# Examiners' Report <br> Final Honour School of Mathematics and Philosophy Part C Trinity Term 2023 

## Part I

## A. STATISTICS

- Numbers and percentages in each class.

See Table 1, page and Table 2, page .

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

Not applicable.

- Marking of scripts.

Typically, all Philosophy scripts, essays and theses are double marked, as are Mathematics dissertations and mini-projects. Due to the Marking and Assessments Boycott, in some instances the Department of Philosophy was granted a dispensation by the Education Committee and Proctors to single mark scripts, essays and theses. For more information on steps taken in response to the Marking and Assessments Boycott (MAB) please see Part I, Section C.
As with normal practice, all Mathematics examination scripts were single-marked according to carefully checked model solutions and a pre-defined marking scheme that is closely adhered to. A comprehensive independent checking procedure is also followed; see the Mathematics Part C report for details.

Table 1: Numbers in each class

|  | Number |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2023 | $(2022)$ | $(2021)$ | $(2020)$ | $(2019)$ | $(2018)$ |
| I | 5 | $(7)$ | $(6)$ | $(6)$ | $(6)$ | $(8)$ |
| II.1 | 8 | $(4)$ | $(4)$ | $(2)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ |
| II.2 | 0 | $(0)$ | $(2)$ | $(0)$ | $(0)$ | $(0)$ |
| III | 0 | $(0)$ | $(0)$ | $(0)$ | $(1)$ | $(0)$ |
| F | 0 | $(1)$ | $(0)$ | $(0)$ | $(0)$ | $(0)$ |
| Total | 13 | $(12)$ | $(12)$ | $(8)$ | $(9)$ | $(11)$ |

Table 2: Percentages in each class

|  | Percentages \% |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2023 | $(2022)$ | $(2021)$ | $(2020)$ | $(2019)$ | $(2018)$ |
| I | 38.46 | $(58.33)$ | $(50)$ | $(75)$ | $(66.67)$ | $(72.73)$ |
| II.1 | 61.54 | $(33.33)$ | $(33.33)$ | $(25)$ | $(22.22)$ | $(27.27)$ |
| II.2 | 0 | $(0)$ | $(16.67)$ | $(0)$ | $(0)$ | $(0)$ |
| III | 0 | $(0)$ | $(0)$ | $(0)$ | $(11.11)$ | $(0)$ |
| F | 0 | $(8.33)$ | $(0)$ | $(0)$ | $(0)$ | $(0)$ |
| Total | 100 | $(100)$ | $(100)$ | $(100)$ | $(100)$ | $(100)$ |

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

It is noted that the scaling procedures for determining the University Standardised Mark awarded for the Mathematics Examination Papers is currently under review.

## C. Strike action

As a result of the marking and assessment boycott (MAB) alternative marking arrangements were organized for the following three Mathematics exams:

- C2.3 Representation Theory of Semisimple Lie Algebras
- C3.1 Algebraic Topology
- C4.1 Further Functional Analysis.

Substitute assessors were recruited for each exam paper; whilst this delayed marking, all scripts were received and checked in time for the final board. All replacement assessors were experienced markers with a suitable level of expertise in the subject matter and all papers were reviewed and scaled by the examiners in the examiners' meeting.

The Department of Philosophy were given permission by the Education Committee to use single marking with moderation for any affected theses and the following papers:

- A12759 Early Modern Philosophy
- A12693 Ethics
- A12697 Philosophy of Religion
- A12704 Theory of Politics
- A16763 The Philosophy of Wittgenstein
- A17605 Special Subject: Feminist Theory
- A17607 Special Subject: Ethics of AI
- A12700 Aquinas
- A12701 Duns Scotus and Ockham
- A12712 Advanced Philosophy of Physics.

The paper moderators reviewed single-marked scripts, being sure to cover (1) marks at class borderlines, e.g. 49, 59, 69 (2) any fails and (3) a random sample of $10-20 \%$ of the remaining scripts.

The release of results faced a minimal delay as a result of the MAB.

## D. Notice of examination conventions for candidates

The first notice to candidates was issued on 4th April 2023 and the second notice on 24th April 2023. These contain details of the examinations and assessments.

All notices and the examination conventions for 2023 examinations are on-line at http://www.maths.ox.ac.uk/members/students/undergraduate-courses/examinations-assessments.

## Part II

## A. General Comments on the Examination

The examiners were pleased by the high standard of the candidates, resulting in a large proportion of firsts. The top-scoring Mathematics and Philosophy Part C candidate obtained a higher average mark on their Mathematics papers than the top-scoring Mathematics Part C candidate.

The examiners are very grateful to James Knight in the Philosophy Centre, and Anwen Amos, Clare Sheppard, Charlotte Turner-Smith, Waldemar Schlackow, Matt Brechin in the Mathematical Institute for their enormous help at all stages in the conduct of this examination. We would also like to thank the rest of the Academic Administration Team for all their work during the busy exam period. We are grateful also to examiners and assessors in Philosophy and in Mathematics who set papers and marked scripts and theses of candidates in this examination and all those involved in the mark-checking process of the Mathematics papers.
The internal examiners are grateful to the external examiners Prof James Robinson (Mathematics) and Dr Karim Thebault (Philosophy) for generously performing their special roles in this process.

## B. Equality and Diversity information: breakdown of the results by gender

Table 3. page , shows percentages of male and female candidates for each class of the degree.

Table 3: Breakdown of results by gender. Upper. Breakdown by numbers. Lower. Breakdown by percentages.

| Class | Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2023 |  |  | 2022 |  |  | 2021 |  |  | 2020 |  |  |
|  | Female | Male | Total | Female | Male | Total | Female | Male | Total | Female | Male | Total |
| I | 0 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| II. 1 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| II. 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| III | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| F | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 3 | 10 | 13 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 3 | 5 | 8 |


| Class | Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2023 |  |  | 2022 |  |  | 2021 |  |  | 2020 |  |  |
|  | Female | Male | Total | Female | Male | Total | Female | Male | Total | Female | Male | Total |
| I | 0 | 50 | 38.46 | 75 | 50 | 58.33 | 40 | 57.14 | 50 | 66.67 | 80 | 75 |
| II. 1 | 100 | 50 | 61.54 | 25 | 37.5 | 33.33 | 40 | 28.57 | 33.33 | 33.33 | 20 | 25 |
| II. 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 14.29 | 16.67 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| III | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| F | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12.5 | 8.33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Table 4: Statistics by paper (Mathematics papers)

| Paper | Number of Candidates | AvgRaw | StdevRaw | Avg USM | StdevUSM |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| C1.1 | 7 | 32.86 | 13.89 | 67.71 | 21.14 |
| C1.2 | 4 | 42.5 | 4.43 | 68.5 | 3.7 |
| C1.3 | 3 | 40 | 9.54 | 77.33 | 19.86 |
| C1.4 | 4 | 31 | 8.72 | 70.75 | 9.95 |
| C2.7 | 2 | 27.5 | 6.36 | 66.5 | 6.36 |
| C5.4 | 1 | - | - | 78 | - |
| C8.1 | 1 | 23 | - | 63 | - |
| C8.3 | 1 | 33 | - | 67 | - |
| CCD | 2 | - | - | 82.5 | 3.54 |
| COD | 2 | - | - | 75.5 | 12.02 |
| SC2 | 1 | 31 | - | 64 | - |
| SC4 | 1 | 34 | - | 70 | - |
| SC7 | 1 | 31 | - | 63 | - |

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

See Table 4, page for the number of candidates taking each Mathematics paper, together with statistics for the raw marks (average and standard deviation), and the University Standardised Marks (USMs, average and standard deviation) attained on each paper by this cohort. All papers listed are single 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.

See Table 5, page for the number of candidates taking each Philosophy paper, together with statistics for the USMs (average and standard deviation) attained in the examination and the extended essay for each subject by this cohort.

Table 5: Statistics by paper (Philosophy papers)

| Paper | Number of Candidates | Avg USM | StDevUSM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 104 Philosophy of Mind Essay | 1 | 68 | - |
| 104 Philosophy of Mind Exam | 1 | 65 | - |
| 108 The Philosophy of Logic and Language Exam | 1 | 68 | - |
| 108 The Philosophy of Logic and Language Essay | 1 | 72 | - |
| 109 Aesthetics and the Philosophy of Criticism Exam | 1 | 72 | - |
| 109 Aesthetics and the Philosophy of Criticism Essay | 1 | 68 | - |
| 110 Medieval Philosophy: Aquinas Exam | 1 | 66 | - |
| 110 Medieval Philosophy: Aquinas Essay | 1 | 59 | - |
| 113 Post-Kantian Philosophy Exam | 1 | 65 | - |
| 113 Post-Kantian Philosophy Essay | 1 | 68 | - |
| 115 Plato, Republic Exam | 1 | 71 | - |
| 115 Plato, Republic Essay | 1 | 73 | - |
| 118 The Later Philosophy of Wittgenstein Exam | 2 | 63.5 | 13.44 |
| 118 The Later Philosophy of Wittgenstein Essay | 2 | 72.5 | 3.54 |
| 124 Philosophy of Science Exam | 1 | 59 | - |
| 124 Philosophy of Science Essay | 1 | 67 | - |
| 127 Philosophical Logic Exam | 1 | 82 | - |
| 127 Philosophical Logic Essay | 1 | 70 | - |
| 128 Practical Ethics Exam | 1 | 73 | - |
| 128 Practical Ethics Essay | 1 | 71 | - |
| 133 Aristotle on Nature Exam | 1 | 67 | - |
| 133 Aristotle on Nature Essay | 1 | 64 | - |
| 202 | 1 | 69 | - |
| 202X | 1 | 67 | - |
| 301 | 2 | 64.5 | 3.54 |
| 301X | 2 | 66 | 1.41 |
| PT Thesis in Philosophy | 10 | 69.3 | 8.45 |

## D. Recommendations for Next Year's Examiners and Joint Committee for Mathematics and Philosophy

The external examiners noted that it would be useful to have a full list of Philosophy and Mathematics examinations, and how they correspond to the unit codes in the database to enable rapid interpretation of the database printout in terms of the different papers.

The external examiners also noted that it would be helpful to know in advance of the final meeting which of the numerous potential classification possibilities applies to each candidate to facilitate the classification process.

It is noted with apologies that Professor Karim Thebault was not listed as the Philosophy External Examiner in the examination conventions. The board agreed this should be updated; the conventions should also be double checked for such errors next year.

## E. Comments on sections and on individual questions

See reports from the Mathematics examiners and from the Philosophy examiners.

## G. Names of members of the Board of Examiners

Mathematics
Prof. Eamonn Gaffney (Chair)
Prof. Qian Wang
Prof. James Robinson (External Examiner)

Philosophy
Prof. Alexander Paseau
Prof. Peter Millican
Dr. Karim Thebault (External Examiner)

