****

Group Project

**Final Group Report Assessment Sheet**

|  |
| --- |
| **Group Name/Student Names: B**  **Alex Wardle, Gan Chee Heing, Jin Liu, Ahmed Egal, Nursyahirah Mohd Ghazali, Saad Aamir, Tze Bey Lim**  **Supervisor: Dr Neil Cooke** |

The final report should be assessed on the standard School marking schedule which may be loosely described as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Degree | Mark Range | Typical Characteristics |
| 1st class | 14-20  (>16 counts as a very good first) | Extraordinary levels of motivation and hard work. Significant added value. High level of analytical ability. Ability to find ways around problems. Fully engineered system demonstrated. Critical analysis of all actions. Well read. Marks > 16 need additional justifying. |
| Upper 2nd class | 12-13.9 | High levels of motivation and hard work. Noticeable added value. Good level of analytical ability. Ability to find ways around problems. Fully engineered system demonstrated. Well read. |
| Lower 2nd class | 10.0-11.9 | Little added value but implemented to the minimum standard consistent with the status of a professional engineer. Working system demonstrated but with little original thought. Reading constrained to the basic technical issues. |

The following sections are included for your guidance and to help you rank the groups.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Group Writing Skills [0 – 5 marks, to 0.5 mark accuracy]:**  Structure and fitness for purpose.  Clear introduction, easy to read and general flow.  Edited to remove repetitions; adequate coverage of important areas.  Thoroughly checked before submission. | 4 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Technical and Analytic Content [0 – 10 marks, to 0.5 mark accuracy]:**  Analytic understanding of the problem.  Performance modelling. Technical progress.  Demonstration of working/completed sections. | 7.5 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **The Gains made by the Group [0 – 5 marks, to 0.5 mark accuracy]:**  Technical merit of proposals for completing the project.  Adequacy and appropriateness of workplan and execution.  Evidence that meetings are being used productively. | 3.5 |

Total mark allocated [out of 20]: 15 .

**Please include comments to justify your decision on this page or overleaf.**

|  |
| --- |
| Assessor: . . .Dr. Neil Cooke . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Date: 30/04/14 . . |

This is a good report. The introduction is clear and the system architecture evolution details design choices made and their rationale well. The subsystem section is consistent in structure and level of detail with appendices providing more when necessary, and there is substantial evidence of an engineering approach and the use of simulation to support theoretical designs. The use of high quality images of the built system is good although their use for individual components perhaps less so. The report has one flaw – namely a lack of detail regarding final unit test other than “it works – please watch the youtube video..” ! But overall, well done.