The average for this exam is very high—over 70. There's nothing I can do about that—either the exam was easier than I thought, or I taught them exceptionally well, or they were an exceptionally clever group. Whatever the reason, the marks I have given seem to me to be the right marks for the answers that they gave to the questions I set, so there's not much that can be done about it. It may be that the questions were too similar to ones from previous years, simply because there aren't all that many different things I can ask about. I didn't re-use any previous questions, or even look at any previous papers when setting questions, but it's the same course, so it covers the same topics, so maybe they were able to make very good guesses about what was likely to come up.

At least two people did each question, so I didn't set anything that I hadn't covered; and at least two people avoided each question, so there wasn't one that leapt out as being excessively easy. So I think that the exam covered the course OK.

I had two accidents whilst marking:

(i) One of the parts of Q1 had a marks breakdown of 4+2, so the whole of Q1 comes to 31 rather than 30. Fortunately nobody actually got it entirely right—I realised the problem when I marked one where there was a mark dropped but the total still came to 30. I have marked the question where I gave a breakdown of 4+2 as being out of 4+2, since that's what it says on the exam.

(ii) About half way through marking Q2 I realised that the set of rules in the model answer was different from the set in the actual paper (because everyone seemed to be making the same mistake, so I just decided that I'd better check). I can't see how that could have happened, given that the two versions of the paper were generated using Graham's LaTeX script, but it did. So a bunch of answers to Q2 have a revised mark with 1 mark added.