

WRITTEN TECHNICAL REPORT – Feedback & Marking

Weighting: 70%

Student: Liam Banfield

ID: 2017192

Engagement with Literature Skills (15 marks)

Mark: 8 / 15

The report includes a reasonable number of academic and professional references, including peer-reviewed sources and recognised authors in quality and safety management. However, the engagement with these sources is almost entirely descriptive. Literature is presented as a list of statements followed by personal opinion (e.g. “this leads me to believe...”) rather than being critically analysed, compared, or evaluated.

There are serious academic weaknesses in referencing quality, grammar, and structure which significantly reduce credibility.

What was done well

- Appropriate choice of sources on risk management and RCA.
- Clear attempt to connect literature to safety and manufacturing.

What must improve

- Critical comparison of sources.
- Removal of informal language.
- Correct academic referencing and proofreading.

Suggested enhancement

- Add a comparison table showing strengths and limitations of 5 Whys, FMEA, Fishbone, and Pareto.

Knowledge & Understanding Skills (25 marks)

Mark: 12 / 25

The report shows basic understanding of risk management and RCA but remains largely theoretical. There is no quantitative risk analysis, no application of severity/occurrence/detection, and no demonstration of technical understanding of a real manufacturing system. The work does not meet expected technical depth for this module.

What was done well

- Correct general explanation of RCA purpose.
- Some awareness of engineering safety responsibility.

What must improve

- Apply engineering risk analysis numerically.
- Introduce a real technical case study.
- Demonstrate understanding of manufacturing processes.

Suggested enhancement

- Add a risk assessment table with calculated RPN values for a real engineering problem.

Cognitive & Intellectual Skills (20 marks)

Mark: 9 / 20

The submission is mostly narrative and descriptive. There is minimal analysis, almost no prioritisation of risks, and no structured reasoning to justify conclusions. Claims are stated without evidence of evaluation or engineering judgement.

What was done well

- Logical sequencing of general ideas.

What must improve

- Demonstrate structured analytical thinking.
- Justify conclusions with evidence.
- Prioritise risks logically.

Suggested enhancement

- Add a before/after risk comparison table showing impact of mitigation.

Practical Application Skills (20 marks)

Mark: 6 / 20

This is the weakest section.

There is no real engineering case study, no clear process analysis, and no practical implementation plan. The report fails to demonstrate how RCA would actually be applied in an engineering or manufacturing environment.

What was done well

- Attempted to describe RCA tools.

What must improve

- Introduce a real manufacturing problem.
- Provide an RCA table.
- Propose specific corrective actions.

Suggested enhancement

- Add a formal RCA table and a process flow diagram for a chosen engineering scenario.

Transferable Skills for Professional Practice (20 marks)

Mark: 10 / 20

The report structure is acceptable, but academic and professional standards are seriously undermined by:

- frequent spelling and grammatical errors,
- inconsistent formatting,
- poor sentence construction,
- informal language.

What was done well

- Clear section headings.
- Logical order of sections.

What must improve

- Proofreading.
- Professional academic tone.
- Formatting and presentation quality.

Written Report Total

Category	Mark
Literature	8 / 15
Knowledge & Understanding	12 / 25
Cognitive Skills	9 / 20
Practical Application	6 / 20
Transferable Skills	10 / 20
Total	45 / 100

Weighted contribution (70%) = 31.5 / 70