

## STUDENT EXAMINATION FEEDBACK FORM 2017/18

Module Code:	G53KRR
Module Title:	Knowledge Representation and Reasoning
Credits:	10
Module Convenor(s):	Natasha Alechina
<b>Basic Statistics:</b>	
<p>49 students sat the exam. All 4 questions were compulsory. Raw data for the G53KRR 1718 exam: average 51.5, median 53, standard deviation 13.98; average for question 1: 15 out of 25, question 2: 15 out of 25, question 3: 12.5 out of 25, question 4: 9 out of 25. Highest mark 87. The number of good (1st class and 2(i)) marks: 13.</p> <p>Marks for questions 3 and 4 were scaled by multiplying by 1.25 and 1.69 to bring the question average to be the same as for questions 1 and 2. After scaling, the statistics is: average 60.6, median 62.58, standard deviation 17. The number of good marks 28.</p>	
<b>General Comments:</b>	
<p><i>Please provide comments on overall performance highlighting how students may improve overall technique to enhance results in the future.</i></p> <p>The lower than expected marks may perhaps be explained by the students only revising topics that appeared in the recent exam papers, rather than all topics of the module. Possible topics were listed in the last lecture on revision advice:  <a href="http://www.cs.nott.ac.uk/~pszrza/G53KRR/sem17-revision.pdf">http://www.cs.nott.ac.uk/~pszrza/G53KRR/sem17-revision.pdf</a></p>	
<b>Question Specific Comments:</b>	
1	Question 1 was generally answered well. The main reason for lost marks was not knowing the definition of logical entailment or not applying it correctly (for example, thinking that in order to show that S1-S5 entail a sentence, it is enough to show one interpretation where S1-S5 and the sentence are all true).
2	Question 2 was generally answered well. Common mistakes were applying the rule of resolution to two pairs of literals simultaneously, and substituting for functional terms instead of for variables only.
3	Questions 3 was answered less well, probably because some parts of the question were not very similar to the ones in the previous exams.
4	Question 4 was answered very badly, probably because description logic did not appear in recent exam papers and many students did not revise it.

Module Convenors Signature

Print name Natasha Alechina