The final marks have roughly the shape of a normal distribution.

Marks were higher than expected. This can be partially explained by the higher quality of the cohort (very noticeable). Another possible contributing factor is the repetition of some of the questions from previous exams. Both points need to be addressed in future versions of the course (introducing harder and new questions).

For the correction I roughly followed the rubric (which is described at the exam template) and assumed that feedback on the template answer + rubric would be sufficient.

In some cases I put some explicit feedback, but assuming that students would have access to the template answer + rubric if needed.

Within a certain rubric there were some minor variations (at the 0.5-1 point range depending on the completeness of explanations for example).