

## Feedback - PP

u7656059 - Jack Roberts

### Things Done Well

The concepts generated in this report did a good job covering the solution space and being plausible solutions. Legal requirements for a helmet to protect against swooping identified. Some research is evident.

### Things to be Improved

The executive summary should include the context and aim of the report, as well as the findings and recommendations made. Citations should also be used whenever information from a source is used. The requirements which will be used in the selection matrix should be clearly identified earlier in the report.

Criteria	F	P	CR	D	HD
<b>Application of Engineering design process</b> <b>A description of A (20)</b>	Insufficient summary of project process or too much description. No attempt to reflect on lessons learnt or future relevance. Evidence or examples not used to support summary. Writing and organisation is not adequate to convey meaning.	Basic summary of the project process, or too focused on description. Some reflection attempted and at least one general lesson learned is identified, partially supported by evidence or examples. Writing and organisation is adequate to convey meaning.	Good summary of the project, process. Basic reflection of process, and some general lessons learned are identified, with some supporting evidence and examples. Mostly well written and organised.	Informative summary of project process. Good level of reflection, some assessment of process supported by examples. Identifies lessons learned and suggests specific improvements for future design processes with supporting evidence. Well written and organised.	Excellent summary of project process. High level of reflection, critically assesses process, well supported by examples. Insightful lessons learned and specific suggestions* for future design process improvements well supported by evidence. Excellent communication and flow.
<b>Project teamwork</b> <b>A longer description of B (20)</b>	Insufficient summary of teamwork experience or too much description. No attempt to reflect on how well the team worked and no lessons learnt identified. Writing and organisation is not adequate to convey meaning	Basic summary of teamwork experience, or too focused on description. Some reflection attempted, description of how well the team worked and at least one lesson learned is identified, partially supported by evidence or examples. Writing and organisation is adequate to convey meaning.	Good summary of teamwork experience. Basic reflection, good description of how well the team worked, and some lessons learned, with some supporting evidence and examples. Mostly well written and organised.	Informative summary of teamwork experience. Good level of reflection, some evaluation of how the team worked and lessons learned with relevant supporting evidence and examples. Well written and organised.	Excellent summary of teamwork experience. High level of reflection, in-depth evaluation of how the team worked, supported by examples. Thoughtful consideration of relationship to future group work. Excellent communication and flow.
<b>Project contribution</b> <b>A longer description of C (20)</b>	Does not appropriately identify skills or knowledge gained. Individual contribution to the project not clear. Does not consider future relevance in terms of own actions or focused on current technical application only. Writing and organisation is not adequate to convey meaning.	Identifies some skills or knowledge gained. Own contribution to project identified, with attempt at assessment. At least one general suggestion for how to improve own approach to project work in the future. Writing and organisation is adequate to convey meaning.	Identifies some skills and knowledge gained. Own contribution to project identified. Some basic assessment of own actions and approach to project work. General suggestions for how to improve own approach to project work in the future, with some evidence. Mostly well written and organised.	Identifies a number of skills and knowledge gained. Examines own project contribution and considers own actions and approach to project work supported by examples. Specific suggestions for how to improve own approach to project work in the future, supported by evidence. Well written and organised.	Identifies skills and knowledge gained across broad categories. In-depth examination of own project contribution. Critically assesses own actions and approach to project work, well supported by examples. Insightful, specific* suggestions for how to improve own approach to project work in the future, well supported by evidence. Excellent communication and flow.

<b>Demonstrating EA competencies</b> <b>A longer description of D (20)</b>	Competency selected is not clear or related to skills developed. Attainment of indicators insufficient. Writing and organisation is not adequate to convey meaning.	Competency element selected with some relation to skills developed. Attainment of indicators somewhat described in part with supportive evidence. Writing and organisation is adequate to convey meaning.	Appropriate selection of competency element relating to skills developed. Attainment of all indicators described with some supporting evidence. Mostly well written and organised.	Good selection of competency element with clear relationship to skills developed. Good description of attainment of all indicators with appropriate supporting evidence. Well written and organised.	Insightful selection of competency element with well justified relationship to skills developed. Clear and concise description of attainment of all indicators with strong supporting evidence. Excellent communication and flow.
<b>Ethics</b> <b>A longer description of E (20)</b>	Insufficient summary, missing main points or with too much description. No reflection attempted, actions only superficially mentioned and no attempt to consider stakeholders. No contributing factors or conflicts of interest identified, or those identified not reasonable. Does not or incorrectly identify parts of the EA code of ethics that were violated. Writing and organisation is not adequate to convey meaning.	Summary captures some of the points of case study but may be too wordy. Some reflection attempted, identifying some of the actions of those involved and effect on at least a few stakeholders. Identifies at least one reasonable contributing factor or conflict of interest, partially supported with evidence. Identifies some parts of the EA code of ethics that were violated. Writing and organisation is adequate to convey meaning.	Summary captures most of the main points of case study, may be too wordy. Basic reflection, identifying most of the actions of those involved and effect on several stakeholders (may miss some). Identifies some contributing factors and conflicts of interest, with some evidence. Identifies the most important parts of the EA code of ethics that were violated. Mostly well written and organised.	Concise summary, capturing main points of case study. Good level of reflection, some assessment of the actions of those involved and effect on key stakeholders. Identifies most of the contributing factors and conflicts of interest, supported by relevant evidence. Identifies the key parts of the EA code of ethics that were violated. Well written and organised.	Excellent, concise summary, capturing main points of case study. High level of reflection critically assesses actions of those involved and effect on all stakeholders. Insightful identification of contributing factors and conflicts of interest, well supported by evidence. Identifies, with justification, the key parts of the EA code of ethics that were violated. Excellent communication and flow.