APPENDIX 1

ROYAL AERONAUTICAL SOCIETY

Submission for N E Rowe Medal Award
Branch Judging Proforma

Branch:	Bedford		
DoB & Award Group:	DoB: 30/6/96	< 22 years old	= 22 < 30 years old
Presentation Date & Age:	Pres'n Date: 5/6/18		Age: 21
Title of Paper:	Systems Engineering for the Mars Sample Return Mission		
Entrant Names: 2nd in CAPS	Myles JOHNSON		
Judge's Names: 2nd in CAPS	Ned STOKES		
Duration of Lecture	Allocated: 20 mins	Taken: 20 mins	

ASSESSMENT Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.	SCORE
Timing – *Keeping the allotted time* Comments: Good pacing throughout	5 /5
Presentation of Case – *Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion* Comments: Very good development of the theme leading to a clear conclusion	9/10
Standard of Oral Presentation – *Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow* Comments: Excellent, clear, confident and knowledgeable	9 /10
Engagement with audience – *Eye contact, interaction, kept attention/interest* Comments:	4 /5
Standard of Visual Presentation – *Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation* Comments: Good mix of images and data	4/5
Discussion – *Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over* Comments: Very engaging and good ability to explain to a varied audience	9/10
General – *Originality, choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject* Comments: Very interesting topic presented well, the complexity was distilled very effectively	14/15
TOTAL SCORE	54 /60

Additional Comments: Excellent, very enjoyable

Judge's Name & Signature: N. STOKES

APPENDIX 1

ROYAL AERONAUTICAL SOCIETY

Submission for N E Rowe Medal Award
Branch Judging Proforma

Branch:	BEDFORD		
DoB & Award Group:	**DoB:** 30/06/1996	**< 22 years old**	**= 22 < 30 years old**
Presentation Date & Age:	**Pres'n Date:** 05/06/2018		**Age:** 21
Title of Paper:	Systems Engineering for the Mars Sample Return Mission		
Entrant Names: 2nd in CAPS	~~DANIEL DYER~~ Myles JOHNSON		
Judge's Names: 2nd in CAPS	Daniel DYER		
Duration of Lecture	**Allocated:** 30 **mins**	**Taken:** 29 **mins**	

ASSESSMENT Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.	**SCORE**
Timing – *Keeping the allotted time* Comments: Kept to time	5 /5
Presentation of Case – *Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion* Comments: Subject well established, good description of technical details well suited to audience, steps taken to establish understanding of more obscure elements some lack of clarity on definition of mission elements	9 /10
Standard of Oral Presentation – *Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow* Comments: Clear well paced delivery, audible	10 /10
Engagement with audience – *Eye contact, interaction, kept attention/interest* Comments: Good clear concised presentation, good pacing an	5 /5
Standard of Visual Presentation – *Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation* Comments: well structured visual presentation enhanced overall description	4 /5
Discussion – *Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over* Comments: Excellent clarity on responses, demonstrates broad and in depth understanding of the subject and mission	10 /10
General – *Originality, choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject* Comments: Novel subject with well explained technical content presenter demonstrates clear understanding of subject and audience was engaged	14 /15
TOTAL SCORE	57/60

Additional Comments: Excellent presentation clarity, explanation and demonstrated understanding

Judge's Name & Signature: DANIEL DYER

APPENDIX 1

ROYAL AERONAUTICAL SOCIETY

Submission for N E Rowe Medal Award
Branch Judging Proforma

Branch:	BEDFORD		
DoB & Award Group:	DoB: 30/6/96	< 22 years old	= 22 < 30 years old
Presentation Date & Age:	Pres'n Date: 5/6/18		Age: 21
Title of Paper:	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING FOR THE MARS SAMPLE RETURN MISSION		
Entrant Names: 2nd in CAPS	MYLES JOHNSON		
Judge's Names: 2nd in CAPS	NATHAN ARNDT		
Duration of Lecture	**Allocated:** 30 mins	**Taken:** 29 +10(Q&A) mins	

ASSESSMENT Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.	**SCORE**
Timing – *Keeping the allotted time* Comments: Very good time keeping	5 /5
Presentation of Case – *Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion* Comments: Good intro to topic + project before going into the detail Good detail, conclusion a little short	9 /10
Standard of Oral Presentation – *Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow* Comments: Well spoken, enthusiastic very good speaker (could have paused a little more - slightly slower)	9 /10
Engagement with audience – *Eye contact, interaction, kept attention/interest* Comments: Good eye contact, good speaker and kept audience interested	4 /5
Standard of Visual Presentation – *Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation* Comments: Good use of images to help convey topic, none cluttered slides	5 /5
Discussion – *Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over* Comments: Good understanding of topic allowed for well delivered response to questions	9 /10
General – *Originality, choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject* Comments: • Interesting, relevant topic • Knowledgable and able to pitch at a good level • Technical detail covered (slightly above so not very technical)	13 /15
TOTAL SCORE	54 /60

Additional Comments: Generally a very interesting topic well presented
Lots of audience interest and therefore questions that explored the topic further.

Judge's Name & Signature: NATHAN ARNDT

APPENDIX 1

ROYAL AERONAUTICAL SOCIETY

Submission for N E Rowe Medal Award
Branch Judging Proforma

Branch:	BEDFORD		
DoB & Award Group:	**DoB:** 30/06/1996	(< 22 years old)	= 22 < 30 years old
Presentation Date & Age:	**Pres'n Date:** 5/6/18	**Age:** 21	
Title of Paper:	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING FOR THE MARS SAMPLE RETURN MISSION		
Entrant Names: 2nd in CAPS	MYLES JOHNSON		
Judge's Names: 2nd in CAPS	NICOLA BARRATT		
Duration of Lecture	**Allocated:** 30 mins	**Taken:** 29 mins	

ASSESSMENT Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.	**SCORE**
Timing – *Keeping the allotted time* Comments:	5 /5
Presentation of Case – *Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion* Comments: Good intro, very ~~bit~~ enthusiastic and knowledgable about the topic. Conclusion was a bit abrupt	8 /10
Standard of Oral Presentation – *Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow* Comments: well spoken, clear, good tonal variation & speed.	9 /10
Engagement with audience – *Eye contact, interaction, kept attention/interest* Comments: Very good, interesting to listen to, kept audience attentive	4 /5
Standard of Visual Presentation – *Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation* Comments: Good relevant imagery, key words and points	5 /5
Discussion – *Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over* Comments: Clear concise answers, good knowledge around the topics + good background.	8 /10
General – *Originality, choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject* Comments: Unique aspect of Mars Missions, cutting edge tech, good understanding of Mission objectives and development schedules of technology.	13 /15
TOTAL SCORE	52 /60

Additional Comments: Good Interesting presentation, well delivered

Judge's Name & Signature: N. Barratt

6:35 - 7004

APPENDIX 1

ROYAL AERONAUTICAL SOCIETY

Submission for N E Rowe Medal Award
Branch Judging Proforma

Branch:	BEDFORD		
DoB & Award Group:	DoB: 30/6/96	< 22 years old	= 22 < 30 years old
Presentation Date & Age:	Pres'n Date: 5/6/2018	Age:	
Title of Paper:	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING FOR THE MARS SAMPLE RETURN MISSION		
Entrant Names: 2nd in CAPS	MYLES JOHNSON		
Judge's Names: 2nd in CAPS			
Duration of Lecture	Allocated: 30 mins	Taken: 29 mins	

ASSESSMENT Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.	SCORE
Timing – *Keeping the allotted time* Comments: Good but a little rushed to keep to time.	4/5
Presentation of Case – *Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion* Comments: Very good clear presentation from introduction to conclusion	9/10
Standard of Oral Presentation – *Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow* Comments: Clearly presented but a little rushed; logically thought out.	9/10
Engagement with audience – *Eye contact, interaction, kept attention/interest* Comments: Good eye contact and captured audience	5/5
Standard of Visual Presentation – *Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation* Comments: Very good clear visual presentation.	5/5
Discussion – *Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over* Comments: Competent and able to add extra information in response to questions.	9/10
General – *Originality, choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject* Comments: Good knowledge of subject and technical issues to be faced. Interesting future project	14/15
TOTAL SCORE	55/60

Additional Comments:
Myles was confident and knowledgable in his subject material

Judge's Name & Signature: MARYLYN E. WOOD M E Wood

APPENDIX 1

ROYAL AERONAUTICAL SOCIETY

Submission for N E Rowe Medal Award
Branch Judging Proforma

Branch:	BEDFORD BRANCH		
DoB & Award Group:	**DoB:** 30 JUN 96	**< 22 years old**	**= 22 < 30 years old**
Presentation Date & Age:	**Pres'n Date:** 05 JUN 18	**Age:** 21	
Title of Paper:	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING FOR THE MARS SAMPLE RETURN MISSION		
Entrant Names: 2nd in CAPS	Myles JOHNSON		
Judge's Names: 2nd in CAPS	Bernard CHAN		
Duration of Lecture	**Allocated:** 30 **mins**	**Taken:** 28 **mins**	

ASSESSMENT Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.	**SCORE**
Timing – *Keeping the allotted time* Comments: THIS DOES NOT INCLUDE THE 15 MIN FOR QUESTIONS	5 /5
Presentation of Case – *Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion* Comments: THE STRUCTURE & FLOW WERE WELL CONCEIVED & EXECUTED	9 /10
Standard of Oral Presentation – *Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow* Comments: A LEVEL OF CERTAINTY & CONFIDENCE WELL ABOVE EXPECTATION	9 /10
Engagement with audience – *Eye contact, interaction, kept attention/interest* Comments: CONSCRIPTED AND ALLOWED CONTINUOUS INTERACTION	5 /5
Standard of Visual Presentation – *Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation* Comments: MATERIAL CHOSEN WAS CLEAR & RELEVANT	5 /5
Discussion – *Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over* Comments: SIGNIFICANT AND CHALLENGING QUESTION SESSION. COMPLETED WITH EASE.	10 /10
General – *Originality, choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject* Comments: A VERY IMPRESSIVE PRESENTATION - A STANDARD FAR ABOVE THAT EXPECTED FOR THE AGE GROUP.	15 /15
TOTAL SCORE	58 /60

Additional Comments:

THIS IS WORTH PRESENTING TO A WIDER AUDIENCE.

Judge's Name & Signature: BERNARD CHAN

APPENDIX 1

ROYAL AERONAUTICAL SOCIETY

Submission for N E Rowe Medal Award
Branch Judging Proforma

Branch:	BEDFORD		
DoB & Award Group:	DoB: 30/6/1996	< 22 years old	= 22 < 30 years old
Presentation Date & Age:	Pres'n Date: 5/6/18		Age:
Title of Paper:	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING FOR THE MARS SAMPLE RETURN MISSION		
Entrant Names: 2nd in CAPS	MYLES JOHNSON		
Judge's Names: 2nd in CAPS	CAROLINE BETTS		
Duration of Lecture	Allocated: 30 mins	Taken: 29 mins	

ASSESSMENT Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.	SCORE
Timing – *Keeping the allotted time* Comments: Five + additional two for questions.	5 /5
Presentation of Case – *Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion* Comments: Good description of different aspects but would have benefited from a 'tell them what you're going to tell them, tell them, remind them what you've told them'!	8 /10
Standard of Oral Presentation – *Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow* Comments: Clear delivery + diction. Could be heard from the back of the room. Suitable pace.	8 /10
Engagement with audience – *Eye contact, interaction, kept attention/interest* Comments: Directed to audience + not screen.	3 /5
Standard of Visual Presentation – *Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation* Comments: Excellent – no formulae! Good use of photographs + diagrams	5 /5
Discussion – *Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over* Comments: Referred back to relevant slide to help explain his answer. Coped well with a variety of questions	8 /10
General – *Originality, choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject* Comments: This was not a topic I knew much about beforehand & am much wiser as a result! Showed good all round knowledge of topic area + current developments.	12/15
TOTAL SCORE	49 /60

Additional Comments: Well delivered & thorough presentation. Nice command of presentation of case. Overall, well done.

Judge's Name & Signature: CAROLINE BETTS FRAeS 5/6/18

APPENDIX 1

ROYAL AERONAUTICAL SOCIETY

Submission for N E Rowe Medal Award
Branch Judging Proforma

Branch:	Bedford ✓		
DoB & Award Group:	**DoB:** 30/6/96	**< 22 years old**	**= 22 < 30 years old**
Presentation Date & Age:	**Pres'n Date:** 5/6/18		**Age:** 21
Title of Paper:	Systems Engineering for the Mars Sample Return Mission		
Entrant Names: 2nd in CAPS	Myles JOHNSON		
Judge's Names: 2nd in CAPS	Peter CURTIS		
Duration of Lecture	**Allocated:** 30 **mins**	**Taken:** 29 **mins**	

ASSESSMENT Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.	**SCORE**
Timing – *Keeping the allotted time* Comments: Spot on.	5 /5
Presentation of Case – *Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion* Comments:	8 /10
Standard of Oral Presentation – *Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow* Comments: Very impressive for one so young.	10 /10
Engagement with audience – *Eye contact, interaction, kept attention/interest* Comments:	5 /5
Standard of Visual Presentation – *Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation* Comments:	4 /5
Discussion – *Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over* Comments:	9 /10
General – *Originality, choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject* Comments: Clearly understood his topic - good organisation	13 /15
TOTAL SCORE	54 /60
Additional Comments: **Judge's Name & Signature:** Peter Curtis P. Curtis	