

PART 2: HOW TASK 3B WORKS

Evaluating Feedback to Inform Future Development

This is worth 15 marks.

You must evaluate:

1. Effectiveness of assets and content
2. Whether prototype meets requirements, KPIs, UAC
3. Legal and ethical considerations
4. How it could be developed further

The mark scheme rewards:

- Comprehensive review of assets
- Thorough evaluation of functional and non-functional requirements
- Strong rationale for future iteration

STRUCTURE FOR TASK 3B

SECTION 1

Effectiveness of Assets and Content

You must discuss:

- Why assets were chosen
- Why others were rejected
- Validity and reliability of sources
- Legal issues
- Ethical issues

Structure:

1. What assets were used

Images, icons, datasets, placeholder text, APIs

2. Why they were selected

Example:

Royalty-free images were selected to avoid copyright infringement.

3. Why alternatives were rejected

Example:

AI-generated text was rejected for core content due to risk of factual inaccuracies.

4. Source validity

Was the data from:

- Government website
- Reputable organisation
- Peer-reviewed source

5. Legal considerations

- Copyright
- Licensing
- GDPR if personal data used

6. Ethical considerations

- Misleading data
- Accessibility exclusion
- Bias in datasets

SECTION 2

Evaluation Against Requirements, KPIs and UAC

This is where many lose marks.

You must clearly refer to:

- Functional requirements
- Non-functional requirements
- KPIs
- User acceptance criteria

Structure:

Functional requirements

Did it perform required calculations?

Did login work?

Did booking system function?

Support with feedback example.

Non-functional requirements

Performance

Accessibility

Security

Usability

Example:

While the system met its calculation requirement, feedback revealed that page load time exceeded 4 seconds on mobile devices, suggesting the performance requirement was only partially met.

KPIs

Examples:

- User satisfaction score
- Completion rate
- Response time

User acceptance criteria

Did users confirm it was easy to use?

Did client approve layout?

use evidence from feedback to support claims.

SECTION 3

Response to Feedback and Future Development

This must not be vague.

Weak:

The system could be improved.

Strong:

Navigation feedback indicated difficulty locating the calculator feature. In future iterations, a persistent navigation bar will be implemented to improve findability.

Show:

- What feedback said
- What it means
- What you will change
- Why that improves system

FULL MODEL – TASK 3B

Evaluating Feedback to Inform Future Development

This evaluation reflects on the effectiveness of the prototype in line with the task requirements and marking criteria .

1. Effectiveness of Assets and Content

The prototype used:

- Royalty-free images from Unsplash
- Government-published environmental datasets
- Custom icons
- Informational text written specifically for the system

The use of royalty-free images ensured compliance with copyright regulations. Image licences were checked prior to use. No copyrighted content was used without permission.

Environmental data was sourced from publicly available government statistics. This increases reliability and reduces risk of misinformation. Alternative sources such as blogs were rejected due to lower credibility.

Feedback from non-technical users indicated that some explanation text was too technical. As a result, simplified language will be introduced in future iterations.

From an ethical perspective, care was taken to avoid exaggerating environmental impact. All calculations were based on cited data to prevent misleading results.

No personal data beyond login credentials was stored. Passwords were hashed, supporting confidentiality.

Overall, the assets were appropriate, legally compliant and mostly effective, although text clarity requires improvement.

2. Evaluation Against Functional and Non-Functional Requirements

Functional Requirements

The calculator correctly processed input data and generated results in all valid test cases. Technical reviewers confirmed that calculations were accurate.

However, one issue was identified where blank input fields caused a generic error message. This partially meets the functional requirement for validation but needs refinement.

Non-Functional Requirements

Performance:

Page load time averaged 2.3 seconds on desktop but increased to 4.8 seconds on mobile. This indicates acceptable but improvable performance.

Usability:

Most users rated navigation as easy. One user struggled to locate the “History” page. This suggests minor improvements are needed for findability.

Accessibility:

The site supports responsive layout. However, colour contrast in one section did not fully meet accessibility standards.

Security:

Input validation and prepared statements were used to reduce injection risk. This was confirmed during technical review.

3. Evaluation Against KPIs and User Acceptance Criteria

KPI 1: System loads under 3 seconds

Met on desktop, not consistently met on mobile.

KPI 2: 80 percent of users rate usability as good or above

Met. 3 out of 4 non-technical users rated it good or very good.

User Acceptance Criteria:

Users must be able to complete calculation without assistance.

All users completed it successfully.

Users must understand output meaning.

One user requested clearer explanation of emission categories.

Overall, most KPIs were achieved, but performance and clarity require improvement.

4. Response to Feedback and Future Development

Based on feedback:

Navigation improvement:

Add a persistent navigation bar and clearer labels.

Performance improvement:

Optimise image sizes and implement caching.

Validation improvement:

Add field-specific error messages rather than generic alerts.

Accessibility improvement:

Increase colour contrast and add ARIA labels.

Content improvement:

Rewrite technical explanation text in simpler language.

These changes will increase usability, performance and compliance with accessibility standards.