

Feedback for EEE221 Session: 2011-2012

Feedback: Please write simple statements about how well students addressed the exam paper in general and each individual question in particular including common problems/mistakes and areas of concern in the boxes provided below. Increase row height if necessary.

General Comments:

EEE221 consists of 50% from SHIPS (the industrial project) 20% from attendance at the EEE221 Duncan Kitchin lectures 25% from and essay assignment set and marked by Duncan Kitchin and 5% for completion of a Work Experience Portfolio.

SHIPS (50%):

SHIPS is marked 15% for an individual visit report, (students generally produced quite good reports and the average score was in the 1st class region) main again students lost marks most often for poor description of company's problem. 15% comes from performance at the Oral Presentations with average performance being the 2.1 class region (students' weaknesses centered mainly on technically weak justifications of choices and lack of a coherent narrative). 30% comes from a Peer and Tutor exercise with an average in the 1st class region (reliability and timekeeping were often viewed as the main weakness by peers followed by lack of contribution of ideas). And finally 40% for contribution to a final written group report score and performance averaged 2.1 class standard (as usual main weaknesses were poor presentation of technical arguments and failure to connect up the various sections into a coherent whole). As is typical with a group activity with many assessments making up the whole the range of marks are bunched in a small range and usually quite high.

Attendance (20%):

Attendance averaged at 18% which is better than in recent years yet could be higher given that listening to Duncan's presentations is key to tackling his essay.

Essay (25%):

Essay performance averaged 2.2 class standard which is perhaps not so surprising when engineering students are not as familiar with essay writing as students from some other disciplines. Duncan Kitchin adds: *The class was markedly bigger this year with 88 students submitting the assignment. This year the assignment title was very explicit, so there was no excuse for students who did not write appropriately. However, a small minority wrote as though they had made up their own title in the absence of knowing the set title. These students almost without exception failed the assignment. There was a significant minority who showed little or no sign of having attended the lectures or have done any reading despite the title telling them to use course material; they also failed. Perhaps two candidates failed because their written English was so poor that I could not tell what they were saying. Some students had a very low standard of written English, if anything worse than in previous years. There was some evidence that five or six assignments were works of fiction that bore little relation to the group's actual experience. As ever I enjoyed teaching the course, and received some very encouraging feedback from class members, but the comments about English comprehension that were made in some assignments makes me wonder how much is understood, despite my efforts to use a basic vocabulary and simple grammatical structures.*

Work Experience Portfolio (5%):

As usual some good reflection was done here by many of those who submitted but it was disappointing that a significant number of students failed to submit this straightforward assignment. A wasted opportunity by those students.