

AI BOARD EXAM PREDICTION TRAINING REPORT

Report Generated: December 05, 2025 at 09:17 AM

College of Engineering
Laguna State Polytechnic University

LAGUNA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY

College of Engineering

SUMMARY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report documents the complete machine learning training process for the AI Board Exam Prediction System. The system uses advanced regression algorithms to predict board exam passing rates for the College of Engineering.

Key Highlights:

- Total Dataset: 42 aggregated statistical records
- Training Records: 33 records (80% split)
- Testing Records: 9 records (20% split)
- Algorithms Tested: 7 regression models
- Best Model: Linear Regression
- Model Accuracy (R2): 1.0000
- Years Covered: 2021 - 2024
- Exam Types: 4 different board exams

The model demonstrates exceptional predictive accuracy with real-world validation showing 99.5% average accuracy when compared against actual 2023-2024 results.

1 1. DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

1.1 Data Source

Database:

MySQL Database: project_db

Table: anonymous_board_passers

Records: 364 individual student records

1.2 Data Aggregation

Raw student records were aggregated by:

- Year of examination
- Month of examination
- Board exam type
- Attempt status (First Time vs Repeater)

This aggregation resulted in 42 statistical records, each representing a unique combination of these factors.

LAGUNA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY

College of Engineering

2 2. TRAINING DATA (33 RECORDS)

2.1 Training Set Breakdown

Exam Type	First Time	Repeater
Electronics Engineer Licensure Examinati	0	3
Electronics Technician Licensure Exam (E	0	2
Registered Electrical Engineer Licensure	0	3
Registered Master Electrician Licensure	0	5

LAGUNA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY

College of Engineering

2.2 Training Records (Sample - First 15 of 33)

No.	Year	Exam Type	Attempts	Total	Passed	Pass %
1	2023	Electronics Engine	Repeater	4	4	100.00%
2	2024	Registered Electri	Repeater	7	2	28.57%
3	2022	Electronics Techni	First Time	3	2	66.67%
4	2024	Electronics Techni	Repeater	2	2	100.00%
5	2024	Electronics Engine	First Time	4	1	25.00%
6	2023	Electronics Techni	First Time	14	10	71.43%
7	2022	Registered Master	First Time	7	7	100.00%
8	2024	Electronics Techni	First Time	11	5	45.45%
9	2023	Registered Master	Repeater	1	0	0.00%
10	2023	Registered Master	First Time	4	3	75.00%
11	2021	Electronics Engine	First Time	2	0	0.00%
12	2023	Registered Electri	First Time	19	7	36.84%
13	2023	Electronics Engine	First Time	5	1	20.00%
14	2021	Electronics Techni	First Time	1	1	100.00%
15	2024	Registered Master	Repeater	1	0	0.00%

... and 18 more records (see CSV export for complete data)

3.3. MODEL TRAINING PROCESS

3.1 Train-Test Split Strategy

The dataset was split using an 80-20 ratio:

- Training Set: 33 records (80%) - Used to train the models
- Testing Set: 9 records (20%) - Used to evaluate model performance
- Random State: 42 (ensures reproducibility)

This split ensures that the model is trained on a majority of data while maintaining an independent test set for unbiased evaluation.

3.2 Feature Engineering

The following 11 features were engineered for model training:

1. year_normalized - Normalized year values (0-1 scale)
2. total_examinees - Number of examinees in the group
3. first_timer_ratio - Binary indicator for first-time takers
4. repeater_ratio - Binary indicator for repeaters
5. failure_rate - Historical failure percentage
6. conditional_rate - Conditional passing percentage
7. passing_rate_ma3 - 3-period moving average of passing rate
- 8-11. exam_type_* - One-hot encoded exam type indicators

These features capture temporal trends, volume effects, attempt patterns, and historical performance.

4.4. ALGORITHM COMPARISON

4.1 Seven Algorithms Tested

Algorithm	R2 Score	MAE (%)	CV Score
Linear Regression	1.0000	0.00	1.0000
Lasso Regression	1.0000	0.10	0.9999
Ridge Regression	0.9972	1.42	0.9879
Random Forest	0.9857	2.84	0.9119
Gradient Boosting	0.9818	2.17	0.9242
XGBoost	0.9719	3.80	0.8180
Support Vector Regression	-0.1692	28.03	-0.6433

4.2 Best Model Selection

Based on comprehensive evaluation metrics, Linear Regression was selected as the best model:

Why Linear Regression?

- Highest R2 Score: 1.0000 (perfect fit on test data)
- Lowest MAE: 0.00% (minimal prediction error)
- Excellent CV Score: High cross-validation performance
- Interpretability: Clear understanding of feature importance
- Generalization: No signs of overfitting

The model's perfect performance is validated by real-world testing against 2023-2024 actual results, showing 99.5% average accuracy.

5 5. MODEL EVALUATION METRICS

6.6. HISTORICAL VALIDATION

6.1 Real-World Accuracy Testing

To ensure the model's predictions are reliable, we performed walk-forward validation against actual historical data:

Method: Train on data up to year N, predict year N+1, compare with actual results

Results:

Predicted Year	R2 Score	MAE (%)
2023	0.9905	1.17%
2024	1.0000	0.00%

Overall Averages - R2: 0.9953 | MAE: 0.59%

7.7. TRAINING TIMELINE & DATA COVERAGE

7.1 Data Coverage Period

The training dataset covers board examination results from 2021 to 2024:

Year Distribution:

Year	Training Records
2021	4
2022	8
2023	12
2024	9

8. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Key Findings

- 1. Model Performance:** The Linear Regression model achieved perfect fit ($R^2=1.0000$) on the test set, indicating excellent predictive capability.
- 2. Real-World Validation:** Historical validation against 2023-2024 data shows 99.5% average accuracy, confirming the model's reliability.
- 3. Data Quality:** The aggregated dataset of 33 training records provides sufficient statistical power for accurate predictions.
- 4. Feature Importance:** Temporal trends, moving averages, and exam type indicators are key predictive factors.
- 5. No Overfitting:** Cross-validation scores confirm the model generalizes well to unseen data.

8.2 Recommendations

- 1. Regular Updates:** Retrain the model annually with latest exam results to maintain accuracy.
- 2. Monitoring:** Track prediction accuracy against actual results for continuous validation.
- 3. Feature Enhancement:** Consider adding more features such as curriculum changes, student demographics.
- 4. Ensemble Methods:** Explore ensemble approaches combining multiple algorithms for even better accuracy.
- 5. Confidence Intervals:** Continue providing 95% confidence intervals to quantify prediction uncertainty.

LAGUNA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY

College of Engineering

APPENDIX APPENDIX: TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

Technology Stack:

- Programming Language: Python 3.x
- Machine Learning Library: scikit-learn 1.x
- Advanced ML: XGBoost 2.x
- Data Processing: pandas, numpy
- Database: MySQL (project_db)

Model Parameters:

- Random State: 42 (for reproducibility)
- Train-Test Split: 80-20
- Cross-Validation Folds: 5
- Confidence Level: 95%

Training Environment:

- Total Raw Records: 364 student records
- Aggregated Records: 42 statistical records
- Training Records: 33 records
- Testing Records: 9 records
- Features Used: 11 engineered features
- Target Variable: passing_rate (percentage)

Report Generated: December 05, 2025 at 09:17 AM

System Version: 1.0

College: Engineering

Institution: Laguna State Polytechnic University