

MARKING CRITERIA AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

MODULE: Group Project

ASSIGNMENT: Report

STUDENT: Ewan Carter

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. 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>Limited evidence of supporting reading in your section - you should have cited relevant sources to discuss wind end plate design elements and the implications of the results obtained. We would expect evidence of a wide range of reading informing your understanding, methods and conclusions at this level.</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.		
30-39%: Gaps in knowledge, with only superficial understanding. Some significant inaccuracies. <i>You could have explained the function of end plates and their aerodynamic effect on performance. This would have given confidence the design requirements were appreciated. Design alternative rationale not explained - this should have been related to what the endplates and design changes are trying to achieve.</i>	25	9.38
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		
40-49%: Evidence of some logical, analytical thinking and some attempts to synthesise, albeit with some weaknesses. Some evidence to support findings/ views, but evidence not consistently interpreted. Some relevant conclusions and recommendations, where relevant <i>CFD process outlined with some of the results obtained presented. More advanced postprocessing could have been conducted. Basic analysis of pressure distributions is correct. Some misunderstanding of why the increase in load occurs. A more detailed assessment of the flow changes is expected, this would have explained the changes in load you have attributed to method errors..</i>	25	11.9
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.		
40-49%: An adequate awareness and mostly appropriate application of well established methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Basic appreciation of the context of the application. <i>Good to see design changes, although these could have been justified more effectively. Evidence that you have applied a reasonable CFD process to develop a model. This appears to have run but you could have included more evidence to show the results through postprocessing and assessed the limitations of your model. Practical workshop element is to be commended.</i>	25	11.9
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.		
50-59%: Can communicate effectively in a suitable format, but may have minor errors. Can work effectively as part of a team, with clear contribution to group activities. Mostly coherent work and is in a suitable structure. <i>Team were well organised and good to see allocation of specific tasks to individuals all contributing to overall project aim. You should have presented your work in greater detail and thought about how you clearly defined the processes and decisions taken.</i>	15	9.75
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	45 %