

MARKING CRITERIA AND STUDENT FEEDBACK				
MODULE: Research Methods and Project				
ASSIGNMENT: Dissertation				
STUDENT: Oliver Gordon				
DATE:				
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. Engagement with Literature Skills (research/literature survey)				
Extent of research and/or own reading; selection of credible sources; application of appropriate referencing conventions.				
50-59%: Inclusion of a range of research-informed literature, including sources retrieved independently. Referencing conventions mostly consistently applied.		10	5.5	
Some suitable research has been completed on general aspects of your report such as FEA but more needs to be done to back up your own work that you have completed, such as other simulations that are similar to yours where you can show you have used similar processes.				
Your bibliography is limited but you do provide some cited references. More research and referencing to your validation processes would have enhanced your findings.				
2. Knowledge and Understanding Skills (ability to identify problems)				
Extent of knowledge and understanding of concepts and underlying principles associated with the discipline.				
50-59%: Knowledge is accurate with a good understanding of the field of study.		30	16.5	
Some good general knowledge has been shown with respects to your processes taken, there is a lack of clarity around your validation results and how some were calculated and thus how accurate some of your results were. This is another area where some more research to back up what your results were saying would help.				
Your report offered reference to regulations which you applied to the new design chassis. You considered an existing chassis using some physical insights and then compared those results with FEA which you used as a bench mark. More insight into limitations on your data and how accurate simulation is through your literature research would have supported your findings.				
3. Cognitive and Intellectual Skills (technical ability, analytical content and ability)				
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.		30	18	
Generally a good process has been followed with the modelling of the Chassis and the resulting FEA but as mentioned above there seems to be a lack of information on the quality of the results and some of the calculations. Also some of your driving loads for the simulation could have been better thought out.				
Your analysis was to review chassis designs under three different test procedures and you validated two different weld angles to determine if your FEA results are same to the Denison test rig. You also offered some formula to review strain and Young's modulus which was partly your validation process. However what forces were used for front and side impact and where were they derived from?				
4. Practical Application Skills (progression/achievement, ability to draw conclusions and understand results)				
Deployment of methods, materials, tools and techniques; application of concepts; formulation of innovative and creative solutions to solve problems				
70-79%: An advanced application of a range of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. The context of the application is well considered, with extensive use of relevant examples. Application and deployment extend beyond established conventions. Innovation and creativity evident throughout.		20	14	
Good CAD work, nicely modelled chassis with good simulation process, you overcame the problems with the software well during the year. It would have been good to include some velocity values for the impact.				
There were a combination of some physical rig testing, CAD modelling followed by FEA chassis comparison and some alternative material selection. More validation of your work even through a literature review would have been beneficial.				
5. Transferable Skills for Life and Professional Practice(presentation and organisation of report)				
Attributes in professional practice; individual and collaborative working; deployment of appropriate media; presentation and organisation.				
60-69%: Can communicate well, confidently and consistently in a suitable format. Work is coherent and fluent and is well structured and organised.		10	6	
Generally well presented report, as I have said in previous meetings the report would read a bit better if you had less directly copied quotes and instead wrote these in your own words to show that you have understood what they mean.				
The Abstract read well and the introduction was Ok but it could have expressed your aims more clearly. More indirect quotes would have made the report flow better.				
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)		60	
	Up to one-week late			%
	Over one week late			