

MARKING CRITERIA AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

MODULE: Major Project

ASSIGNMENT: Interim Viva

STUDENT: Loghan Slade

DATE: 9th December 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	% 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.				
0-29%: Little or no evidence of reading. Views and findings unsupported and non-authoritative. Referencing conventions largely ignored. <i>Citations should be used on the slides. You have done some background reading but produce no evidence that you have. Lacks any technical research or substantiated facts.</i>		15	3	20
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.				
40-49%: Evidence of basic knowledge and understanding of the relevant concepts and underlying principles. <i>Try to use tables and diagrams to support your discussion. Rather too much heresay and lacking in factual information, eg battery mass within vehicles. Its good to talk about the limitations of ICE however it was all anecdotal and lacked facts and figures to back up the statements</i>		15	6	40
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				
0-29%: Unsubstantiated generalisations, made without use of any credible evidence. Lack of logic, leading to unsupportable/missing conclusions. Lack of any attempt to analyse, synthesise or evaluate. <i>There was limited analysis. At this stage some calculations would have been expected. Eg energy used, energy available for recovery etc. There is a wide range of different analysis strategies you could employ here. Need to get more work done!</i>		35	7	20
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.				
0-29%: Limited or no use of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Little or no appreciation of the context of the application. <i>No evidence of planned tests or investigations</i>		10	2	20
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.				
30-39%: Media is poorly designed and/or not suitable for the audience. Poor independent or collaborative initiative. Work lacks structure, organisation, and/or coherence <i>Relaxed approach. Read directly from printed notes. Please try look at the audience more. You read lots of numbers out, would have been better if graphs were generated. Eg NEDC v WLTP. Trying to explain fuel cell function with no diagrams is a tough thing to do.</i>		25	9.5	38
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		
		27.5	%	