

Design and Professional Practice 2

Final Report Marking Criteria

Objective

The final report not only provides an overview of the selected solution but also looks to critique it against the requirements. The report is also a chance to reflect on the experience and the groups performance during the development.

Document Format

The word limit is 3000 words for the main body of the text (this limit does not include the abstract, references, appendices, tables or figure captions).

A template is provided on Blackboard and Teams as a guide for you and also to give you some hints and tips on layout.

Submission

A pdf of the document should be submitted on Turnitin, be sure to use the following title formats when naming your files:

BME Group X - Final Report.pdf or *Mol Group Y - Final Report.pdf*

Marking Criteria

The following criteria are attributes that we will be looking for in your final report.

| Aspect | Criteria |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Writing and Style | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does the report use appropriate language and tense for a technical report?• Is the report readable and easy to understand?• Does the report uses images such as figures, tables and graphs to explain key points efficiently.• Are all figures, tables and graphs adequately referenced in the text? |
| Introduction | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the project brief clearly defined?• Does the background information and detailing of existing technology show an in-depth understanding of the topic? |
| Final Design | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the design clearly explained?• Is the design viable and scalable? |
| Discussion | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does the discussion provide a balanced evaluation of the solution, referencing the PSD as appropriate?• Does the discussion reflect upon the teams performance and provide a considered analysis of the team's performance? |
| Group Working | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Has the project work been distributed evenly between the group?• Do the OneNote pages demonstrate strong communication between the team members? |
| Risk Management | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Have appropriate risks been assessed and mitigating actions put in place as required?• Has the team used the Risk Assessment template correctly and understood its purpose? |
| Ethical Consideration | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Have the ethical implications of the design been taken into account and justified? |

Grade Descriptors

| Grade | Mark Range | Characterisation |
|-------|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A* | 85-100 | <p>Outstanding survey of relevant literature.</p> <p>Outstanding achievement and presentation beyond the expectation of the supervisor. Report is of publishable quality demonstrating of outstanding analytical ability in design development with an impressive volume of work.</p> <p>Insightful reflection on both the performance of the device and the performance of the group. The greatest consideration has been made of both risk in the design and ethical factors, to which nothing further can be added.</p> |
| A | 70-84 | <p>Excellent coverage of relevant literature.</p> <p>Excellent work and presentation; substantial level of independent enquiry, of analytical thought or creative ability all clearly demonstrated.</p> <p>Excellent quantity of work. Purposeful reflection considers both the performance of the device and the group. A strong consideration is demonstrated for the risks in the design and the ethics of the solution.</p> |
| B | 60-69 | <p>Well organised, clearly presented and adequately detailed.</p> <p>The report demonstrates a thorough grasp of relevant principles with some evidence of independent enquiry, analytical thought or creative ability.</p> <p>Generally very good quantity of work. Reflects upon the performance of the team and device with some consideration of the intended outcomes. Suitable consideration has been given to the risks and ethical aspects of the project.</p> |
| C | 50-59 | <p>The report is substantially correct demonstrating a basic understanding of relevant principles.</p> <p>Competent in design and organisation, there is modest evidence of creative or critical ability. The report is adequately presented but would benefit from better use of images/referencing/analysis.</p> <p>Some reflection upon the performance of the team and the device. A basic level of risk analysis and ethical evaluation.</p> |
| D | 40-49 | <p>Some elements of the report are correct but there is an incomplete understanding of relevant principles.</p> <p>Demonstrates some competence in routine tasks but somewhat lacking in presentation or in the application of consistent effort.</p> <p>Marginal reflection on design and performance without proper balance. Minimal consideration of risk and ethics.</p> |

| | | |
|---|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| E | 30-39 | <p>Work displaying little or no understanding of the relevant principles. The report demonstrates a failure to develop an approach that would achieve the desired outcome. Major elements of the report are incorrect.</p> <p>Little or no reflection on the teamwork or the device performance. No consideration of risk or ethics.</p> |
|---|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|