Some Comments on the Reports

1. A peer evaluation will be handed out with each report. This will help the instructor to evaluate the contribution of individual students to the group effort.

2. Oral reports will be presented approximately every two weeks, once the design work has begun. The intent of the oral-report meetings is to simulate interim design-review sessions that would be held in the workplace, in industry or government. Your instructors will act as your supervisors or reviewers. The focus of such reviews is on understanding the progress made, the work remaining, and on early identification of any problems. Be forthright about any difficulties you are having, so your reviewers are not forced to ferret them out by asking numerous questions. Problems are best handled following early identification and open acknowledgement. A good reviewer must ask lots of questions to make sure they understand the key issues and problems, so problems are identified in time to find solutions, and so the design does not go forward with hidden flaws. While the reviewer should work hard to be polite and friendly, the presenters should work hard to be open in the acknowledgement of limitations, errors, and flaws (which are always present).

3. The Methods report should be much more than a listing of your code. As with any report, it should include an abstract, introduction, list of methods (assumptions, physical basis, equations, etc.), the results, and a summary or some conclusions. In this design course, you are not expected to derive new analysis methods, but you are expected to use existing methods in a well-founded way that you are able to document. The equations embodied in your code should be referenced back to your report, and the equations in your report should be referenced back to an authoritative source. An overview of the code should be included, along with results for a sample case. If you have any questions contact one of your instructors.