****

Group Project

**Second Demonstration & Presentation Assessment Sheet**

|  |
| --- |
| **Group Name B**  **Supervisor: Dr Neil Cooke** |

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]: 2i+ .

# Comments And Advice

|  |
| --- |
| The detail in the presentation was good in places (for example the software architecture) the level of detail was not consistent and you need to bear this in mind for your report. Also some of the basic science behind what you were doing could have been more in depth and better presented.  Project management might not have worked so well for your team and it wasn’t clear that everyone was totally involved but the experience of rotated leadership could be valuable and was a novel approach. It would have been useful to have seen more detail on the project management and in particular how your group interacted.  The vision processing was strong in this project but it would have been useful to have seen exactly how you applied the Hough transform. The communication to motors seemed to be the processing bottleneck. It also wasn’t clear that the Blender model was appropriate as the physics inside it assumes orthogonal planes. This may need some discussion in your report.  The simulation of the control algorithm using a physics engine was sensible but for your report you should extract measurements from it rather than relying on a youtube video. There was no justification for using the PID controller.  Your demonstration showed that you were unable to balance the broom but you showed some sensible output from your vision subsystem and that motor control seemed to be working well.  continue overleaf if required |

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