

- Section 2.2.4 Quote Selection can be omitted for the final report.

Mid-Report Feedback :

Report structure:

The structure below outlines the key content of your report, as well as highlights the key aspects that we will be looking for when marking. Specifically, we will be marking the combination of:

- the report text — which outlines clearly what you had done, why, and how your understanding of the design context developed; and
- the 'paper-trail' of your design process — such as the Miro boards that evidence the specifics of the analysis and ideation that you have taken.

The purpose for this dual structure is that you do not have to write too much in such a way: the report can become a succinct summary of your methods, approach, and the reasons behind major design choices you make (such as why you would choose one problem statement over another); and the Miro board (or any other alternative) then showcases the rigour with which you engaged with the design.

Following what you were asked to do in your SGTs on a weekly basis, the key stepping stones of your group work should be as follows. The points in *italics* emphasise the marking criteria. I use 'Miro' as a reference to any sort of online platform you could have used to keep track of your design process.

For simplicity, we divide the marks below on a 100 point scale for the full group coursework for the teacher-marked part of the coursework (scaled down to the appropriate module mark percentages at the end).

- **Empathise and Define [50 points]**

- 4/5 1. your final interview guide, linked from your report [5 points] *(no need to redo)*
(do you use appropriate question framing? does your interview flow work well?)
- 4/5 2. # of interviews done [5 points] *(good code book)*
(did you do the asked-for number of interviews, considering your group size?)
- 8/10 3. the breadth and depth of the selected quotes you brought into your analysis; likely on 'Miro' [10 points]
(do you use quotes at all? are the numbers of quotes appropriate to your group size? are the quotes relevant to the topic at hand? do they cover the key themes in your interview guides?)
- 12/15 4. quality of your analysis, i.e., how you combine the quotes into codes & themes [15 points] *(We've defined the Themes by codes but not really describing what's (is it clear from the report & 'Miro' how you approached the analysis? are the selected codes / theme clusters appropriate, i.e., well defined and coherent with your data? are any tools you used (e.g., empathy maps) correctly applied?) the synthesis of this. To be specific, not really visible within Personas, Future work can be done via reiteration and expansion of Section 2.2.7).*
- 3/5 5. quality of prepared personas [5 points] *(There's nothing about how we went about doing that, so (do personas include all characteristics required? is it clear how each persona corresponds to an important sub-part of the population you observed?) how did we go through all these low level quotes / how did they combine into this particular person and why).*
- 6.5/10 6. quality of the selected problem statements [10 points] *(It's hard for the reader to understand (are these clearly emerging from your observations, themes, and other analytic techniques? Are you clearly arguing in your report why you had selected the final problem statement to take forward to ideation; this will include & rely on references to your themes and general understanding of your data.) how well this fits with the quotes, but it seems believable from the process that we're doing, a little more specific might be better, especially when comes to the later design stage.)*

2nd Check-In Feedback:

- **Ideate and prototype [40 points]**

- 8/10 1. is your ideation stage well described? [10 points]
(are you clear about what techniques you used, why, and what were some of the outcomes? how did your team select the directions to focus on? are these choices well connected to the empirical data and analysis from E&D stages?)
2. prototype specification [10 points]
(is it clear which key assumption(s) your prototype is supposed to test, and why these are crucial to addressing your problem statement? have you described how/why these were selected—drawing on your empirical data from E&D stages—and what were the alternatives you considered?)
- 14/20 3. prototype execution [20 points]
(is the prototype sufficiently complete to address your questions? does it really address the key assumptions you specified? are choices for main functionalities to do so well argued for (whether that is by referring to your E&D observations, or by design arguments) and linked to the key assumptions? is the visual / interaction design quality acceptable for the kind of assumption tested?)

- **Test [10 points]**

1. well crafted usability study protocol [5 points]
(does it specify the key assumption which is being tested? is this clearly linked to the problem statement underpinning the prototype? are the selected tasks appropriate, i.e., is it argued why they should enable testing the assumption?)
2. observations from the 2-3 participants and suggested improvements [5 points]
(is the report clear on what users had done and the common issues / challenges encountered? are the suggested improvements relevant and consistent with the data as well as the prototype design?)

• For the part that we've submitted earlier this term, even if we've updated, we need to show in the final report what we have changed, which makes it easier for the marker to go in and double check if those sections are better so they can add points for us.

→ I will do this by resetting colours within LaTeX.