

MARKING CRITERIA AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

MODULE: Race Engineering	ASSIGNMENT: Driver Analysis
STUDENT: Ehab Barsoum	DATE: 17/12/18

This section details the assessment criteria. The extent to which these are demonstrated by you determines your mark. The marks available for each criterion are shown. Lecturers will use the space provided to comment on the achievement of the task(s), including those areas in which you have performed well and areas that would benefit from development/improvement.

Common Assessment Criteria Applied	Marks available	Marks awarded	Percent Awarded
1. Research-informed Literature Extent of research and/or own reading, selection of credible sources, application of appropriate referencing conventions. (e.g. Research of testing procedures, vehicle specifics, aerodynamic principles, testing methods etc.)			%
50-59%: Inclusion of a range of research-informed literature, including sources retrieved independently. Referencing conventions mostly consistently applied. <i>You have conducted some good background reading, but you could have referenced a wider range of literature to support your knowledge of driver analysis techniques using data acquisition</i> <i>You have only conducted minimal research into testing techniques</i> <i>Evidence of some supporting reading through citations to some relevant literature sources. Citations to web sources don't all follow correct referencing convention. Citations should be embedded in discussion not just follow paragraphs. Relevance of some research presented questionable. Good to see some citations to support driver analysis, but you could have implemented this further.</i>	10	5.3	53
2. Knowledge and Understanding of Subject Extent of knowledge and understanding of concepts and underlying principles associated with the discipline. (e.g. Choice of tests and explanation of underlying principles)			
40-49%: Evidence of basic knowledge and understanding of the relevant concepts and underlying principles. <i>You demonstrate a superficial understanding of driver techniques and you could have more clearly indicated how you would have expected the drivers inputs to influence the vehicle and driver performance as a system</i> <i>You have presented the theory behind the analysis techniques, but limited understanding of these demonstrated</i> <i>A greater depth of knowledge could have been demonstrated through a clearer discussion and analysis of differences in drivers and approaches. Whilst you appear to understand the basic requirements for driver inputs, you have not fully appreciated the relationships between the driver input and vehicle responses. Some statements made indicate a misunderstanding of data trends.</i>	20	8.6	43
3. Analysis Analysis, evaluation and synthesis; logic, argument and judgement; analytical reflection; organisation of ideas and evidence (e.g. Analysis of data, findings and use of MATH channels)			
30-39%: Some evidence of analytical intellectual skills, but for the most part descriptive. Ideas/findings sometimes illogical and contradictory. Generalised statements made with scant evidence. Conclusions lack relevance. <i>Some basic analysis of the data obtained, but you could have looked in more detail at secondary inputs to explain/support observations made</i> <i>Driver data comparison is basic. Superficial conclusions drawn. Little critical analysis demonstrated</i> <i>Some very general statements made without reference to any supporting evidence. RPM analysis superficial. Good to see combined G math channel but analysis of this is superficial and not adequately explained. Some minor errors in analysis (egg. oversteer described is probably understeer - these observations are not supported with evidence). Lack of data overlays makes comparisons very difficult to draw, and hence many of your statements assessing each of the driver inputs are not fully substantiated.</i>	40	15.2	38
4. Practical Application and Deployment Deployment of methods, materials, tools and techniques; application of concepts; formulation of innovative and creative solutions to solve problems. (e.g. Test Plan, Use of Motec I2, conclusions drawn from analysis)			
50-59%: A good and appropriate application of standard methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Good appreciation of the context of the application, with some use of examples, where relevant. <i>Group 1: Session 1 - Engaged with testing. Good group work with some very good discussion of Live data. You Collated data in a logical way. Instructions to drivers could be clearer and a clearer test plan could be evident. Some down time between Sessions - could be more slick. Some good driver advice based on live observations. Session 2-Unfortunatley you started the session with some confusion. Further preparation of the testing methodology and thinking about controlled testing so you could critically evaluate the instructions given to improve performance would have helped here. Having said this the group did act as a team and collated the data effectively. Instructions to drivers could be clearer - Improvements could have been supported by data overlays and print outs - corner number printouts would have also helped. Group improved throughout session, but lack of preparation limited how slick the testing was.</i> <i>Test planning and method rationale not justified in detail. You should have explained vehicle, track and test structure choices.</i>	20	11.6	58
<i>Results presented well with a good use of the MOTEC analysis software evident</i>			
5. Skills for Professional Practice Attributes in professional practice: individual and collaborative working; deployment of appropriate media; presentation and organisation. (e.g. Technical report writing and presentation.)			
50-59%: Can communicate effectively in a suitable format, but may have minor errors. Mostly coherent work and is in a suitable structure. <i>A good account of the work conducted. Structure shows some room for improvement to portray your ideas in a more succinct manner.</i> <i>Technical report guidelines only generally followed. You need to refer to the guidelines and make sure you present accordingly in future.</i> <i>Abstract is more an introduction as there is no discussion of method or results. Formatting inconsistent and shows room for improvement in places. You need to think about your argument structures and be clear and concise with statements which should be supported by evidence.</i>	10	5	50
Assignment Mark (Assessment marks are subject to ratification at the Exam Board. These comments and marks are to give feedback on module work and are for guidance only until they are confirmed.)	Late Submission Penalties (tick if appropriate) Up to one-week late Over one week late		45.7 %