Every part of every question was done correctly by at least one person (not many did a good job of Q5, but one person did it perfectly). So at least it was a fair exam: each bit was do-able on the basis of the course.

The exam average is 59, which is pretty close to the target. Unfortunately this was achieved on the basis of a big collection of outliers (if you can have a big collection of outliers: if they're outliers then shouldn't there only be a small number of them?). Big standard deviation, several very high scores, several rather low ones. The exam is fairly closely related to the coursework. This is deliberate: the coursework is aimed at reinforcing some of the key ideas in the lectures, and if they're the key ideas then they're going to be things that I want to examine. So what happens is that people who do the coursework (and think about it) do well on the exam. Well that's OK—that means that they've got a good grip on the key ideas in the course.

There was one systematic error, in the question about TF-IDF. A lot of people calculated a single TF-IDF score for the entire set of documents, which makes no sense. I checked the question, and I don't think it was easily misinterpretable. I checked the notes, and they're not misleading. And several people did get it right. So I think that this might just have been group revision getting the wrong end of a stick. So it goes: revising together is a good idea, but you do risk getting a group misconception. Anyway, it was only 3 marks, so it's not a disaster.

Almost everyone did Q2, which was one of the coursework-based questions. And a lot of people did it well, so the coursework must have done its job. Q3 was also popular: this was on a new topic on the course, so anyone looking at past papers and then looking at the course structure would have spotted that there had never been a past question on this quite large topic, and that it was therefore something that was ripe for a question. I don't think it was easy: people who got a good mark on it deserved what they got. Q4 & Q5 were more bookworky than the others, and I was a bit stricter on answers that were vague or that included a lot of irrelevant material here. If you're just telling me things I told you then you'd better get it right. The person who got 35/35 for Q5 had to work for it.

There's not much evidence of people running out of time. Most people who got good marks on two questions got a good one on the third, most people who got reasonable marks on two questions got a reasonable one on the third. Two students did OK on two questions and then had a disaster on the third, but I think that was because they didn't know what they were doing (one of them actually wrote quite a lot on the third question, but unfortunately it was all wrong).

There was a short run of scripts where I marked Q4(ii) out of 6 rather than 7. I went back over these and fixed them (several got 0/6, so correcting that to 0/7 didn't require a lot of rethinking; most of the others went up by a mark).