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Overall Exam Performance

Here are the basic stats for the exam:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stat</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>71.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stdev</td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>56.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This graph gives shows the distribution of marks in a more granular form.
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**Question Breakdown**

There are two sorts of question in this exam: automarked questions (e.g., multiple choice questions (MCQs), true/false, multiple response, etc.) and manually marked questions (e.g., essay questions).

**Automarked Questions**
Manually Marked Questions

General Question Feedback

- **Q25 (mean=3.45 out of 4; min = 2.0; max=4.0):**

  This question tested basic understanding of OWL and students' ability to formulate simple statements in OWL; it was mostly answered well. The formalisation of the last bullet item was the most tricky and thus caused most of the errors.

- **Q26 (mean=2.41 out of 5; min = 0.0; max=5.0):**

  One of the questions that was less well answered. A number of answers suggested that reasoning was needed here. It is not, as we are simply interested in whether or not only restrictions are present in the ontology. Several answers failed to provide any details of how they would inspect the data structure to find restrictions (for example the use of a Visitor).

- **Q27 (mean=6.14 out of 7; min = 4.0; max=7.0):**

  This question was answered very well. Most students identified root classes such as Animal, Plant, GeographicalSite, BodyPart and Movement. Appropriate properties capturing the dimensions were also
identified. In some cases, there were small issues with normalisation, with Animal appearing in the hierarchy as both Living Thing and Food. PIMPS was also applied well.

- Q28 (mean=2.14 out of 3; min = 0.5; max=3.0):

  This question tested advanced understanding of OWL and students’ ability to model complex statements in OWL; it was mostly answered well, partly helped by the fact that we were mainly after the right “shape” of axioms and ignored detail.

- Q29 (mean=2.05 out of 4; min = 1.5; max=3.0):

  This question required a good explanation of the concept of post-coordination and its benefits, and a suitable illustration of these using an example of the given scenario. Most students were able to give a rough sketch of this concept and its benefits, but only fewer showed a good understanding with a convincing example and a satisfactory description of the role played by a reasoner.