PADMA ROBOTICS PROGRAMME — EVIDENCE PACK

The folder a moderator opens first · Awaken Innovation Lab

---

1. What this pack is for

A certificate is a claim. An evidence pack is what makes the claim survivable.

Three people will open this folder:

WHO	WHY	WHAT THEY LOOK AT
The teacher	To decide a term grade	Everything, weekly
A parent	To see what their child actually did	Video, service card, notebook
A moderator — partner school, university, or awarding body	To check the claim is true	A sample of 3–6 students, 20 minutes

Most centres build evidence packs *after* the showcase, which means they build them from memory. This document exists so you build them **as you go**, one page per week, and the pack assembles itself.

> **The rule.** If an artefact is not in the folder on the day it was made, it will not be in the folder in July. Collect weekly or not at all.

---

2. Folder anatomy

Physical: one A4 ring-binder per student, plus one class folder for teacher-held material.

```
📁 CLASS FOLDER (teacher)
   ├── 00_Register            attendance + certificate serials
   ├── 01_FourStateTables     one per team, hand-written, Term 2 W3
   ├── 02_TrimLog             per robot, values over time
   ├── 03_FaultCards          the deck used in Term 3 W9
   └── 04_ModerationSample    what the moderator will see
```

```
📁 STUDENT FOLDER (one per student)
   ├── 00_CoverSheet          the index in §4
   ├── 01_Notebook            three terms, one page per week
   ├── 02_BugLog              Term 1 W9, six rows
   ├── 03_DecisionTable       Term 2 W3, hand-filled
   ├── 04_TestTable           Term 2 W10, with boundaries
   ├── 05_DriftTable          Term 3 W2
   ├── 06_FaultLog            Term 3 W9, five faults
   ├── 07_ServiceCard         Term 3 W10, laminated copy + paper copy
   ├── 08_Video               90 seconds, on the class SD card, indexed here
   ├── 09_Flowchart           Term 1 W2, hand-drawn, on the worksheet
   └── 10_FaultsList          Term 3 W9, screenshot of the `faults` list on stage
```

Digital: mirror the structure exactly. One folder per student, named `SURNAME_Firstname`. No exceptions — a moderator who cannot find a student's folder in ten seconds will assume it does not exist.

---

3. Evidence items — what each one proves

Eleven items. Each maps to a descriptor in the Curriculum Map. Nothing here is decorative; if you cannot name what an item proves, do not keep it.

#	ITEM	FROM	PROVES	WHAT "GOOD" LOOKS LIKE
1	Engineering notebook	All terms	PD7, CM1	Weekly entries in the student's own hand, including failures
2	Bug log, six rows	T1 W9	PD7	A prediction column filled in *before* the run
3	Decision table **and gate truth table**	T2 W1–3	PD4, CT2	Hand-drawn; four-row gate table complete; all decision rows; one row corrected and initialled
4	**Four-state table**	**T2 W3**	**PD4, CT6**	**Hand-written, four rows, both wheel values**
5	Test table	T2 W10	PD7, CT5	At least four boundary rows, expected results written first
6	Drift table	T3 W2	DS4	Five runs, one value changed per run, a written cause
7	Fault log **and** `faults` **list**	T3 W9	DS6, **PD9**	Five faults, each categorised before it was fixed; the list shown on stage
8	Service card	T3 W10	PD8, CM3	A stranger could restart the robot from it
9	Course video	T3 W10	PD5, DS5	90 seconds, unedited, one continuous run

#	ITEM	FROM	PROVES	WHAT "GOOD" LOOKS LIKE
10	**Flowchart of the square**	**T1 W2**	**CF1**	**Five shapes, standard symbols, drawn before the program**
11	**Four-state flowchart**	**T2 W3**	**CF2, CF3**	**Three diamonds, YES/NO exits, back-arrow to start**

The item that matters most

If a moderator reads only one thing, it is **item 4**.

It is the only artefact in the pack that proves a student reasoned about a machine before it existed, and then watched that reasoning become behaviour two months later. Everything else could be produced by following instructions; that table could not.

Keep the original. A photocopy loses the corrections, and the corrections are the evidence.

---

4. Cover sheet — one per student

Print this page, fill it by hand, and put it at the front of the folder. It is the difference between a moderator spending ten minutes and spending two.

Student	_____
Centre	_____
Certificate number	PA-_____-_____
Terms completed	☐ 1 Signals ☐ 2 Rules ☐ 3 Autonomy
Robots driven	____ sessions (target: 4)
Course completed	____ / 10 runs (target: 8)

Evidence present

ITEM	PRESENT	NOTE
1 Notebook, three terms	☐	
2 Bug log	☐	
3 Decision table and gate truth table	☐	
4 **Four-state table**	☐	

ITEM	PRESENT	NOTE
5 Test table	☐	
6 Drift table	☐	
7 Fault log	☐	
8 Service card	☐	
9 Course video	☐	
10 **Flowchart of the square**	☐	T1 W2 · CF1
11 **Four-state flowchart**	☐	T2 W3 · CF2/CF3

Teacher's summary — three sentences, no more

1. The strongest thing this student did was _____
2. The thing they are still developing is _____
3. If I had to defend one piece of work in this folder, it would be _____

---

5. Moderation protocol

If you never intend to be moderated, skip this section. If you might — do it anyway, once a year, internally. It is the cheapest quality control available.

Sampling

- **10% of the cohort, minimum three students**, chosen at random, not by the teacher.
- Include one **borderline** student — a middle-grade case is more informative than a star.
- The moderator sees the whole folder, not a selection.

Two markers

Two teachers independently mark the same three folders against the Curriculum Map descriptors. Then compare.

AGREEMENT	ACTION
Within one level on every descriptor	Accept the marks
Two levels apart on any descriptor	Re-read the descriptor **statement**, not the student
Persistent disagreement	The descriptor is ambiguous — rewrite it for next year

Do not average disagreements. An average hides the ambiguity that caused the problem, and the same argument returns next term.

The defence test

For each sampled student, ask the teacher one question:

> *"Point at the work in this folder that proves this student can do PD4."*

If the teacher cannot point, the mark is not evidenced. That is not a failing of the student — it is a gap in the pack, and it is fixable in September.

---

6. The twenty-minute walkthrough

What a moderator actually does, in order. Build the pack so this works.

MIN	LOOK AT	LOOKING FOR
0–2	Cover sheet	Is the pack complete and honest? Are gaps admitted?
2–5	**Four-state table**	Hand-written? Four rows? Wheel values, not just words?
5–8	Course video	Does the robot finish? Is it one continuous take?
8–11	Fault log	Were faults categorised *before* being fixed?
11–14	Test table	Are there boundary rows, or only easy cases?
14–17	Service card	Could a stranger use it?
17–20	Notebook	Continuous, weekly, in the student's hand?

A moderator who cannot complete this in twenty minutes will mark the centre down for administration, not for teaching. That is the most common reason good programmes fail inspection.

---

7. Retention, privacy, and what not to keep

Keep

- Everything in §3, for **five years** after the student leaves
- The certificate register (serial numbers, names, dates)

- One copy of each transcript

Do not keep

- Photographs of identifiable children without written consent
- Full-length lesson recordings
- Anything from a device that leaves the centre

Video rules

The 90-second course video is the highest-risk item in the pack. Three rules:

1. **Frame the robot, not the child.** A closed shot of the mat with hands at the edge is ideal.
2. **One video per team**, not per student. Eleven items, one video.
3. **Consent form on file** before the video is taken, not after.

If a parent withdraws consent, delete the video and note on the cover sheet that it was removed by request. Do not leave a gap that looks like an omission.

---

8. Common moderation failures

FAILURE	WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE	FIX
The curated folder	Every item perfect, nothing crossed out	Keep the failures — corrections are the evidence
The teacher's handwriting	Notes in an adult hand labelled "student work"	Students write, teachers initial
The missing middle	Star students have folders, the rest do not	Same eleven items for everyone, or the claim is not for everyone
The retrospective pack	Assembled in July from memory	Collect weekly
The undated item	No date on the notebook page	One date per page, every page
The photocopy	Table reproduced, corrections lost	Originals only

---

9. Assembly checklist — run this at the end of each term

End of Term 1

- [ ] Notebooks collected, 10 pages initialled

- [ ] Bug logs filed
- [ ] One team photo or video of the remote-control robot session
- [ ] Exit tickets sorted; the "confused" pile noted for Term 2

End of Term 2

- [ ] **Four-state tables collected and filed in the class folder** — this is the Term 3 lesson
- [ ] Decision tables and test tables filed
- [ ] Trim values recorded per robot
- [ ] Notebooks collected, 20 pages initialled

End of Term 3

- [ ] Eleven-item folders assembled and checked against cover sheets
- [ ] Videos taken, consent on file, indexed on the cover sheet
- [ ] Service cards laminated, paper copy filed
- [ ] Register closed, serials issued
- [ ] Moderation sample of three drawn at random

---

10. One page for the head of school

If nobody reads anything else in this pack, they read this.

> **What we hold, why we hold it, and what it lets us say.**
>
> Every student leaves with a folder containing eleven pieces of work produced during the course. Together they show what the student built, how they tested it, and what they did when it broke.
>
> That folder is what allows us to issue a certificate that says "evidenced competence at the standard expected of an 11–14 computing curriculum" — and to mean it.
>
> Without the folder, the certificate is a poster. With it, the certificate is a record.
