

MARKING CRITERIA AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

MODULE: Race Engineering	ASSIGNMENT: Driver Analysis
STUDENT: Stephen Hutchings	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.)			%
80-100%: Outstanding knowledge of research-informed literature embedded in the work. Outstanding selection of relevant and credible sources. High-level referencing skills consistently and professionally applied. <i>You have conducted some excellent background reading to support your knowledge of analysis techniques using data acquisition to assess driver performance</i> <i>You have conducted some good research into testing methodologies for driver analysis and used these to inform your methodology</i> <i>Your research to support approach rationale and inform background is excellent. You have embedded this effectively within the report.</i>	10	9	90
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)			
70-79%: Excellent knowledge and understanding of the main concepts and key theories. Clear awareness of challenges to established views and the limitations of the knowledge base. <i>You demonstrate an excellent depth of knowledge of data acquisition analysis techniques and the theoretical impact on car performance of driving techniques.</i> <i>You demonstrate some understanding of the methods and techniques applied in the data analysis to characterise the performance of the drivers.</i> <i>Generally you have shown that you appreciate the trends to identify and whether those identified would have a positive effect on lap performance.</i>	20	14.6	73
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)			
70-79%: Methodology logical work, supported by evaluated evidence. High quality analysis, developed independently or through effective collaboration. Ability to investigate contradictory information and identify reasons for contradictions. Strong, persuasive, conclusions, justifiable recommendations <i>Excellent analysis conducted with evidence based conclusions drawn through fundamental assessment of the data obtained.</i> <i>Analysis of each driver is detailed and you have assessed their inputs clearly. Comparison of drivers is excellent with valid improvements and conclusions identified</i> <i>Some excellent discussion of the results obtained with correct statements made. Excellent to see use of basic math channels to help support your analysis.</i>	40	30	75
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)			
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>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-Unfortunately 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>Approach and methodology outlined with the instructions given to each driver clearly stated. You also demonstrated that you appreciate that feedback should have been collected from the driver.</i> <i>Presentation of results and analysis is excellent. You have used advanced techniques available using the MOTEC software to fully support your conclusions</i>	20	13.6	68
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.)			
80-100%: Can communicate with an exceptionally high level of professionalism. Work is exceptionally coherent, very fluent and is presented professionally. <i>A very professional document which has an excellent structure and is a coherent account of the investigation conducted.</i> <i>Technical report formatting and presentation is excellent.</i> <i>Excellent abstract. Clear structure. Well presented. Good job Steve!</i>	10	8	80
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		
	75.2		%