The exam was designed to assess the extent to which students had gained a real understanding of agile methods, so credit was given for a reasonable comment in the 'spirit' of agile, even if the value, principle or practice hadn't been named correctly.

For every question, there was at least one student who provided an answer that got full marks.

There was some misunderstanding in the question about user stories, about what was meant by 'length'. This referred to the amount of effort involved, rather than the number of words used to describe the story. Answers suggesting that the stories should involve roles or business rules were not penalised, but credit was only given for comments on whether the story could be implemented in a reasonable length of time (i.e. an iteration).

The question that provided a list of scenarios, and asked which, if any agile manifesto values were being broken required an answer where a *value from the manifesto* was named and discussed; although partial credit was given for a comment about a relevant practice being broken if it was explained well.

These issues - and several others - were covered in the revision session prior to the exam, which was not attended by everyone.

There was quite a lot of repetition in some answers. Rather than making the same point in several different ways, it would have been better to focus on making additional points, or improving answers to other questions.