

Example 5: Newton–Raphson

General guidance

[How to use this teacher support material](#)
[Teacher responsibilities](#)
[Skills and strategies required by students](#)
[Developing the exploration](#)
[Use of technology](#)
[Planning](#)
[Authenticity](#)
[Assessment criteria](#)
[Record keeping](#)

Assessed student work

[Overview](#)
[Examples of explorations](#)
[Example 1](#)
[Example 2](#)
[Example 3](#)
[Example 4](#)
[Example 5](#)
[Example 6](#)
[Example 7](#)
[Example 8](#)
[Example 9](#)
[Example 10](#)
[Example 11](#)
[Example 12](#)
[Example 13](#)
[Example 14](#)
[Example 15](#)
[Example 16](#)
[Example 17](#)
[Example 18](#)
[Example 19](#)
[Example 20](#)
[Example 21](#)
[Frequently asked questions](#)

Assessment

Criterion	A	B	C	D	E (SL)	E (HL)	Total (SL)	Total (HL)
Achievement level awarded	2	2	2	1	4	2	11	9
Maximum possible achievement level	4	3	4	3	6	6	20	20



[Student work \(PDF\)](#)



[Annotated student work \(PDF\)](#)



[Comments](#)

Comments

Criterion A: Communication

A2—There is an aim and a rationale in an introduction, but there is a lack of explanations throughout. For example, on page 4, where do the numbers in the table come from? The diagrams do not aid the explanations very much.

Criterion B: Mathematical presentation

B2—There is inconsistent use of terminology, for example, “root or zero” on page 7. There is some appropriate use of ICT tools.

Criterion C: Personal engagement

C2—The student does apply some unfamiliar mathematics, and some research has taken place. Some examples were created, but not followed through.

Criterion D: Reflection

D1—There is very limited and superficial reflection. Opportunities for reflection were not taken.

SL Criterion E: Use of mathematics

E4—The mathematics used is mostly correct. The student can apply the method, but there is no evidence of understanding why it works.

HL Criterion E: Use of mathematics

E2—There is partial, rather than good, understanding.



