

MARKING CRITERIA AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

MODULE: Race Engineering

ASSIGNMENT: Driver Analysis

STUDENT: Luke Cripps

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 have only conducted basic research to support data analysis as a driver development tool . We would expect a wider range of background reading to be evident at this level.</i> <i>You have conducted some good research into testing methodologies for driver analysis and used these to inform your methodology</i> <i>Whilst you include some evidence of background reading at the start of the report, how this has effected your methodology and how these support your conclusions is not clear. You should have citations embedded throughout your report at this level. Having said this a couple of interesting sources cited.</i>	10	5.8	58
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)			
50-59%: Knowledge is accurate with a good understanding of the field of study. <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>The depth of analysis doesn't allow you to demonstrate a detailed understanding. Although it is clear you can understand the data presented, the application of driver input with relation to vehicle response and the reasoning behind this in respect to the vehicle situation could be more clearly appreciated.</i>	20	11.4	57
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)			
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 the ability to use evidence to support the argument. Valid conclusions and recommendations where relevant. <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 presented data for each driver and identified obvious differences. You could have conducted further analysis to explain root causes of driver inputs.</i> <i>Discussion of results could be clearer through more a more carefully structured assessment of each driver or each turn. Throttle and braking inputs compared but steering and gear analysis lacking. Although you have presented the response of the drivers to the instructions you should have quantified the improvements these yielded on lap or sector performance.</i>	40	23.2	58
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 I2, conclusions drawn from analysis)			
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. <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 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 justification of circuit selection. Vehicle selection and influence on driving techniques could have been discussed.</i> <i>Results presented well with a good use of the MOTEC analysis software evident</i>	20	12.1	60.5
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.)			
60-69%: Can communicate well, confidently and consistently in a suitable format. Work is coherent and fluent and is well structured and organised. <i>A very good account of the investigation conducted, could be structured a little more professionally in places.</i> <i>Technical report formatting and presentation generally is very good. A couple of minor errors only.</i> <i>Generally a good report, although analysis could be a little more structured and the comparisons made could be explored further..</i>	10	6.3	63
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		58.8 %