

Activity A: Journal Club

Student: STUDENT X (Structural Vibrations)

Comments on presentation

Please don't hesitate to contact me (37050) if you want to discuss the following comments on your presentation.

1. Suitability of article (appropriate level, reasonable length)

Right general level - plenty to discuss. Never apologise for content of talk! Subject interesting and easy for audience to relate to. 'Pictures' should have been presented on OHP. Obviously put a lot of effort into talk. Better to give out handout at beginning. Explained concepts well. Needed OHP pen - should have brought with you!

2. Organisation of talk (introduction, content, summary, overheads, presentation, time keeping)

Rather too much detail on transparameters. Explained basic resonance concepts using swing example - simple but effective. Spoke too quickly when reading from overhead (OK when explaining). Needed to bring transparamin to life by varying type face, adding diagrams etc. Nervous at beginning but confidence grew. Too detailed transparameters difficult to convey information (audience cannot possibly read!). Rushed at end. Use videotail to summarise.

3. Response to questions (understanding, interpretation)

Turned away from audience at end - always face! Answered questions well but tended to speak too quickly - little nervous. Showed good general understanding of subject.

4. Overall comments

Overall good. Try to avoid 'reading' from OHP slide - also vary style of pens. Show pictures if possible or give handouts. Too much detail on some transparameters. Understood subject well. Use videotail to summarise at end.

Feedback on Draft Statics Report

STUDENT Y

Overall good. Well-laid out and reasonably well structured. Easy to follow and nice written style.

General Comments;

- 1 Coupled Summary with introduction. Summary should contain results as well as details of theory. Intro should only set the scene. Write intro independently of Summary and include objectives within it.
- 2 Show graphs as figures rather than appendices.
- 3 Append and refer to Experiment instruction sheet.
- 4 Give details of calculations of forces (theory) and Young's modulus (Diburra). Reader not a mind reader!
- 5 Generally expand Diburra section.
- 6 Write Calculations in connected sentences (this is! is rather subjective - up to you!).

Pinked for a very good report.

Dani

STUDENT Z

Feedback on Final Statics Report

(Queens')

General Comments

Overall a well structured report which was easy to read and follow in some places but disjoint and unsupported in others. Unfortunately the report did not contain enough detail in the experimental, discussion or conclusion sections (due possibly to lack of time?), which rather let it down, and virtually abandoned reader to an appendix at key points. Shame, given its promising structure.

Specific Advice

1. Abstract and introduction entirely appropriate for the nature of the report.
2. First level headings are labelled 1, 2 etc. (not 1.0, 2.0!).
3. It would have been appropriate to give details of the calculations in theory section. The reader had no idea later on where the figures came from.
4. Diagram of experiment was omitted (careless) which made the experimental section difficult to follow.
5. Part of report was written in 'draft' form and part in prose, which made it appear disjoint. Needed to adopt a consistent (sentences rather than notes) style throughout.
6. Relied far too heavily on contents of appendix. Needed to draw out and restate salient points in main body of report. Made reader work too hard and didn't explain where some observations came from. Needed to reproduce key figures in main body of report itself.
7. Reproduce important figures in the main body of the report. Figures given in appendices should be peripheral to the main document.
8. All tables and figures need captions.
9. More references would have been useful.
10. Needed to compare measured value of Young's modulus with theory.
11. Young's modulus per unit mass per unit cost more appropriate figure of merit for cheap, light beams with high stiffness. Your analysis is perfectly acceptable though.
12. Discussion was too brief (written almost at level of a draft report).

Needed considerably more detail and coherence. I expected better from your draft report!

David Cardwell
27/11/01

Exercise C: Energy Debate

Feedback on second set of presentations (Renewable Energy)

Overall comments

The individual presentations were of an exceptionally high standard throughout. Overall the group was extremely coherent, the structure appropriate and the degree of teamwork impressive. It was clear that everybody put considerable effort into preparing for and coordinating this presentation. The result was a polished, thorough and impressive performance that was extremely convincing. Doubtless the less than convincing presentation of the case for non-renewables gave your group a few pointers. *Even so, this was easily the best group presentation I have seen in 4 years of running the Exposition activity.*

Specific comments

The introduction was very good. The overview of the entire presentation and identification who would be doing what was invaluable to the audience. You came across as a team from the onset. The summary at the end was appropriate and drew together the main points.

Structuring the presentation in Technical, Economic and Environmental sub-sections was appropriate and effective (I suspect much was learned from the non-renewables presentation!), The result was that every appropriate renewable technology was covered at an appropriate technical level and supported throughout with sensible data.

Technical

- Suitably broad coverage of appropriate technologies and well researched.
- Comprehensive range of renewable technologies presented.
- Tended to focus almost entirely on advantages and ignored potential problems although this is a minor criticism.
- Good technical detail and good use of supporting data.
- Good coordination between presenters.

Teamwork; 9/10

Economic

- Related very well to technical presentation.
- Authoritative, well-researched and excellent use of data.

- Sensible and convincing financial comparisons made between specific renewables and non-renewables.
- Comments regarding Government intervention were spot-on!
- Presentation gave impression of hope (this usually lets down the case for renewables).
- Good coordination between presenters.

Teamwork; 9/10

Environmental

- Two very well structured and detailed presentations.
- A reasonable range environmental considerations were covered at an understandable level.
- Some overlap with technical part of presentation, which was unnecessary.
- Addressed a wide range of relevant, well-researched issues.
- Useful summary of sub-section part way through.
- Limitations of various technologies acknowledged (didn't argue case for the sake of it)

Teamwork; 9/10

As ever, feel free to e-mail me if you'd like to discuss any of the above points further.

Well done to all of you.

David Cardwell

dc135@cam

23rd November 2001