

Report Mark Sheet: Fundamentals Problem

Student Name: Alix Bailie, Kaan Kesgin, Alberto Moreno, Gregory Myles
Academic marker: Andy Harvey

Grade range (highest to lowest)	A1,A2,A3,A4,A5 (22-18)	B1,B2,B3 (17-15)	C1,C2,C3 (14-12)	D1,D2,D3 (11-9)	E1,E2,E3 (8-6)	F1,F2,F3 (5-3)	G1,G2,G3,H (<3)	Grade awarded
Descriptor	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>G: Very Poor, H: No attainment</i>	
Writing	Exceptionally clear, precise and concise English. Excellent spelling & grammar, few typos.	Clear and well written, easy to understand, and mostly free of errors.	Most of the text is clear and easily understood. There are some issues with grammar and spelling.	The text can be understood but some elements are not entirely clear. A sizeable volume of errors is noticeable	Hard to understand much of the text. Significant spelling errors and grammatical flaws.	The volume and nature to the grammatical errors, combined with poor writing makes this report difficult to read.	Unintelligible. Impossible to read due to exceptionally poor use of English.	A2
Presentation and Figures	Professional standard of presentation. All illustrations are well formatted and presented.	A clear and consistent presentation style making it easy to read. Most of the figures are clear and well presented.	There are some minor flaws in the presentation and the clarity of the figures, but overall a well presented report.	A number of basic errors present – inconsistent use of styles, margins etc. Figures are satisfactory	Significant flaws in the presentation detracting from the overall impression of the report. Flawed figures – badly drawn and untidy,	Unacceptable presentation: untidy and inconsistent use of styles. Figures are messy and unclear.	A messy report – no evidence of any effective effort on the quality of the presentation. Report is hard to follow due to unclear figures.	A2
Organisation and Structure	Structure is entirely correct with all sections correctly placed. Reading contents gives clear overview.	A well organised report with all sections logically placed enhancing understanding of work.	A report which is sufficiently well organised to make reading report easy.	There may be some issues with the structure, but these don't detract from overall quality.	There are flaws in the way the report is structured which damages the overall quality of the report.	Serious flaws in structure which makes it difficult to read and understand the report.	No discernable structure. Illogical placement of sections. Impossible to follow argument.	A2
Technical Content	Well informed and authoritative discussion of a significantly complex technical problem. Excellent breadth and depth of knowledge.	Clear and reasoned arguments indicating a very good grasp of a difficult technical problem.	Arguments presented are of a reasonable technical level, and have been well considered and clearly stated.	The arguments presented are of reasonable technical depth and show a satisfactory understanding.	Only limited critical discussion of the technical problem studied. Suggests limited understanding of problem	Very little evidence of critical discussion of technical work or results. Superficial understanding of problem.	The lack of quality of the technical argument suggests that the student has very little understanding of the problem.	A1
References	Exemplary range of references indicating comprehensive background reading.	An appropriate range of relevant references suggesting substantial background reading.	Sufficient references to indicate a good level of background reading.	Perhaps just enough references to suggest some background reading was undertaken. Too many www references.	Too few relevant references and possibly an over reliance on www sources indicating insufficient background work.	Only a few references and majority are irrelevant. Little evidence of background reading.	Very few (or no) references. No evidence of any background reading.	NA

Feedback:

Note checklist with [x] means completed

1. Excellent introduction and scene setting for the problem
2. It would have been useful in the intro to give a guide to what will be presented throughout the report- eg discussions with the expert advisors
3. Sources of diagrams should have been acknowledged
4. Very good indications that you worked stnergistically

1. Required Components

1. [x] **One or more brain-storming activities to propose possible solutions.**
 2. [x] **A minimum of two minuted meetings with Technical Advisors**
 3. [x] **A list of all solutions identified, covering the spectrum from speculative to highly credible.**
 1. It was unfortunate that the scoring did not provide a strong concluding discrimination, but your conclusion was sensible
 2. Some really good ideas: liked EIT/microwave. Could they be enhanced by exploiting differing temporal behaviour?
 4. [x] **A process of reasoning with qualitative and/or quantitative assessment of this list to enable down selection to a short list of between two and five techniques for appraisal.**
 1. Good reasoned discussion
 2. But the algorithmic challenges for EIT and microwave should not be a reason for not pursuing
-
1. [x] **Quantitative assessment of the short-listed techniques, probable attainable performance and comparison with initial objectives.**
 2. [x] **A conclusion on the proposed technique(s) and quantification of the probable performance.**
 3. [x] **This should include a proposal for future research to establish the knowledge and understanding required for to enable a detailed proposal for the development of your proposed technique to an operational prototype (not for the actual construction of a prototype).**

1. [x] You should include a rough estimate of the number of person-months/years of effort you envisage to be get to the position where you are able to write this proposal.

Student Name:

Academic marker: Prof Andy Harvey