PGT Exam Performance Feedback 2017/2018 Semester 1

COMP60711   Data Engineering

John Keane
Sandra Sampaio

Comments

In Part A (Questions 1 and 2), Question 1 was more popular than Question 2, although, unlike last year, a significant number of students chose Question 2, which contained a higher amount of application of technique than bookwork, while Question 1 had the opposite balance.

However, the students who chose Question 1 seem to have scored higher than the students who chose Question 2. And this probably reflects the fact that, while students find it easier to merely explain concepts presented to them before, and describe relationships between those concepts, they find it much harder to apply those concepts in practice, explaining their impact and addressing all the necessary points, even though similar examples were given in class prior to the exam.

Also, where background in general Computer Science areas, not covered in detail in class, was necessary, such as basic Statistics and Databases, scores were lower. This probably shows limitations in previous learning (Undergraduate level), carried forward to the MSc.

Section B:

Q3:
-Part a: generally, reasonably well answered; the comparison of row/column could have been more complete.
-Part b: the algorithm was reasonably well described; answers on the effects of unbalanced data etc were reasonable; handling methods and examples were weaker.
-Part c: the AR measures were generally well answered; answers on the "AR extensions" were less complete.
-Part d: some very good answers, some quite poor; more reflection was needed in the weaker cases.

Q4:
-Part a: generally well done; apriori algorithm/support fine; example generally good but some mistakes.
-Part b: classification example generally well done; comparison of attribute split less good; memory usage answers weaker.
-Part c: some very good answers, some quite poor; more reflection was needed in the weaker cases