

Evaluation and Iteration

40 minutes

Coursework Project Preparation

Outcome 3.6

Outcome 3.5

Outcome 3.7

Outcome 3.8

Outcome 3.9

Outcome 1.9

Outcome 2.4

WHAT THIS LESSON DOES

Please note: this module follows the 2026 project brief, whose theme was forests. The State Examinations Commission publishes a new brief each year, with its own theme and its own dates. These lessons will be updated once this year's brief is published. Check the current brief on the SEC website before you begin. In this lesson, you will evaluate your final artefact against the project brief, reflecting on its strengths, weaknesses, and effectiveness for forest management. Suggest and justify two to three improvements, then write a 300-word evaluation section. Add it to your report website and update the word count to stay under 2500 words.

CURRICULUM OUTCOMES

Outcome	What the specification asks for
3.6	represent data to effectively communicate in a graphical form
3.5	structure and transform raw data to prepare it for analysis
3.7	use algorithms to analyse and interpret data in a way that informs decision-making
3.8	develop a model that will allow different scenarios to be tested
3.9	analyse and interpret the outcome of simulations both before and after modifications have been made
1.9	use modelling and simulation in relevant situations
2.4	illustrate examples of abstract models

WHAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO

- Evaluate the final artefact against the project's brief requirements using evidence from testing.
- Identify strengths and limitations of the artefact in relation to its intended forest theme.
- Suggest justified improvements or future iterations to enhance the artefact's effectiveness.
- Reflect on the development process, including what worked well and areas for improvement.
- Integrate the evaluation section into the project report while maintaining word count limits.

BEFORE THE LESSON

- Have the official brief open at page 10 so you can point to the exact evaluation wording and the 5-plus-5 mark split.
- Confirm students can open and edit their own index.html report file and that their earlier Testing section is present to draw evidence from.
- Remind students where their running word count table lives so they can update it.

Evaluation and Iteration

HOW THE LESSON RUNS

Objectives

What the Brief Requires for Evaluation

Evaluating Your Final Artefact

Suggesting Improvements with Justification

Writing the Full Evaluation Section

Add to Your Report and Check Word Count

Checklist Before Final Lesson

TEACHING MOVES

- 2. What the Brief Requires for Evaluation. Stress that 5 of the 10 marks are for suggestions with justification, so an evaluation that only lists strengths and weaknesses caps at half marks. Read the brief wording aloud.
- 3. Evaluating Your Final Artefact. Insist every strength and weakness claim points back to a specific test result or figure. Vague praise like 'it works well' scores nothing. Have them quote their own Testing section.
- 4. Suggesting Improvements with Justification. Each improvement must answer 'why', linked to a named limitation. Reject 'add more features'. The worked examples show the pattern: change plus consequence plus the problem it fixes.
- 5. Writing the Full Evaluation Section. Give them the skeleton to fill, not to copy verbatim. Warn that identical phrasing across the class flags in moderation. Screenshots only if word count allows, and always labelled.
- 6. Add to Your Report and Check Word Count. Have them recount the full report now, not at the end. Confirm code snippets and tables are excluded from the 2500 limit as the brief states.

WHAT TO WATCH FOR

- Students think listing what the artefact does well and badly is the whole evaluation, and skip the improvements or add them without reasons. Show the mark split explicitly: half the marks are for justified suggestions. Ask each student to read out one improvement and its 'because'; if the because is missing, it does not count.
- Students make claims about strengths and effectiveness with no evidence, treating evaluation as opinion. Require every claim to cite a test result or research point already in their report. Have them highlight each sentence that has no evidence and fix or delete it.

DIFFERENTIATION

- Emerging: Give the sentence skeleton from step 5 and have them fill one blank at a time, starting from a single test result they are confident about. Let them speak their evaluation aloud to you first, then write down what they just said.
- Developing: Prompt them to distinguish basic from advanced requirements explicitly, so their evaluation shows they understood the brief's tiers.
- Proficient: Push them to connect each improvement to a Higher Level idea such as machine learning or adaptive feedback, with a justification that names the specific limitation it addresses. Ask them to weigh trade-offs, for example cost or power against accuracy, rather than listing improvements as all upside.