

MARKING CRITERIA AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

MODULE: Major Project	ASSIGNMENT: Interim Viva
STUDENT: Jack Bridgeland	DATE: 12/12/18

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	% Awarded
1. Research-informed Literature (Extent of research and/or own reading, selection of credible sources to support the aims of the project) Extent of research and/or own reading, selection of credible sources, application of appropriate referencing conventions.			
30-39%: Poor evidence of reading and/or of reliance on inappropriate sources, and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Referencing conventions used inconsistently. <i>A knowledge of the regulations inferred but some explanation of how these limit your project direction would have demonstrated deeper reading. A lack of academic reading and analysis of research evident.</i>	15	4.5	30
2. Knowledge and Understanding of Subject (Ability to identify problems within, and technical direction of the project) Extent of knowledge and understanding of concepts and underlying principles associated with the discipline.			
60-69%: Knowledge is extensive. Exhibits understanding of the breadth and depth of established views. <i>A general knowledge of the simulator programming and CFD process demonstrated. Your Responses to technical questioning clarified many ambiguities of the presentation, which demonstrated a deeper understanding.</i>	15	9.45	63
3. Analysis (Technical content of experimental and analytical work already completed and project relevance and merit) Analysis, evaluation and synthesis; logic, argument and judgement; analytical reflection; organisation of ideas and evidence			
60-69%: Sound, logical, analytical thinking, synthesis and evaluation. Ability to devise and sustain persuasive arguments, and to review the reliability, validity & significance of evidence. Ability to communicate ideas and evidence accurately and convincingly. Sound, convincing conclusions / recommendations. <i>Use of CFD software for aerodynamic analysis supported with a validation case to inform simulation parameters. Good to see practical testing conducted to obtain required data (rolling road, spring and damper dyno) for simulation model development. Good to see comparison of simulator model with real data and issues identified.</i>	35	23.8	68
4. Practical Application and Deployment (Organisation and Planning of the project) Deployment of methods, materials, tools and techniques; application of concepts; formulation of innovative and creative solutions to solve problems.			
60-69%: A very good application of a range of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Very good consideration of the context of the application, with perceptive use of examples, where relevant. Evidence of some innovation and creativity. <i>Project plan overview clearly explained by diagram - you could have stepped through this to structure your presentation. You demonstrate enthusiasm and ownership of the project, we just need to structure the reporting of your findings.</i>	10	6.5	65
5. Skills for Professional Practice (Quality of presentation and success in communicating the aims and scope of the project) Attributes in professional practice: individual and collaborative working; deployment of appropriate media; presentation and organisation.			
50-59%: Can communicate effectively in a suitable format, but may have minor errors. Can work effectively as part of a team, with clear contribution to group activities. Mostly coherent work and is in a suitable structure. <i>Presentation was very rushed which meant it was short and difficult to follow. Try to refrain from using the phrase "stuff like that" etc. Practice your delivery and timing in future! Response to technical questioning was excellent - an enjoyable discussion. Whilst we liked your technical work, you were let down by your supporting research and presentation delivery</i>	25	14.5	58
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		58.8 %
	Over one week late		