

Examiners' Report: Final Honour School of Mathematics & Philosophy Part B Trinity Term 2026

October 27, 2026

Part I

A. Statistics

- Numbers and percentages in each class.

Table 1: Numbers in each class

	Number					
	2026	(2025)	(2024)	(2023)	(2022)	(2021)
I	3	(6)	(8)	(10)	(6)	(6)
II.1	13	(10)	(8)	(5)	(8)	(9)
II.2	-	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
III	-	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
P	-	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
F	-	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Total	17	(18)	(17)	(18)	(16)	(15)

Table 2: Percentages in each class

	Percentages (%)					
	2026	(2025)	(2024)	(2023)	(2022)	(2021)
I	17.65	(33.33)	(47.06)	(55.56)	(37.5)	(42.86)
II.1	76.47	(55.56)	(47.06)	(27.78)	(50)	(57.14)
II.2	-	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
III	-	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
P	-	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
F	-	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Total	100	100	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)

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

Not applicable.

- **Marking of scripts.**

All Philosophy scripts, essays and theses are double-marked, after which the two markers consult in order to agree a mark between them. If the two markers are unable after discussion to agree a mark, the mark is decided by a third marker, within the range of the two initial marks. All Mathematics scripts were, as is the normal practice, single-marked according to carefully checked model solutions and a pre-defined marking scheme closely adhered to. A comprehensive independent checking procedure is also followed. (See the Mathematics Part B report for details). Coursework for BO1.1 History of Mathematics was double-marked.

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

None.

C. Notice of examination conventions for candidates

All notices for 2026 are available online at:

<https://www.maths.ox.ac.uk/members/students/undergraduate-courses/ba-master-mathematics/examination-assessments/examination-19>

The examination conventions for 2026 are available online at:

<https://courses.maths.ox.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=6514>

Part II

A. General Comments on the Examination

The examiners would like to record their thanks to all those who helped in the preparation, administering, and assessing of this year's examinations. The chair would like to thank the academic administration team for their support of the Part B examinations.

In addition the internal examiners would like to express their gratitude to Dr Eleanor Knox and Dr Ed Brambley for carrying out their duties as external examiners in such a constructive and supportive way during the year and for their thoughtful contributions during the final examiners' meetings.

For further comments on the examination process, see Section D below.

Exam errors affecting groups of students.

The examiners were notified of a material irregularity with the Philosophy of Cognitive Science exam whereby following the exam Philosophy were made aware that some candidates had seen some of the questions before, having been set them in a collection. Upon further investigation it was revealed that a copy of the draft exam paper was accidentally sent to a college office at the start of this term, in place of the collection paper that was intended. Unfortunately, the mistake wasn't picked up at the time.

The Proctors were informed and instructed the affected exam boards to act as follows:

- Candidates who did not answer any of the compromised questions which were in the collection paper should have their scripts marked as usual.
- Candidates who answered one compromised question should have that one response disregarded, and the paper mark based off the remaining two questions. They should also be given the opportunity to retake the examination during the long vacation window in September under a 'no-detriment' clause (in other words, the higher of the two marks, whichever it is, will count).
- Candidates who answered two or three compromised questions should have the entire paper disregarded, and the final degree classification based off their remaining results. They should again be given the opportunity to retake the examination during the long vacation window under a no-detriment clause (which this time means that the effect of retaking the examination can only be to increase the candidate's classification, not to decrease it). If a candidate in this category decides not to retake the exam, 'Philosophy of Cognitive Science' will still appear on their transcript, but with 'No Result' recorded alongside it.

Two Part B Mathematics and Philosophy students were impacted by this error, the examiners followed the guidance and as both candidates had answered two or three compromised questions the entire paper was disregarded when confirming their final classification.

Prizes

The following prizes were awarded:

Gibbs Prize (performance in Mathematics papers): Inha Choi, University College

Gibbs Prize (performance in Philosophy papers): Inha Choi, University College

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

Redacted for data protection reasons due to low student numbers.

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

See Table 3, page 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. It should be noted that the total raw marks for a unit are 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.

Table 3: Statistics by paper (Mathematics papers)

Paper	Number of Candidates	AvgRaw	StdevRaw	Avg USM	StdevUSM
BSP	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
B1.1	17	30.71	7.14	67.88	7.61
B1.2	17	24	6.64	59.59	9.87
B2.1	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
B3.1	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
B3.2	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
B3.3	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
B3.5	7	27.71	5.65	61.57	6.08
B4.1	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
B4.2	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
B6.2	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
B8.1	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
B8.2	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
B8.4	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
B8.5	7	33.29	6.13	63.57	5.56
SB3.1	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)

See Table 4, page for the number of candidates taking each Philosophy paper, together with statistics for the USMs (average and standard deviation) attained on each paper by this cohort. In accordance with University guidelines, statistics are not given for papers where the number of candidates was five or fewer.

Table 4: Statistics by paper (Philosophy papers)

Paper	Number of Candidates	Avg USM	StDev USM
103	(-)	(-)	(-)
104	(-)	(-)	(-)
108	(-)	(-)	(-)
113	(-)	(-)	(-)
114	(-)	(-)	(-)
118	6	62.67	7.37
127	7	68	12.61
128	(-)	(-)	(-)
101	(-)	(-)	(-)
102	14	65.07	4.3
112	(-)	(-)	(-)
122	17	62.76	3.99
125	(-)	(-)	(-)

D: Comments on papers and individual questions

See reports from Mathematics Examiners and from Philosophy Examiners.

E. Comments and Recommendations from the Examination Board

The Board recommends to Teaching Committee that future boards are provided with guidance on percentages including data from the last 5 years. This would ensure consistency across exam boards and allow the examiners to maintain oversight on the distribution of results.

It was noted that the scaling of mathematics papers does not currently take into account the results of Mathematics and Philosophy students. When scaling the Mathematics Board of Examiners do not have access to the results of all students sitting that examination. Whilst the cohort of Mathematics and Philosophy students is small and unlikely to impact overall scaling, it was felt that it is important to take all students into account.

F. Comments on performance of identifiable individuals and other material which would usually be treated as reserved business

1. Mitigating Circumstance Notices to Examiners

A subset of the board (the 'Mitigating Circumstances Panel') had a preliminary meeting to discuss three individual notices to examiners at Part B which were classified in band 1, 2, 3 as appropriate.

The full board of examiners then considered notices to determine what action to take. All of the decisions, and the reasoning behind them, have been recorded as required.

2. Issues for Teaching Committee to Consider

None.

G. Names of members of the Board of Examiners

Prof. Ben Green (chair)
Prof. Alain Goriely
Dr James Studd
Dr Oliver Pooley
Dr. Ed Brambley (external)
Dr Eleanor Knox (external)