

Feedback for EEE222 Session:2009-2010

General Comments:

Generally most students made a reasonable attempt at this paper, but for some language is a difficulty. However, some students who are clearly not good at English do, nevertheless, answer questions very fully and do well. Attendance at lectures towards the end of semester was very poor and this is clearly reflected in the poor quality of the answers on the subject matter covered in these lectures.

Approximately 10% of the final mark was given for attendance and participation at tutorial sessions and this was a lifeline for several students who would otherwise have failed the module. Several students who did fail to pass the module had poor tutorial attendance marks and would probably have gained enough marks to scrape a pass had they bothered to attend the tutorial sessions.

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 85% of candidates. In part (a) Part (a) several students confused the role of the Data Controller with that of the Information Commissioner. Answers were very brief and candidates could have used the example given in part (b) to illustrate their answers in part (a).

Generally part (b) was reasonably well attempted but part (ii) caused the most problems with only about half the candidates mentioning the Information Commissioner. For parts (iii) and (iv) many of the obligations of Finditright and Jobassessor are very similar, but candidates need to state this to obtain full marks.

Question 2:

Attempted by 70% of candidates. Part (a) was reasonably well attempted, but for full marks candidates needed to mention something about market knowledge.

Part (b) was poorly answered – the question required candidates to mention and discuss the abstract, claims, description, specification etc. Some candidates described the application process here, which was what was required in part (c). Parts (d) and (e) were very similar to a question discussed in one of the tutorial classes, but answers were very brief and did not provide much discussion. In part (f) the question leads candidates to some of the issues they should discuss, nevertheless most candidates chose to ignore this advice.

Question 3:

Attempted by 56% of candidates. This was the highest scoring question as it was relatively easy to obtain marks for how to implement Health and Safety legislation and how to carry out a risk assessment in part (d). Most candidates who attempted this question had a reasonable attempt at part (a), although some had no clue whatsoever and were obviously trying to dream up answers relating to the quality of the product itself! Many candidates did not bother with part (b) and in part (c) candidates tried to think up issues that may be related to the product itself rather than general examples such as COSHH, Fire regulations, PAT testing etc.

Question 4:

Attempted by 87% of candidates. Most of the items covered in this question were very similar to those discussed in the tutorial sessions. Most candidates gained reasonable marks on part (a)(i). Parts (a)(ii) and (iii) tended to be confused (interchanged) – in the end I marked these two sections as one section as most students covered what was required.

Students who had prepared well and worked through past papers answered part (b) well. Those that didn't tended to get confused with the terminology, giving examples relating to aircraft doors rather than Karl's contract of employment. For part (c) some reference needed to be made to the IET Rules of Conduct and the fact that liability for death and injury cannot be excluded from a contract. For part (d) candidates needed to mention Professional Liability Insurance for full marks, not just insurance.