

MARKING CRITERIA AND STUDENT FEEDBACK	
MODULE: L6 Systems Engineering QinetiQ (M6X00947)	
ASSIGNMENT: Design, Development and Evaluation – Report	
STUDENT: George Atkins	
DATE: 10/05/17 (submission)	

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.		
30-39%: Poor evidence of reading and/or of reliance on inappropriate sources, and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Referencing conventions used inconsistently. You have clearly conducted a considerable amount of research when undertaking this project. This is evident when reading the content of your report. However, you don't seem to have referenced appropriately. It is really important that you use an appropriate referencing convention (e.g. Vancouver/Harvard) if undertaking academic work in the future.	10	3.7
2. Knowledge and Understanding of Subject 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. You clearly have a very good level of knowledge of the procedures and protocols relating to the tests discussed in the report. In some cases, however, you drew reference to 'what is' rather than going as far as providing a justification or reasoning behind the protocol or precaution. The addition of the Failure Modes Effects Analysis helped to address this.	20	11.8
3. Analysis Analysis, evaluation and synthesis; logic, argument and judgement; analytical reflection; organisation of ideas and evidence		
50-59%: Evidence of some logical, analytical thinking and synthesis. Can analyse new and/or abstract data and situations without guidance. An emerging awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence to support the argument. Valid conclusions and recommendations, where relevant A Failure Modes Effects Analysis has been carried out. It is clear that considerable work has gone into this. I would suggest that the outputs from this could have been discussed at greater length in the report itself. A Quality Function Deployment (or equivalent technique) could have been used to capture, analyse and understand customer expectations and requirements.	30	16.8
4. Practical Application and Deployment Deployment of methods, materials, tools and techniques; application of concepts; formulation of innovative and creative solutions to solve problems.		
50-59%: A good and appropriate application of standard methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Good appreciation of the context of the application, with some use of examples, where relevant. Again, the way in which your work could be most improved would be by tying together the work you have done analysing the risks to project success and safety with the detailed test procedures outlined in the main body of the	30	17.1
5. Skills for Professional Practice 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. Mostly coherent work and is in a suitable structure. Your report is neat and relatively well structured but there is an over reliance on tabulated data and bullet points. If you are undertaking similar work in the future, try to provide more detailed explanations rather than just presenting the facts/procedures. Ensure that you include a conclusion in your academic reports.	10	5.6

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)		55	%
	Up to one-week late			
	Over one week late			