

MARKING CRITERIA AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

MODULE: Race Engineering	ASSIGNMENT: Driver Analysis
STUDENT: Samuel Fripp	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.)			%
50-59%: Inclusion of a range of research-informed literature, including sources retrieved independently. Referencing conventions mostly consistently applied. <i>You should have reviewed a much larger range of sources to support your understanding of the principles being investigated by this report.</i> <i>You have conducted some good research into testing methodologies for driver analysis and used these to inform your methodology</i> <i>Samuel, although you have included references to a range of web based sources, at this level we would expect you to be reviewing published material such as books and journal papers to support your knowledge and understanding. Some inclusion of citations in background at start of report - you should have used citations in your results discussions to support your analysis and conclusions.</i>	10	5	50
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)			
60-69%: Knowledge is extensive. Exhibits understanding of the breadth and depth of established views. <i>You show a good level on understanding of driver techniques and how these may effect vehicle performance in general.</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>You demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between yaw, steering and vehicle balance. You also appreciate the differences in approaches taken by the different drivers and sessions and the positive and negative impacts of these on the lap performance. Good to see further recommendations (post session 2) for drivers included.</i>	20	12.6	63
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)			
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>Some basic analysis of the data obtained, but you could have looked in more detail at secondary inputs to explain/support observations made</i> <i>You have compared the drivers inputs and used these to draw comparisons and suggestions for each driver.</i> <i>Whilst you make some reasonable comments regarding the data, you have not fully supported this with evidence. Some comments are generalised observations and your conclusions could be more convincing if accompanied with specific evidence through further interrogation of the data.. Overlaying the 3 drivers "characteristic" laps earlier in the report would have helped demonstrate the differences and successes of the different approaches and this would have helped justify your recommendations/instructions given pre session 2. Assessing section times and variance would have helped evaluate if the changes made were positive.</i>	40	26	65
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 12, conclusions drawn from analysis)			
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. <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 this 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>Some evidence of test planning accounting for driver fatigue, but further justification of test planning could have been presented. Track and car selection could have been critically explained in terms of the requirements these place upon the drivers such as the effects of aerodynamics and mechanical grip. Overall a reasonable test plan.</i> <i>Basic results presentation with only limited use of the analysis tools available.</i>	20	10.8	54
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.)			
50-59%: Can communicate effectively in a suitable format, but may have minor errors. Mostly coherent work and is in a suitable structure. <i>A good account of the work conducted. Structure shows some room for improvement to portray your ideas in a more succinct manner.</i> <i>Technical report guidelines only generally followed. You need to refer to the guidelines and make sure you present accordingly in future.</i> <i>Whilst the general report structure is good, figures should be captioned and numbered below. The report would be improved by inclusion of the data figures in the main body of the report with the accompanying discussion. This would have not required the reader to flick back and forth through the report. Some sentences could be structured more professionally - you need to proof read your work. Presentation of data is difficult to view - it's too small!!</i>	10	5	50
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	59.4	%