

Marking Scheme for CSCU9N5 Assignment, Autumn 2017

The Marks are split at 60% for the report and 40% for the presentation itself.

The Report – 60%

1 Product description – 15%

Is a good overview of the presentation given? E.g. what is it? Who is it aimed at? User profiles/personas. How would it be delivered? Broadly: description (5), users (8) and delivery (2) here, but with flexibility to cater for really excellent answers in any of the categories.

Marks allocated here: 1-5 for inadequate description and poor product, 6-7 marks for a reasonable product described sensibly with minimal information about users or delivery, 8-10 marks for including some more user information or delivery information, 11-15 marks for excellence in product and description, including thorough consideration of users, and product delivery.

2 Design – 25%

Consistent and complete design documentation e.g. Nav Maps, storyboards, task analysis and design information. Broadly: storyboard (9), nav map (3), task analysis (6) and design decisions (7) here, but with flexibility to cater for really excellent answers in any of the categories.

Marks allocated here: 1-9 for inadequate design and documentation, 10-12 marks for a reasonable design process with poor description (or poor process, but described well), 13-14 marks for a reasonable design process described sensibly, 15-17 marks for thorough approach (but missing a small number of elements, or with a small number of elements not well grasped), 18-25 marks for excellence in consideration of design decisions, description and thorough task analysis.

3 Prototype Description – 5%

What does the prototype contain and why? An excellent answer will explain clearly how the full version differs from the prototype and justify the choices made.

4 Usability Testing – 10%

Two options here. Option 1 is that the student attends the usability testing lab, with a plan for testing, and does some tests. This gets full marks. Alternatively, turning up with no preparation and not participating well will get zero marks. Half marks for something inbetween these two options.

Option 2: the report should detail the usability tests that would be / have been employed and the suitability of those tests for this type of multimedia presentation? Roughly, 6 marks for the range of usability testing described. 4 for the testing carried out and conclusions drawn.

Marks allocated here: 1-3 for inadequate consideration of testing, 4 marks for a basic level of testing description (generic), 5 marks for a basic level of testing description (relevant to design here), 6 marks for good range of testing (relevant to design), 7-10 marks for excellence in range of testing, well described, and pertinent to design, with evidence of own testing. Note it is not necessary to carry out all testing proposed to get full marks here - but it is good to show relevance in choice.

5 Report Layout – 5%

Spelling, contents, structure of report etc

Marks allocated here: 1 for a disorganised report with poor layout and multiple errors, 2 for an attempt to organise, 3 for sensible organisation and satisfactory text, 4 for very good report, 5 for excellence.

Prototype Application – 40%

1 Multimedia Elements – 15%

Is the concept suitable to Multimedia? Does the concept work?
Do all the multimedia elements combine to produce a “good” user experience?
Can the user interact with the prototype sensibly?
Can the user find their way around easily?

Marks allocated here: 1-5 for no convincing use of multimedia; 6-7 for a minimal use of MM; 8 for a sensible, but basic use of MM; 9-10 for good use of MM that matches all of the above criteria; 11-12 for exemplary use of MM; 13-15 for having that extra “sparkle”.

2 Prototype-ness – 15%

Is the prototype of suitable breadth and depth? Is there enough content?
Are any missing elements clearly signposted?
Are differences from the final version highlighted?
Does the interactivity match the Nav map?

Marks allocated here: 1-5 for no depth or breadth and lacking content; 6 for a minimal prototype; 7-8 for an acceptable but basic prototype; 9-10 meets all requirements for a prototype; 11-12 very well thought-through prototype; 13-15 exceptional prototype that clearly demonstrates depth and breadth to the user.

3 Web technical competence – 10%

Does everything work cleanly eg. Buttons, animations?
Use of JavaScript and CSS.

Marks allocated here: 1-3 for clear deficiencies in the technical implementation; 4 basically works but with deficiencies, such as some errors in JS or poor use of CSS; 5 competent but only includes simple use of multimedia eg no animation; 6-7 definitely works well, including some technical complexity eg animations; 8-10 works seamlessly and includes everything to a high level eg sound control, complex animations.