****

Group Project

**Second Demonstration & Presentation Assessment Sheet**

|  |
| --- |
| **Group Name Group A**  **Supervisor: Dr Tim Jackson** |

The following sections are intended to provide feedback about your performance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation Skills (20% of overall mark)** | 1+ | 1- | 2.i+ | 2.i- | 2.ii+ | 2.ii- | Fail |
| *Presentation, visual aids, etc.* |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Technical Progress to Date (40% of overall mark)** | 1+ | 1- | 2.i+ | 2.i- | 2.ii+ | 2.ii- | Fail |
| *Progress, hardware built, software written, equations, etc.* |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Results (40% of overall mark)** | 1+ | 1- | 2.i+ | 2.i- | 2.ii+ | 2.ii- | Fail |
| *Competition Results. Evidence that the results are commensurate with a group exercise. Technical, time, resource and skill management.* |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |

Total grade allocated [in 1+,1-,2.i+,2.i-,2.ii+,2.ii-,F]: 1- .

# Comments And Advice

|  |
| --- |
| A well delivered presentation that showed a clear grounding of the work undertaken and appropriate background material. The interplay between video, slides and demonstration was engaging and a lot of detail was given. The handouts are well presented and useful. The presentation contained some good details, in particular measurable requirements and performance limitations for the various sub-systems. Also you gave an excellent description of project management. The division into sub-systems was good although a small on-slide indicator would have helped with context. It would have been good to see further analysys of how the current limitations could be overcome and whether resource (mis) allocation was an issue. It was disappointing that no detail at all was given about the vision processing and the algorithm used. However, you gave a good theoretical treatment of the control problem and the effects of different control algorithms.  It would have been helpful to have seen more technical information on the deliverables of the system. Also if you are focusing on system’s approaches, there are a number of standard techniques.  Regarding the demonstration, the robot in general worked well and was very robust. Although it was unable to balance, the vision processing interface to motor controller was shown to be performing sensibly. Obviously the speed of data transfer seemed to be the problem.  continue overleaf if required |

|  |
| --- |
| Project Team Assessor(s): MS, ES, NJC, TJ Date: 26/3 |