

Student	Time	Marker 1 (Jan)			Marker 2 (Nik)			Average		TOTAL	NOTES
		C1 Content/5	C1 Topic/5	C3 Communication/10	C1 Content/5	C1 Topic/5	C3 Communication/10	C1 Content/5	C1 Topic/5		
Santiago Velazquez	8:15	5	5	9.25	5	4.83	10	5	4.815	9.825	<p>Great introduction and background, very good use of humour.</p> <p>Very awesome props</p> <p>Time to check on slide</p> <p>Method approaches and clearly defined</p> <p>Qualifications and analysis well described</p> <p>Good anecdotal results to identify limitations. Turning and speed identified as issues</p> <p>Visuals used to hear things in a great way</p> <p>Legislation an issue</p> <p>Interesting combinations although qualitative</p> <p>Laash vs handle meaningful discussions</p> <p>Good understanding of feedback</p>
Cory Bullen	8:30	5	4.83	9.25	4.83	5	8	4.815	4.815	8.825	<p>JR: Nice work. Presentation could be more natural without script etc.</p> <p>SLAM helps with accuracy, although not systematic errors</p> <p>Good file, acknowledgement of country</p> <p>Very clear text, slides and visuals</p> <p>Good detail aims and objectives, with quantitative criteria</p> <p>Detailed publications, with good methodology differentiation</p> <p>Isometric design approach, which was engaging</p> <p>Excellent diagrams if area for improvement?</p> <p>Design iterations good, but could have been shown with decision matrix</p> <p>Display target for an practitioners needed, but otherwise excellent</p> <p>Very good insight into pros and cons of improvements plus reflections</p> <p>Great to compare methods used. Plus recommendations for future work.</p> <p>Quantitative. Why so positive? A/C?</p> <p>Clear opening like A/C.</p>
Syrene Eggen	8:45	4	4.83	9.25	5	4.83	10	4.83	4.83	9.825	<p>JR: some pictures in the literature review would have helped with understanding</p> <p>Very good slide approach</p> <p>Very different research question, which is a positive!</p> <p>Why use an alien environment? Dark future etc?</p> <p>Why use Haar cascade not say Viola-Jones? Pros and cons of each? Very well answered</p> <p>Development stages linear rather than design cycle</p> <p>Batch design practical, with good initial methods/needs</p> <p>Why do I do that?</p> <p>Clear insight into post design adaptation</p> <p>Clear future directions and reflections</p> <p>Excellent connections and ideas</p>
Dustin Bailey	9:00	4	4.83	9.25	5	4.4	9	4.8	4.515	9.125	<p>JR: Could explain the busbox concept a bit more</p> <p>Honest background and context of the work</p> <p>Includes benefits for user, as the best method?</p> <p>Excellent pictures and slide arrangements. Great to include video even if each issues.</p> <p>To be used but heavy slides.</p> <p>Good anecdotal results for the designed harness</p> <p>Reflections on field test and important insights</p> <p>Future design, good to consider alternatives</p> <p>Personal assessment of success and design options</p> <p>Quantitative questions could have had clearer answer</p> <p>Clear title and A/C.</p> <p>Very good slide approach</p> <p>Excellent eye contact, gaze of voice and proximity, but could breath deeper.</p> <p>Clear methods, although hear other than design cycle.</p> <p>Great to quantify the requirements, i.e. research questions. Shows awesome depth of knowledge of subject. Try to avoid too much jargon for audience type.</p> <p>Context of why discuss control system could have been clearer.</p> <p>Could be consider regulations and safety.</p> <p>Clear reflections, quantitative results are very impressive, but well understood!</p>
Jerrid Fisher	9:15	3.5	3.5	8	4	3.5	8	3.75	3.5	8	<p>JR: A bit brief on the context and the exact research aims. Do don't give a detailed description of the actual tests and ethics etc. Do not really describe design of the harness.</p> <p>Clear title and A/C.</p> <p>Very good slide approach</p> <p>Excellent eye contact, gaze of voice and proximity, but could breath deeper.</p> <p>Clear methods, although hear other than design cycle.</p> <p>Great to quantify the requirements, i.e. research questions. Shows awesome depth of knowledge of subject. Try to avoid too much jargon for audience type.</p> <p>Context of why discuss control system could have been clearer.</p> <p>Could be consider regulations and safety.</p> <p>Clear reflections, quantitative results are very impressive, but well understood!</p>
Ashleigh Clifford	9:30	4.83	5	10	4.83	4.83	9.25	4.83	4.815	9.825	<p>JR: Great slides! Very well presented.</p> <p>Clear title and A/C.</p> <p>Very good slide approach</p> <p>Excellent eye contact, gaze of voice and proximity, but could breath deeper.</p> <p>Clear methods, although hear other than design cycle.</p> <p>Great to quantify the requirements, i.e. research questions. Shows awesome depth of knowledge of subject. Try to avoid too much jargon for audience type.</p> <p>Context of why discuss control system could have been clearer.</p> <p>Could be consider regulations and safety.</p> <p>Clear reflections, quantitative results are very impressive, but well understood!</p>
Alexander Van Lint	11:45	Marker 1 (Janet)			Marker 2 (Nik)			Average			