

# PGT Exam Performance Feedback

## 2016/2017 Semester 2

---

COMP62342 Ontology Engineering for the Semantic Web

Sean Bechhofer  
Uli Sattler

Comments Please see the attached report.

---

# COMP62342 Exam Performance Feedback AY16-17

Sean Bechhofer  
Uli Sattler

June 14, 2017

## General Remarks

There were 18 students who sat the exam. The median mark was 34 out of 58, with the mean mark 35.4. There were 4 students with a mark below 50%. Some of these students *may* be able to pass the unit with suitable coursework marks. There were 4 students who achieved a mark above 70% in the exam.

## Item analysis

Test Summary						Discrimination		Difficulty	
58.0	29	0	18	35.42	01 hr 53 min	13 Good Questions	3 Easy Questions		
Possible Points	Possible Questions	In Progress Attempts	Completed Attempts	Average Score	Average Time	8 Fair Questions	26 Medium Questions		
						8 Poor Questions	0 Hard Questions		
						0 Cannot Calculate			

Figure 1: Item Analysis

As the item analysis (see Figure 1 shows, the exam had 3 easy, 26 medium and 0 hard questions, which we consider to be a good mix. It also had 8 questions flagged with poor discrimination which have been reviewed. These were largely questions which rely on recall or bookwork, and are questions that we would expect students who had attended the course unit to be able to answer. This is thus a situation we consider acceptable.

## Question 26

Average score: 2.56 (out of 4)

Answers to this question were reasonable. Although some leniency was given for minor syntactic variations, some answers fell well short of providing anything close to Manchester Syntax. Other, more minor errors included neglecting the “only” clause required.

In some cases, the answers included declarations of individuals, which was not asked for.

### **Question 27**

Average score: 2.34 (out of 5)

Credit was given for answers that identified key elements required, including parsing/loading the ontology, representing axioms and describing how the task would be done. Most answers correctly identified that reasoning is not required here – the task is about examining the data structures.

### **Question 28**

Average score: 4.8 (out of 8)

Marks were lost here for failing to identify the properties asked for. PIMPS classification was mixed, with aspects such as the usage or treatment of Wood not being adequately considered.

The performance on this question was (expectedly) mixed: this was a question targeted at the high performing end of the class, and required both good understanding of the material – PIMPS classes – and the ability to apply that knowledge to the given scenario.

### **Question 29**

Average score: 2.23 (out of 5)

Many answers failed to address the fact that the use of post-coordination relies on having some kind of reasoning engine. Similarly, the fact that post-coordination enables us to avoid the need for a multitude of named entities was not always cited.