

MARKING CRITERIA AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

MODULE: Major Project	ASSIGNMENT: Dissertation Report
STUDENT: Charlie Randall	DATE: 30/4/19

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.			
70-79%: Inclusion of a wide range of research-informed literature, including sources retrieved independently. Selection of relevant and credible sources. Very good use of referencing conventions, consistently applied. <i>Good to see some excellent references embedded in background explanations of key theories. A good wide range of reading evident. You could have demonstrated more clearly how these sources informed your methods and development direction (this was covered for the tail shaping)</i>	10	7	70
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.			
60-69%: Knowledge is extensive. Exhibits understanding of the breadth and depth of established views. <i>Aims could be expanded on with rationale and potentially specific targets. Good understanding of aerodynamic principles demonstrated in background section. Turbulence models could have been covered further. You demonstrate a good knowledge of flow characteristics and have employed a logical development strategy in general.</i>	10	6.75	68
3. Analysis (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. <i>Why only cover the top half of the front wheel? Based on improvement why not investigate further? It's not clear if this was conducted with moving wheel and road which would significantly impact results. Air intake development geometries not all presented. Some very good analysis of flow changes base on developments. It's a shame the front fairing design was not an improvement - further investigation here could have lead to large performance improvements. Judging by the significant improvement achieved through tail development, it would have been nice to see this area taken further. You could have characterised / predicted the time saving on a run which would result from the decrease in drag coefficients and proposed package - this would have helped contextualise the improvement. A little more technical rigour to assess limitations of work and validity of findings could have improved this section.</i>	35	22.8	65
4. Practical Application and Deployment (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.			
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. CAD Model development is good - you could have explained decisions to maintain simplifications. Surfacing require was not trivial so well done here. MIRA validation is good, but some of the investigation results could have been presented to convince the reader the proposed method is valid. Some of the changes made to the geometry may not package around physical components - this could have more clearly been considered. Some very good post processing to present work.	35	23.6	68
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.			
70-79%: Can communicate professionally and, confidently in a suitable format. Can work professionally within a team, showing leadership skills as appropriate, managing conflict and meeting obligations. Work is coherent, very fluent and is presented professionally. <i>Well presented report. Some typographical errors and some statements could be more technical - 'errors of 5% are going to be fairly accurate'. This is a solid piece of work Charlie.</i>	10	7.5	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		
	68	%	