

Feedback for EEE222 Session: 2010-2011

General Comments:

The exam contributes 90% to the overall mark for this module with the remaining 10% coming from attendance and participation in the weekly tutorials.

Candidates on the whole made a reasonable attempt at this paper, although some answers were extremely brief. Certain papers were extremely untidy making answers very difficult to read.

Several candidates should have received zero marks as they did not indicate on the front cover of the answerbook which questions they had answered and which they wished the examiner to mark! You should always indicate the questions attempted in the table on the front sheet in the order in which you attempt them.

Question 1:

Attempted by approximately 86% of candidates. This question was very similar to an example covered in the tutorial class and most candidates made a reasonable attempt at answering it. For part (a) it is important to state that it is “any company or person who has employees”. Some candidates confused parts (c) and (d) but most made a reasonable attempt. For full marks in part (e) it is important to indicate that Simon has a “duty of care for themselves and each other under” H&S law. For parts (f) and (g) candidates generally gave rather brief answers, whereas there was scope in the question to discuss several aspects (e.g. H&S law, morality of the situation, IET rules etc.)

Question 2:

Attempted by approximately 53% of candidates. A degree of ‘flexibility’ was used when marking this question; exact quotations of the rules were not required provided candidates had described the general meaning of the appropriate rule. In some cases candidates ‘hedged their bets’ by quoting many rules that may possibly apply in the hope that they may hit on the correct one – marks were only awarded for any rules that may be relevant to that section of the question. In some cases candidates went on at length about H&S rules, law of confidentiality, copyright law etc. without mentioning IET rules. This is useful supportive information, but the question specifically refers to the IET Rules of Conduct. Part (a)(ii) scored lowest of the 3 parts to section (a) with very few candidates referring to Mr. South’s situation – “Members whose professional advice is not accepted shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that the person overruling or neglecting their advice is aware of any danger which they believe may result from such overruling or neglect”.

In general part (b) was well answered.

Question 3:

Attempted by approximately 79% of candidates. Most candidates gave good answers for part (a) although some simply defined what a patent etc. was rather than giving examples of when an infringement had occurred. Part (b) was generally answered correctly, but part (c) presented more problems. The 4 marks for this part indicates that some discussion is required e.g. discussing scenarios where Mark may, or may not, own the IPR (e.g. did he use company resources to design cigarette).

Again part (d) allowed candidates to discuss the various options for Mark to market his idea and marks were gained for demonstrating the various routes he could take and reasoned argument to support this. Some candidates gave very brief answers for parts (c) and (d) so did not score highly.

Question 4:

Attempted by approximately 78% of candidates. Most candidates made a reasonable attempt at part (a), but many answers were extremely brief and did not really enter into sufficient depth to gain full marks. Many candidates stated the obvious, for example: “Maintenance: To provide maintenance of the software”, rather than explaining that this is to fix bugs that may come to light as the software is used, provide documentation, updates, training etc. for a specific period of time. Part (b) was the worst answered section of the whole paper. For part (b)(i) it is important to mention that Miss Flower is not party to any contract but could sue for negligence. A discussion of remoteness etc. should have been included (only 1 candidate cited the snail in beer bottle example). For part (b)(ii) very few candidates even mentioned the Supply of Goods and Services Act (1982) let alone discussed its implications to this situation.