayed due to technical difficulties at Exam Schools, affecting the group of students taking them, which led to three group Mitigating Circumstances Notices to Examiners. See the Part C Mathematics Examiner Report for details.

C. Changes in examining methods and procedures currently under discussion or contemplated for the future

The Examiners are not aware of any changes the examining processes in the current year.

D. Notice of examination conventions for candidates

The first notice to candidates was issued on 17th March 2025 and the second notice on 14th May 2025. These contain details of the examinations and assessments.

All notices and the examination conventions for 2025 are available online at:

https://www.maths.ox.ac.uk/members/students/undergraduate-courses/teaching-and-learning/part-c-students/examinations-and-assessments/part-c-and-omms

Part II

A. General Comments on the Examination

The examiners would like to convey their grateful thanks for their help and cooperation to all those who assisted with this year's examination, either as assessors or in an administrative capacity. The chair would like to thank Anwen Amos, Rosalind Mitchell, Charlotte Turner-Smith, Waldemar Schlackow, Matt Brechin, Jonathan Whyman, Hannah Harrision and the rest of the academic administration team for their support of the Part C and OMMS examinations.

In addition, the internal examiners would like to express their gratitude to Prof Rosemary Dyson, Prof Roger Moser and Prof. Ioanna Manolopoulou for carrying out their duties as external examiners in a constructive and supportive way during the year, and for their valuable input at the final examiners' meetings.

Mitigating Circumstances Notice to Examiners and other special circumstances

A subset of the examiners (the 'Mitigating Circumstances Panel') attended a pre-board meeting to band the seriousness of the individual notices to examiners. The outcome of this meeting was relayed to the Examiners at the final exam board, who gave careful regard to each case, scrutinised the relevant candidates' marks and agreed actions as appropriate. See Section F for further details.

Setting and checking of papers and marks processing

See the Part C Mathematics Examiner Report for details.

B. Equality and Diversity issues and breakdown of the results by gender

Table 2, page 3, shows male and female candidate percentages for each degree class.

Table 2: Breakdown of results by gender

Class	Number																				
	2025			2024			2023			2022			2021			2020			2019		
	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total
Distinction	4	24	28	3	17	20	4	18	22	1	23	24	0	21	21	5	22	27	4	12	16
Merit	3	11	14	2	11	13	2	9	11	1	17	18	4	5	9	3	4	7	1	5	6
Pass	4	7	11	8	17	25	6	7	13	6	7	13	4	17	21	1	4	5	3	6	9
DDM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	2	2	-	-	-
Fail	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	12	44	56	14	47	61	13	34	47	8	48	56	9	43	52	9	32	41	8	24	32

Class	Percentage																				
	2025			2024			2023			2022			2021			2020			2019		
	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total
Distinction	33.33	54.55	50	21.43	36.17	32.79	30.77	52.94	46.81	12.5	47.92	42.86	0	48.84	40.38	55.56	68.75	65.85	50.0	50.0	50.0
Merit	25	25	25	14.29	23.4	21.31	15.38	26.47	23.40	12.5	35.42	32.14	44.44	11.63	17.31	33.33	12.5	17.07	12.5	20.8	18.8
Pass	33.33	15.91	19.64	57.14	36.17	40.98	46.15	20.59	27.66	75	14.58	23.21	44.44	39.53	40.38	11.11	12.5	12.20	37.5	25.0	28.1
DDM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	6.25	4.88	-	-	-
Fail	8.33	4.55	5.36	7.14	14.29	4.92	7.69	0	2.13	0	2.08	1.79	11.11	0	1.92	0	0	0	0	4.2	3.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

C. Detailed numbers on candidates' performance in each part of the exam

See Table 3, page 4 for the number of candidates taking each Mathematics paper, together with statistics for the raw marks (average and standard deviation), and USMs (average and standard deviation) attained on each paper by this cohort. All papers listed are units except the Mathematics Dissertation, which is a double unit. The total maximum raw mark for a unit is 50 whilst the USMs are scaled to a maximum of 100. In accordance with University guidelines, statistics are not given for papers where the number of candidates was five or fewer in the public version of this report.

Table 3: Statistics by paper

Paper	Number of Candidates	AvgRaw	StdevRaw	AvgUSM	StdevUSM
C1.1	-	-	-	-	-
C1.2	-	-	-	-	-
C1.3	-	-	-	-	-
C1.4	-	-	-	-	-
C2.2	-	-	-	-	-
C2.4	-	-	-	-	-
C2.7	-	-	-	-	-
C2.3 OS	-	-	-	-	
C3.1	-	-	-	-	-
C3.2	-	-	-	-	-
C3.3	7	28	3.74	56.71	25.07
C3.5	8	20.86	6.54	54	24.11
C3.6	-	-	-	-	-
C3.7	6	30.4	5.13	56	27.8
C3.8	9	25.11	10.96	62.78	14.98
C3.10	6	24	9.84	63.17	12.29
C3.11	-	-	-	-	-
C3.12	-	-	-	-	-
C4.1	6	29	3.85	67.67	4.93
C4.3	9	25.78	10.4	57.22	18.21
C4.6	-	-	-	-	-
C3.8 OS	-	-	-	-	-
C4.9	-	-	-	-	-
C5.1	-	-	-	-	-
C5.2	-	-	-	-	-
C5.5	7	27.86	6.67	65.14	8.11
C5.6	-	-	-	-	-
C5.11	8	24.5	8.05	57.38	10.85
C5.12	-	-	-	-	-
C6.1	17	20.88	8.41	55.18	12.3
C6.2	13	26	9.95	57.08	14.55
C6.4	8	31.88	12.91	64.62	21.09

Paper	Number of Candidates	AvgRaw	StdevRaw	AvgUSM	StdevUSM
C7.4	-	-	-	-	-
C7.6	-	-	-	-	-
C7.7	9	30.11	11.33	62.89	17.01
C8.1	10	26.4	5.15	65.9	5.65
C8.2	6	26.5	5.24	62.17	7.47
C8.3	14	33.29	8.53	65.5	12.16
C8.4	6	25.67	11.91	61.5	19.22
C8.7	-	-	-	-	-
SC1	-	-	-	-	-
SC2	-	-	-	-	-
SC4	9	29.56	5.5	68.56	2.83
SC5	-	-	-	-	-
SC6	7	34	4.83	67.71	6.78
SC7	-	-	-	-	-
SC9	-	-	-	-	-
SC10	-	-	-	-	-
SC11	-	-	-	-	-

Table 3: Statistics by paper (USM only assessments)

Paper	Number of Candidates	AvgUSM	StdevUSM
C2.6	-	-	-
C3.9	7	79.57	10.15
C5.4	16	73.44	4.27
C6.5	30	74.33	7.6
C7.1	-	-	-
CCD	55	70.58	15.92
SC8	9	70	26.52
CCS3	-	-	-
CS3	7	69.71	2.21
CS5	-	-	-
CS7	-	-	-
CS8	9	68.56	26.68
CS11	-	-	-
CS13	-	-	-

D. Recommendations for Next Year's Examiners and OMMS Supervisory Committee

In line with the Part C Examiners report, the OMMS exam board would like to share the following recommendations.

The exam board recommends that the department introduces strong repercussions for markers who consistently do not meet the standards of marking required, or return their marking late. The examiners felt that there was a high volume of errors in marking. It was noted that the department offers thorough guidelines on marking, as well as a marking seminar. The examiners would encourage a review of all guidance to ensure consistency across markers.

Additionally, the examiners note their concern at the volume of mistakes within the exam papers and solutions this year. The exam board recommends that the guidance for paper setters should emphasise the importance in double checking formulas and mathematical aspects of questions to avoid mistakes.

The exam board would be in strong support of the removal or easing of the University regulation that prevents candidates from achieving a merit or distinction where one paper has been failed. For example, the board would ask that Teaching Committee consider whether this regulation could be reserved for cases where more than one paper has been failed, or alternatively whether results should be capped at a merit instead of a pass. Additionally, the exam board would welcome further guidance on when this regulation should be applied and when it can be waived by the examiners.

The board notes that the database should be updated to prevent candidates with excusals from being included in the difficulty rating of those papers.

Finally, the board would recommend that Teaching Committee review whether it is possible to introduce automated emails on Inspera to notify students when they have successfully submitted work. It is felt that this would reduce the amount of technical issues, and subsequent penalties, overall.

E. Comments on sections and on individual questions

See the Part C Mathematics Examiner Report for details.

F. Comments on performance of identifiable individuals

1. Prizes

The following prizes was awarded:

Mathematical Institute Prize (OMMS exam performance)
Johan Slettengren, Kellogg College

Mathematical Institute Prize (OMMS dissertation)
Jazz Ee Ze Ooi, Reuben College

G. Names of members of the Board of Examiners

Internal Examiners:
Prof. Philip Maini (Chair)
Prof. Emmanuel Breuillard
Prof. Jose Carrillo de la Plata
Prof. Massimiliano Gubinelli
Prof. Ehud Hrushovski
Prof. Geoff Nicholls
Prof. David Steinsaltz

External Examiners:
Prof. Rosemary Dyson
Prof. Ioanna Manolopoulou
Prof. Roger Moser