

MARKING CRITERIA AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

MODULE: Group Project

ASSIGNMENT: Report

STUDENT: Surriya Krishna

DATE: 1st April 2019

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
1. Research-informed Literature (Extent of research and/or own reading, selection of credible sources, application of appropriate referencing conventions.) Extent of research and/or own reading, selection of credible sources, application of appropriate referencing conventions. 0-29%: Little or no evidence of reading. Views and findings unsupported and non-authoritative. Referencing conventions largely ignored. <i>No evidence of background reading</i> <i>Limited resoutces in the bibliography</i>	10	2.5
2. Knowledge and Understanding of Subject (Extent of knowledge and understanding of concepts and underlying principles associated with the project) Extent of knowledge and understanding of concepts and underlying principles associated with the discipline. 0-29%: Major gaps in knowledge and understanding of material at this level. Substantial inaccuracies. <i>You corecctely stated in the introduction that you should undertsand the forces that will act on the car under varying situations.</i> <i>However there is no such understanding demonstarted in the report. Braking, cornering @ combined loadings</i> <i>What is a suitable level of friction (mu). What (if any) are the aero effects?</i>	25	6.25
3. Analysis (For example - use of analytical calculations, Matlab, Excel FEA CFD, Wave, WinGeo3 etc.) Analysis, evaluation and synthesis; logic, argument and judgement; analytical reflection; organisation of ideas and evidence 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>You have a model of the upright (did you create this?)</i> <i>It is not evident how you contrained the upright and how you applied the forces. Why did you choose 2000N?</i> No analysis of contact pacth loads and resulting forces in the suspension joints.	25	8
4. Practical Application and Deployment (Design ideas, proposed design parameters and methods for evaluation of these ideas such as experimental work and simulation) Deployment of methods, materials, tools and techniques; application of concepts; formulation of innovative and creative solutions to solve problems. 0-29%: Limited or no use of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Little or no appreciation of the context of the application. Your proposed design parameters are simplistic. The original upright was designed in aluminium, so is appropriate. Your suggestion for alternative materials is interesting, however it shhould necessitate a redesign(s) to allow for the different material properties No testing was performed to validate the modelling approach.	20	5.6
5. Skills for Professional Practice (How well you worked as a group. Report presentation quality, project planning and organisation.) Attributes in professional practice: individual and collaborative working; deployment of appropriate media; presentation and organisation. 0-29%: Communication media is inappropriate or misapplied. Little or no evidence of autonomy in the completion of tasks. Work is poorly structured and/or largely incoherent. <i>The approaches usedfall short of the required engineering rigour.</i> <i>There is limited structure, tables and graphs could be used to compare material properties.</i>	20	5
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	27 %