

# UG Exam Performance Feedback

## First Year

### 2018/2019 Semester 2

---

COMP14112 Fundamentals of Artificial Intelligence

Tim Morris  
Xiao-Jun Zeng

Comments General Feedback:

- There were 241 students who took the exam.
- The average mark for Section A is 78% which is higher than the average mark of the last year which is 70.
- 183 or 76% students received a mark of 70% or better (i.e., 14 marks or more). This is much higher than about 60% last year.
- 37 or 15% received a mark between 50% and 69%, (i.e., between 10 and 13 marks) which is less than 33% of the last years due to much more 1st class marks this year.
- 9 or 4% received a mark between 40% and 49% (i.e., between 8 and 9 marks) which is a little less than 6.1% of the last year.
- 12 or 5% students received a mark of less than 40% (i.e., 7 marks or less). This is worse than 2% last year.
- Generally speaking, the students' performance in Section A is very good with the average mark as 78%. On the other hand, the first two questions in Section A are easier this year than the last year.
- On the other hand, there are more students who failed to pass this year than those in the last year, despite the higher average mark this year.

Detailed Feedbacks for Section A:

- Question 1). The average mark to this question is 83%. Most students answer this question very well, except a small number of students who make the incorrect calculations or mistakenly use Bayes updating formula rather than the extended total probability formula.
- Question 2). The average mark to this question is 81.5%. Most students answer this question well and correctly. The common mistake is the calculation error.
- Question 3). The average mark to this question is 55.5%. This question was designed as a more challenging one and so the lower average mark reflects this. There are 4 common mistakes: The most common one is that some students have no idea how to prove the given formula; the second one is that some students mix the probability formulas and the event (set) operations; the third one is that some incorrect or non-existent formulas are used, and the final one is the incomplete proof.

Section B

Q4: Most candidates made sensible suggestions for symptoms, fewer realised they should put values into a classifier to recognise an illness.

Q5: Many candidates confused Bayes and naïve Bayes, or some form of temporal correlation.

Q6: A number of candidates missed the first part of the question. After consultation it was agreed that they should be given the marks for this part. Otherwise, the question was very well answered.

---