

STUDENT FEEDBACK FORM: DAV22868331

Generic Assessment Criteria	Marks available	Marks awarded
1. Engagement with Literature Skills		
The report shows engagement with a range of academic-style sources, including technical papers, e.g., Chen et al. 2011, open-access resources. Some effort is made to engage with engineering literature relevant to control systems. However, referencing is inconsistent, with entries like Rodriguez, 2013 and Paz, 2001., lack full publication details. In-text citations are present but poorly integrated; some seem inserted rather than discussed. There is limited critical engagement with the sources- literature is reported, not discussed. URLs in the reference list are raw and repeated; some sources lack titles or journal formatting, and Harvard style is inconsistently applied. Areas to improve and Feedforward: Standardise all references using proper Harvard formatting. Critically discuss how sources support or challenge your findings rather than only reporting them. Avoid using the same URL more than once.	20	10
2. Knowledge and Understanding Skills		
Your work demonstrates a good grasp of PID controller principles and the roles of proportional, integral and derivative gains. Newton's Second Law and basic dynamic equations have been clearly explained. While you have identified key system characteristics such as overshoot and settling time, some definitions are repetitive or vaguely worded, e.g., "The controller is also at one point a situation...". The explanation of terms like damping, underdamped, and steady-state could be more tightly connected to observed system behaviour. The theoretical foundation could be deepened with more precise equations and control theory discussion. Areas to improve and Feedforward: Include more detailed analysis of how theoretical concepts such as damping ratio and frequency response affect system performance. Use figures or formulae to clarify and connect theory with observed behaviours in MATLAB.	20	15
3. Cognitive and Intellectual Skills		
You have provided adequate analysis of open and close-loop responses, with some discussion of performance metrics. You have also made attempts to interpret system behaviour such as overshoot % and settling time. However, the analysis is mostly descriptive. There is little comparison or justification of control decision or tuning values. There is also no critical evaluation of PID tuning choices or trade-offs between response speed and stability. Areas to improve and Feedback: Explain why certain gains were chosen and what each adjustment was expected to do. Reflect on system limitations or assumptions and how these may affect outcomes.	20	13
4. Practical Application Skills		
You have demonstrated the use of MATLAB for simulating system responses with and without control. Your figures are referenced and interpreted with regard to system behaviour. You have made good attempts at tuning and comparing performances across different settings. However, no detailed code is included, and it is unclear how the tuning was implemented. Figure analysis is quite general and sometimes lacks clear reference to specific metrics or PID roles. Simulink or more advanced modelling tools were not mentioned or used. Areas to improve and Feedback: Include a summary or sample of your MATLAB code to demonstrate understanding of implementation. Quantify more results, e.g., using stepinfo outputs and relate them to control theory. Explore additional platforms, Simulink, for practical reinforcement.	25	14
5. Transferable Skills for Life and Professional Practice		
The report is structured with clear headings and logical flow. While the language is mostly clear, with effort to relate control principles to real-world systems, several sections are vague or loosely written, e.g., "It gets the job done, but it could be better". Spelling/grammar issues such as "miss2 instead of "overshoot", "engineering" affect professional tone. Areas to improve and Feedback: Focus on using more precise and formal language throughout. Proofread to eliminate typographical errors. Reflect briefly on how the tools and techniques explored could be applied in engineering work settings.	15	10

Assessment 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 1 week late (40% Max)

Over 1 week late (0%)

62%

