**CUED - Engineering Tripos Part IIA 2017-2018 Module Full Technical Report**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student name: | **<your name>** | CRSID: | **<your name>** | Module number: | **3C6** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feedback to the student **□ See also comments in the text** | | Very good | **Good** | Needs improvmt |
| C O N T E N T | **Completeness, quantity of content:** Has the report covered all aspects of the lab? Has the analysis been carried out thoroughly? |  |  |  |
| **Correctness, quality of content** Is the data correct? Is the analysis of the data correct? Are the conclusions correct? |  |  |  |
| **Depth of understanding, quality of discussion** Does the report show a good technical understanding? Have all the relevant conclusions been drawn? |  |  |  |
| Comments: | | | |
| P R E S E N T A T I O N | **Structure, organisation of content** Has the report content been structured clearly and in a logical order? |  |  |  |
| **Attention to detail, typesetting and typographical errors** Is the report free of typographical errors? Are the figures/tables/references presented professionally? |  |  |  |
| Comments: | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Raw report mark | **/ 10** | *The weighting of comments is not intended to be equal, and the relative importance of criteria may vary between modules. A good report should attract about 7 marks.* |
| Penalty for lateness |  | *2 marks / week or part week. Please use allowance forms to inform the teaching office about mitigating circumstances.* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marker: | **Dr Tore Butlin** | Date: |  |