

Cambridge University Engineering Department
Engineering Tripos Part IIA
Module Experiment Report and Full Technical Report
 2015-2016

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------|--|
| To be completed by the student | | | | <i>Note: All work must be your own unless otherwise acknowledged</i> | | | | |
| Student name: | | | | CRSID: | | | College: | |
| Module number: | | | Date experiment performed: | | | Date submitted for marking: | | |
| This report is (tick as appropriate): | | | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Module experiment report</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>FTR</i> | | | | | |
| Title of report: | | | | | | | | |

Instructions to markers of Part IIA coursework:

Grade this coursework by marking the appropriate Overall Assessment box, and **provide feedback by ticking as many of the comments as are applicable on the marking sheet overleaf**. Students should be aware that different parts of a report may show different characteristics, so a range of remarks can be expected. The weighting of comments is not intended to be equal, and the relative importance of criteria may vary between reports. Markers should provide guidance on which parts of the report fall below acceptable standards (A grade).

A good report should receive an A grade overall.

Additional specific notes from marker:

See also comments in the text

| Overall assessment (circle grade) | A* | A | B | C | D | Overall Mark (including any late penalty) |
|-----------------------------------|------|--|---------|--------|------|--|
| Guideline standard | >75% | 65-75% | 55-65% | 40-55% | <40% | |
| Module experiment report marks | 4-5 | 3.5 | 3 | 2.5 | 0-2 | |
| Full Technical Report marks | 8-10 | 7 | 5.5-6.5 | 4.5-5 | 0-4 | |
| <i>Penalty for lateness</i> | | <i>Per week or part week that the work is late: Lab reports 1 mark; FTRs 2 marks</i> | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------|--|--|--|-------|--|--|--|
| Marker: | | | | Date: | | | |
|---------|--|--|--|-------|--|--|--|

| Tick | | Comment box |
|--|--|-------------|
| Completeness of the work | | |
| A* | Relevant additional experiments carried out | |
| A | Assignment instructions followed properly | |
| B | Minor omissions in requested work | |
| C | Parts of the instruction not followed | |
| D | Student did not follow instructions | |
| Completeness of the report | | |
| A* | Additional relevant information provided, including references | |
| A | All required information included, including references | |
| B | Minor omissions in information | |
| C | Notable omissions in information | |
| D | Major omissions in information | |
| Structure and clarity | | |
| A* | Outstanding clarity and organisation of the material | |
| A | Clear and well structured document | |
| B | Weakness in structure, lack of clarity, too wordy or too brief | |
| C | Unclear structure of the document | |
| D | Inadequate structure | |
| Presentation of the data and references | | |
| A* | Professional use of figures, tables and references | |
| A | Good use of diagrams, tables, references | |
| B | Graphs and tables are poorly presented and/or improperly referenced | |
| C | Inappropriate use of graphs, tables and references | |
| D | Lack of graphs, tables and references | |
| Typographic errors and attention to the details | | |
| A* | Professional level of typesetting | |
| A | A few typographic errors, weakness in layout | |
| B | Minor typographic or language errors, some typos in mathematical expressions | |
| C | Numerous typographic errors, unprofessional display of equations | |
| D | Sentences and formulae difficult to understand. | |
| Quality of the data presented | | |
| A* | Data presented in insightful way | |
| A | Graphs and figures are correct | |
| B | Poor choice of data in graphs | |
| C | Missing important graphs or tables | |
| D | No data presented | |
| Analysis of the results | | |
| A* | Novel analysis, computing effort | |
| A | Calculations are correct | |
| B | Correct methods, but some numerical mistakes, lack of error analysis | |
| C | Substantial errors in analysis, inappropriate methods | |
| D | Failure to apply appropriate method | |
| Depth of understanding, critical thinking | | |
| A* | Incisive remarks | |
| A | Good remarks | |
| B | Insufficient comment on the results | |
| C | Remarks showing lack of understanding | |
| D | Misunderstanding of fundamental aspect | |
| Quality of the discussion | | |
| A* | Excellent depth of discussion | |
| A | Competent discussion of all main issues | |
| B | Incomplete discussion | |
| C | Discussion weak, muddled or incorrect | |
| D | Poor discussion, incorrect conclusions | |