My exam questions in this paper are: Q1-a [4], Q1-b [3], Q1-c [3], Q2-a [5], Q2-b [5], Q3-a [4], Q3-b[2], and Q3-c[4], where [X] denotes the number of marks assigned to each question.

My observation on the performance of each question is summarised as follows:

• Q1-a: A common mistake is lack of understanding the difference between driver scheduling and rostering.
• Q1-b: Most students can answer this question, but some could not answer why driver scheduling is hard.
• Q1-c: Very few students got the full marks for this question. Common mistakes: (1) mixed data abstraction with refactoring; (2) mixed information hiding with encapsulation; (3) incomplete answer to encapsulation.
• Q2-a: Most students could not answer this question and mixed it with GRASP principles and design patterns.
• Q2-b: Common mistakes are: (1) failed to give an example to illustrate the Role pattern; (2) insufficient information given to the pattern.
• Q3-a: Only a couple of students got the full marks for this question. Common mistakes: (1) could not draw Class Diagram correctly; (2) missed essential attributes and methods; (3) wrong relationships between classes.
• Q3-b: Only a small number of students got the full marks for this question as most of the students didn’t know the name of the patterns used.
• Q3-c: same as Q3-a.

A general observation is that there is no evidence that my questions are harder or easier than John’s as the exam performance of both sets of questions is consistent.

Overall, I think my questions are modestly challenging and were carefully designed to test how well students have understood the topics covered by my lectures. My guess is that the students who did well with my questions are those who attended my lectures and who also revised my lecture notes properly. Unfortunately attendance to the lectures was a problem, especially after the Easter holiday.