STEP-BY-STEP STRUCTURE FOR 3A

1. State your feedback aim

Start simple.

Example structure:

The aim of this feedback phase was to evaluate usability, functionality, performance and overall user satisfaction of the prototype before further iteration.

2. Identify your audiences

You must include:

- Technical audience
- non-technical audience

Technical audience examples:

- Developers
- IT staff
- Computing students

Non-technical audience examples:

- Client
- End users
- Staff members

Explain why each group matters.

Technical users test:

- Code structure
- Logic
- Efficiency
- Data handling

Non-technical users test:

- Usability
- Navigation
- Clarity
- Accessibility

3. Create appropriate materials

According to the mark scheme, strong responses include:

- Screencasts
- Questionnaires
- Observation records
- Code reviews

you do not just say what you used.
You explain why that method was appropriate.

Example:

A screencast was created for the non-technical audience so they could see the workflow without needing technical explanations.

A paired code review was conducted with a computing student to assess database queries and validation logic.

4. Produce a Feedback Plan

Your plan should include:

- Who you will collect feedback from
- When

- What tool you will use
- What you are evaluating

Example structure:

Audience: Non-technical users
Method: Online questionnaire
Focus: Navigation clarity, readability, overall satisfaction
Reason: Allows structured and comparable responses

Audience: Technical reviewer
Method: Code walkthrough
Focus: Efficiency, error handling, database interaction
Reason: Allows deeper technical critique

5. Record Feedback Clearly

You must record feedback in a way that can be analysed

Good formats:

- Table with question and response
- Themed summary
- Categorised feedback list

Stronger answers group feedback into themes:

Theme 1: Navigation
Theme 2: Functionality
Theme 3: Performance
Theme 4: Accessibility

This makes 3B much easier.

Good. I am going to give you:

1. A full model Task 3A example
2. Example questionnaires for technical and non-technical audiences
3. A full model Task 3B evaluation

It will follow the 2025 briefs for Part A and Part B and align with the mark scheme expectations .

I will assume a realistic prototype example:
A web-based carbon footprint calculator with user accounts and data storage.

You can adapt this to any scenario.

FULL MODEL – TASK 3A
Gathering Feedback to Inform Future Development

1. Aim of the Feedback Phase

The aim of this feedback phase was to evaluate the usability, functionality, technical structure and overall effectiveness of the carbon footprint calculator prototype. The feedback gathered will be used to identify areas for improvement before the next development iteration.

The focus areas were:

- Accuracy of calculations
- Usability and navigation
- Performance and responsiveness
- Code structure and validation
- Accessibility

2. Identification of Audiences

Two types of audiences were selected in line with the task brief .

Technical audience:
- One computing student
- One web development tutor

Purpose:
To review database structure, validation logic, API usage and overall efficiency.

Non-technical audience:
- Three potential end users
- One staff member acting as client

Purpose:
To review clarity of instructions, ease of navigation, understanding of outputs and overall user experience.

3. Materials Produced

To gather effective feedback, different tools were prepared for each audience, as suggested in the marking guidance .

For the technical audience:

- Live code walkthrough session
- Structured technical questionnaire
- Access to database schema diagram
- Observation notes template

For the non-technical audience:

- Short screencast demonstrating key features
- Online questionnaire

- Task-based usability testing sheet
- Observation record form

4. Feedback Plan

Audience: Technical
Method: Code walkthrough and questionnaire
Focus areas:

- Input validation
- Error handling
- Database relationships
- Query efficiency

Reason:
Technical users can identify logic errors and structural inefficiencies that non-technical users may not notice.

Audience: Non-technical
Method: Screencast + guided task completion + questionnaire
Focus areas:

- Ease of navigation
- Clarity of language
- Understanding of results
- Mobile responsiveness

Reason:
End users are best placed to judge usability and clarity of information.

5. Recording Feedback

Feedback was recorded in:

• A structured spreadsheet
• Themed summary categories:

- Navigation
- Functionality
- Performance
- Accessibility
- Content clarity

This allowed patterns to be identified rather than relying on isolated comments.

QUESTIONNAIRE EXAMPLES - MICROSOFT FORMS ADVISED

NON-TECHNICAL USER QUESTIONNAIRE

Section 1: General Usability

1. How easy was it to navigate the website?
   Very easy / Easy / Neutral / Difficult / Very difficult
2. Were the instructions clear and understandable?
   Yes / Mostly / No
3. Did you understand how your carbon footprint result was calculated?
   Yes / Partially / No

4. Did you encounter any errors or confusion?
   If yes, please describe.
5. How visually appealing is the design?
   Very good / Good / Average / Poor
6. Was the text readable and appropriately sized?
   Yes / No
7. How quickly did the calculator load?
   Very fast / Fast / Acceptable / Slow
8. Would you use this system again?
   Yes / No / Maybe
9. What improvements would you suggest?

TECHNICAL AUDIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Section 1: Code and Structure

1. Is the code modular and logically structured?
   Yes / Partially / No
2. Is input validation implemented effectively?
   Fully / Mostly / Poorly
3. Are error messages informative and user-friendly?
   Yes / Partially / No
4. Is the database structure normalised and efficient?
   Yes / Partially / No
5. Are there any security concerns, for example SQL injection risks?

Yes / No
If yes, explain.

6. Are queries and API calls optimised?
   Yes / Partially / No

7. Does the system follow good naming conventions and indentation?
   Yes / Partially / No

8. What technical improvements would you recommend?