

Examiners' Report

Oxford Masters in Mathematical Sciences (OMMS)

Trinity Term 2026

Part I

A. STATISTICS

- **Numbers and percentages in each class.**

See Table 1, page 1.

Table 1: Numbers in each class

	Number								Percentage (%)							
	2026	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2026	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019
Distinction	25	29	20	22	24	21	27	16	44.3	52.73	32.79	46.81	42.86	40.38	65.85	50.0
Merit	19	14	13	11	18	9	7	6	24.05	25.45	23.40	32.14	21.31	17.31	17.07	18.8
Pass	17	11	25	13	13	21	5	9	21.52	20	27.66	23.21	40.98	40.38	12.2	28.1
DDM	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Fail	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Total	79	55	61	47	56	52	41	32	100	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.

There were no group MCEs raised for exam errors.

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

The Examiners are aware of the planned change to the examination convention to required students to offer a minimum of 4 units assessed by written examination.

D. Notice of examination conventions for candidates

The first notice to candidates was issued on 18th February 2026 and the second notice on 31st March 2026. These contain details of the examinations and assessments.

All notices for 2026 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>

The examination conventions for 2026 are available online at:

<https://courses.maths.ox.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=6011>

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 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.

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 7, shows male and female candidate percentages for each degree class.

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

See Table 3, page 3 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	8	31.12	9.2	70.25	13.34
C2.4	6	22.2	7.09	50.5	26.59
C2.5	-	-	-	-	-
C2.7	14	16.83	8.5	51.71	25.52
C3.1	13	35.08	10.26	63.38	24.07
C3.10	-	-	-	-	-
C3.11	-	-	-	-	-
C3.12	-	-	-	-	-
C3.2	-	-	-	-	-
C3.3	11	26.5	12.05	60.64	24.16
C3.4	8	31.75	13.75	67.75	20.74
C3.5	-	-	-	-	-
C3.6	-	-	-	-	-
C3.7	7	36.57	13.36	73.14	21.98
C3.8	6	18.33	9.81	52.5	14.42
C4.1	9	23.67	7.45	62.89	12.35
C4.3	6	24	7.69	62.17	13.7
C4.6	-	-	-	-	-
C4.9	-	-	-	-	-
C5.1	-	-	-	-	-
C5.11	7	25.43	13.84	56.14	27.43
C5.12	-	-	-	-	-
C5.2	-	-	-	-	-
C5.5	15	19.6	9.48	52.07	18.76
C5.6	-	-	-	-	-
C5.7	-	-	-	-	-
C5.9	6	25.5	4.93	60.17	6.43

Paper	Number of Candidates	AvgRaw	StdevRaw	AvgUSM	StdevUSM
C6.1	26	25.32	10.9	58.19	21.84
C6.2	29	25.79	7.63	62.41	13.38
C6.4	-	-	-	-	-
C7.4	-	-	-	-	-
C7.5	-	-	-	-	-
C7.7	9	30.11	10.69	67.67	15.17
C8.1	9	25.89	8.31	66.44	12.47
C8.2	8	26.25	6.02	64.62	7.33
C8.3	17	34.62	9.24	64.53	21.27
C8.4	12	35	7.73	71.33	10.73
C8.7	-	-	-	-	-
SC1	9	24.67	11.61	56.44	20.61
SC10	10	28.7	13.69	63.5	22.7
SC11	7	26.43	9.38	66.71	15.33
SC2	12	32.09	7.8	61.25	21.55
SC4	16	24.87	10.66	52.81	21.98
SC5	7	26.86	12.48	64.71	23.16
SC6	-	-	-	-	-
SC7	9	25.33	11.55	59	20.54
SC9	-	-	-	-	-

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 resolutely recommends that the department carries out a full review of the impact of AI on submitted coursework. In particular the examiners resolutely recommend a review of the dissertations scheme.

As currently constituted, dissertations cannot continue considering the potential for students to utilise AI and the department's inability to recognise and penalise such instances. The examiners strongly recommend that Teaching Committee discontinue the dissertations unless the following can be put into place:

1. Oral examinations Due to AI, dissertations are not effective summative assessments at present; the department should take action to make them better formative assessments by introducing presentations that give thorough feedback. The examiners propose that the oral examinations are held going forward. These should take place after the submission deadline and provide the department with the opportunity to confirm the student's understanding of their dissertation. It was noted that there are logistical difficulties to address:

- The pool of assessors. The suitability of having the supervisor as an assessor was raised. Prof Manolopoulou noted that UCL require their supervisors to submit 5 questions in advance in place of them assessing the oral examination.
 - Due to the potential increase in workload for faculty and postdocs, it was felt that PhD students should be permitted to act as assessors, although it was noted that the University discourages PhD students from acting as such.
 - Format of the examination. It was suggested that they could consist of a Q&A session in place of a longer presentation.
 - Marking. Whether the oral examination will standalone or combine with the project mark will need to be finalised.
2. Students should be required to submit a draft or sample of their dissertation prior to the submission deadline. There should be the expectation that the supervisor should read a draft of the dissertation. The examiners propose that this should take place prior to a final supervision meeting where the supervisor would have the opportunity to raise any concerns with the student. This meeting should take place allowing sufficient time for the student to address any feedback before the submission deadline. This would enable supervisors to have more control over the student's work.
 3. Increased supervision hours and mandatory supervision meetings To ensure effective oversight, students must be required to attend supervision meetings.
 4. Increased Teaching Stint. To make the dissertation more attractive to supervisors, stint must be increased to reflect the true workload. It is not feasible to continue the dissertations without a complete overhaul. The examiners hope that increased oversight through higher supervision hours, oral examinations and a review of a draft submission would help to ensure that the relevant competencies have been validly assessed, despite changes in the way students carry out the work. If these changes are not possible the examiners recommend that the dissertations should be discontinued.

Similarly, to mitigate against the impact of AI, the examiners would encourage Teaching Committee to discontinue utilising mini-projects as a form of assessment. The examiners noted the recommendation of the work that Professor Michael Grove from the University of Birmingham has carried out on how to support students to use AI positively.

The exam board noted that script checking processes identified an increasing volume of marking errors. In particular markers not following the marking guidelines hampered script checking and harmed the robustness of the process.

Additionally, the examiners would welcome a formalisation of the process whereby the exam board can break conventions, to ensure consistency in future years. Specific guidance from Teaching Committee on how to consider borderline cases would be helpful

Finally, the examiners note their concerns with the ambiguity of word count penalty guidance for dissertations. In one case a student had exceeded the word count by 2000 words due to a misunderstanding of whether the appendix should be included. The examiners agreed that the guidance was misleading and would strongly recommend to Teaching Committee that this paragraph is revisited to clarify how appendices should count towards the word count. The examiners recommend that students are no longer permitted to include an appendix in their dissertation, other than in cases where coding is used.

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)

Jakob Edmaier, St Edmund Hall

Zifan Hua, St Hilda's College

Mathematical Institute Prize (OMMS dissertation)

Maria Stuebner, Balliol 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. Alan Lauder

Prof. Francois Caron

Prof. David Steinsaltz

External Examiners:

Prof. Rosemary Dyson

Prof. Ioanna Manolopoulou

Prof. Roger Moser

Table 2: Breakdown of results by gender

Number							
Year	Gender	Distinction	Merit	Pass	DDM	Fail	Total
2026	Female	5	5	3	–	1	14
2026	Male	30	14	14	–	6	65
2026	Total	35	19	17	–	7	79
2025	Female	5	3	4	–	0	12
2025	Male	24	11	7	–	1	44
2025	Total	29	14	11	–	1	56
2024	Female	3	2	8	–	1	14
2024	Male	17	11	17	–	2	47
2024	Total	20	13	25	–	3	61
2023	Female	4	2	6	–	1	13
2023	Male	18	9	7	–	0	34
2023	Total	22	11	13	–	1	47
2022	Female	1	1	6	–	0	8
2022	Male	23	17	7	–	1	48
2022	Total	24	18	13	–	1	56
2021	Female	0	4	4	–	1	9
2021	Male	21	5	17	–	0	43
2021	Total	21	9	21	–	1	52
2020	Female	5	3	1	0	0	9
2020	Male	22	4	4	2	0	32
2020	Total	27	7	5	2	0	41
2019	Female	4	1	3	–	0	8
2019	Male	12	5	6	–	1	24
2019	Total	16	6	9	–	1	32
Percentage							
Year	Gender	Distinction	Merit	Pass	DDM	Fail	Total
2026	Female	35.71	35.71	21.43	–	7.14	100
2026	Male	46.15	21.54	21.54	–	9.23	100
2026	Total	44.30	24.05	21.52	–	8.86	100
2025	Female	41.67	25.00	33.33	–	0.00	100
2025	Male	54.55	25.00	15.91	–	2.27	100
2025	Total	51.79	25.00	19.64	–	1.82	100
2024	Female	21.43	14.29	57.14	–	7.14	100
2024	Male	36.17	23.40	36.17	–	4.26	100
2024	Total	32.79	21.31	40.98	–	4.92	100
2023	Female	30.77	15.38	46.15	–	7.69	100
2023	Male	52.94	26.47	20.59	–	0.00	100
2023	Total	46.81	23.40	27.66	–	2.13	100
2022	Female	12.50	12.50	75.00	–	0.00	100
2022	Male	47.92	35.42	14.58	–	2.08	100
2022	Total	42.86	32.14	23.21	–	1.79	100
2021	Female	0.00	44.44	44.44	–	11.11	100
2021	Male	48.84	11.63	39.53	–	0.00	100
2021	Total	40.38	17.31	40.38	–	1.92	100
2020	Female	55.56	33.33	11.11	0.00	0.00	100
2020	Male	68.75	12.50	12.50	6.25	0.00	100
2020	Total	65.85	17.07	12.20	4.88	0.00	100
2019	Female	50.00	12.50	37.50	–	0.00	100
2019	Male	50.00	20.83	25.00	–	4.17	100
2019	Total	50.00	18.75	28.13	–	3.13	100

Table 3: Statistics by paper (USM only assessments)

Paper	Number of Candidates	AvgUSM	StdevUSM
C2.3	-	-	-
C2.6	8	69	9.1
C3.9	9	81.33	10.67
C4.7	-	-	-
C5.4	24	71.75	8.4
C6.5	35	67.6	4.85
CCD	76	71.75	11.91
COD	-	-	-
CS1	-	-	-
CS13	-	-	-
CS2	-	-	-
CS5	-	-	-