****

Group Project

**Interim Group Report Assessment Sheet**

|  |
| --- |
| **Group Name/Student Names: Group C**  **Aaron Lyons, Kh Sam, Kavin Kalai Selvan, Sam James, Piotr Opacki, Alex Farmer, Liew Kit Shen**  **Supervisor: EJS** |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Writing Skills (25% of overall mark)** | 1+ | 1- | 2.i+ | 2.i- | 2.ii+ | 2.ii- | Fail |
| *Structure and fitness for purpose. Clear introduction, easy to read and general flow.* |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Technical and Analytic Content (50% of overall mark)** | 1+ | 1- | 2.i+ | 2.i- | 2.ii+ | 2.ii- | Fail |
| *Analytic understanding of the problem.* |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Future (25% of overall mark)** | 1+ | 1- | 2.i+ | 2.i- | 2.ii+ | 2.ii- | Fail |
| Technical merit of proposals for completing the project. Adequacy and appropriateness of workplan. |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |

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

# Comments And Advice

|  |
| --- |
| This is a substantial, well written, and coherent report that shows a group functioning well together towards the project goals.  A substantial body of work has clearly been undertaken, although in some cases the explanation of this work, the tangible deliverables, or in the absence thereof justified design decisions are not entirely clear.  I would have expected, on a project this size, to see clearly extracted and formalised requirements which could be used in a later verification / testing process. Likewise, I would have expected to see literature or supporting research for all of your design decisions.  The report would have benefitted from an earlier discussion of high level technical architecture (backed up by literature) and greater linking of the research options to the technical review. Some of the design choices / technical options barely seem to feature in the literature review.  Some technical sections are very strong (e.g. the theory behind the control requirements), but this is not carried forward into the technical decisions. The decision between PID and fuzzy control, for example, doesn’t link clearly enough to this theory and is poorly justified in comparison.  The approach of presenting alternatives and making a selection is valid, but again the justification of the selection is essential. The selection of LabVIEW over MATLAB for example lacks clear justification and the explanation of the LabVIEW vision system implemented doesn’t convey the expected level of technical understanding – toolboxes are fine but you need to explain what is going on!  Another example of a lack of technical justification falls in the decision to reduce the dimensionality of the initial work. Having discussed this with the group you should be aware of the contentious nature of this point, and yet the justification did not even make reference to examples in your own literature review where you had material that could have supported your case.  Finally, the future planning section was OK with clearly identified tasks, but could have been improved by ensuring that the tasks were SMART and thus could be evaluated in the context of completing the project.  Summary: A well written report but lacking in justification for decisions and clarity around tangible deliverables. |
| Project Team Assessor(s): EJS Date: . . . . . . . . . . . |