|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **COMP1649 Human Computer Interaction and Design 2023-2024 (Partnerships)** | | | | | | | | **Participant id:** | | | | | | | | **Marking criterion** | | | **Feedback** | | **Maximum marks** | **Actual marks** | | **Report** | | | | |  |  | |  | Professional writing style, English language proficiency, writing with appropriate level of detail, professional report formatting, sufficient and appropriate referencing in Harvard style of academic sources (e.g. journal papers, conference papers, academic books) throughout the report. |  | | | 5 |  | |  | A review of relevant and appropriate HCI background literature to inform the design of the product and to generate requirements. Relevant background should support the requirements of the proposed solution (e.g. related work, HCI literature in relation to the product’s context, interaction design theory, cognitive psychology etc.). |  | | | 20 |  | |  | A discussion of the product idea (conceptual design) explaining the components of the product and how the user will interact with the product, and how requirements will be met.  Also design principles (by Don Norman) and their application to the coursework product are discussed. A brief discussion for each principle/concept and suitable visual representations should be included. |  | | | 15 |  | |  | A detailed proposal for an empirical HCI research study that uses your interactive prototype to test at least one assumption that you have made when designing your prototype. In this proposal, you need to present the details for a research study including the question(s) or hypothesis that your research study attempts to investigate, who the participants of your study will be, how the study will be run, the data collection, and how you will analyse the data. You do not need to run the study but you need to create all necessary instruments and documentation that are required for a usability expert to run the study. |  | | | 20 |  | |  | A conclusion drawing together the key facts, critical reflections on the limitations of the work that has been carried out and a discussion of potential future work if the project would be developed further. The conclusion needs to go beyond repeating what has been said elsewhere and show a clear vision of what the next steps for such a project would be. |  | | | 10 |  | | **Mid-fidelity prototype** | | | | | | 0 | |  | Clear links between the coursework report and the prototype with design decisions explicitly documented and justified in the report. There is evidence of the effective and successful application of HCI theory and design principles to create a prototype that can be used to test core assumptions of your design and that is suitable for researchers and designers to test and evaluate the product. The implementation of design research, theory, and principles is evident in both the report and the prototype. |  | | | 30 |  | |  |  | | |  |  | 0 | |  | **Total** | | |  | 100 | 0 | |

**Rubric COMP1649**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Rubric COMP1649* | **0-29% Fail** | **30-39% Fail** | **40-49% Satisfactory** | **50-59% Good** | **60-69% Very Good** | **70-79% Excellent** | **80-100% Exceptional** |
| *15 points* | *0-4* | *5* | *6-7* | *8* | *9-10* | *11* | *12-15* |
| **D1 Knowledge  Demonstrating the design process and implementation of design principles** | Little to no discussion of the product idea (conceptual design) explaining the components of the product and how the user will interact with the product, and how requirements will be met. Also little to no design principles (by Don Norman) and their application to the coursework product are discussed. The report lacks a discussion for each principle/concept and little to no suitable visual representations. | A poor discussion of the product idea (conceptual design) explaining the components of the product and how the user will interact with the product, and how requirements will be met. Also a poor discussion of the design principles (by Don Norman) and their application to the coursework product. The report has a poor discussion for each principle/concept and poor suitable visual representations. | A satisfactory discussion of the product idea (conceptual design) explaining the components of the product and how the user will interact with the product, and how requirements will be met. Also a satisfactory discussion of the design principles (by Don Norman) and their application to the coursework product. The report has a satisfactory discussion for each principle/concept and satisfactory suitable visual representations. | A good discussion of the product idea (conceptual design) explaining the components of the product and how the user will interact with the product, and how requirements will be met. Also a good discussion of the design principles (by Don Norman) and their application to the coursework product. The report has a good discussion for each principle/concept and good suitable visual representations. | A very good discussion of the product idea (conceptual design) explaining the components of the product and how the user will interact with the product, and how requirements will be met. Also a very good discussion of the design principles (by Don Norman) and their application to the coursework product. The report has a very good discussion for each principle/concept and very good suitable visual representations. | An excellent discussion of the product idea (conceptual design) explaining the components of the product and how the user will interact with the product, and how requirements will be met. Also an excellent discussion of the design principles (by Don Norman) and their application to the coursework product. The report has an excellent discussion for each principle/concept and excellent suitable visual representations. | An exceptional discussion of the product idea (conceptual design) explaining the components of the product and how the user will interact with the product, and how requirements will be met. Also an exceptional discussion of the design principles (by Don Norman) and their application to the coursework product. The report has an exceptional discussion for each principle/concept and exceptional suitable visual representations. |
| *30 points* | *0-8* | *9-11* | *12-14* | *15-17* | *18-20* | *21-23* | *24-30* |
| **D1 Knowledge  Mid-fidelity Prototype** | Little to no links between the coursework report and the prototype with design decisions explicitly documented and justified in the report. Little to no evidence of the effective and successful application of HCI theory and design principles to create a prototype that can be used to test core assumptions of your design and that is suitable for researchers and designers to test and evaluate the product. Little to no demonstration of implementation of design research and theory in both the report and the prototype. | Poor links between the coursework report and the prototype with design decisions explicitly documented and justified in the report. Poor evidence of the effective and successful application of HCI theory and design principles to create a prototype that can be used to test core assumptions of your design and that is suitable for researchers and designers to test and evaluate the product. Poor demonstration of the implementation of design research and theory in both the report and the prototype. | Satisfactory links between the coursework report and the prototype with design decisions explicitly documented and justified in the report. Satisfactory evidence of the effective and successful application of HCI theory and design principles to create a prototype that can be used to test core assumptions of your design and that is suitable for researchers and designers to test and evaluate the product. Satisfactory demonstration of the implementation of design research and theory in both the report and the prototype. | Good links between the coursework report and the prototype with design decisions explicitly documented and justified in the report. Good evidence of the effective and successful application of HCI theory and design principles to create a prototype that can be used to test core assumptions of your design and that is suitable for researchers and designers to test and evaluate the product. Good demonstration of the implementation of design research and theory in both the report and the prototype. | Very good links between the coursework report and the prototype with design decisions explicitly documented and justified in the report. Very good evidence of the effective and successful application of HCI theory and design principles to create a prototype that can be used to test core assumptions of your design and that is suitable for researchers and designers to test and evaluate the product. Very good demonstration of the implementation of design research and theory in both the report and the prototype. | Excellent links between the coursework report and the prototype with design decisions explicitly documented and justified in the report. Excellent evidence of the effective and successful application of HCI theory and design principles to create a prototype that can be used to test core assumptions of your design and that is suitable for researchers and designers to test and evaluate the product. Excellent demonstration of the implementation of design research and theory in both the report and the prototype. | Exceptional links between the coursework report and the prototype with design decisions explicitly documented and justified in the report. Exceptional evidence of the effective and successful application of HCI theory and design principles to create a prototype that can be used to test core assumptions of your design and that is suitable for researchers and designers to test and evaluate the product. Exceptional demonstration of the implementation of design research and theory in both the report and the prototype. |
| *20 points* | *0-5* | *6-7* | *8-9* | *10-11* | *12-13* | *14-15* | *16-20* |
| **D1 Research  Review of relevant HCI literature** | Little to no review of relevant and appropriate HCI background literature to inform the design of the product and to generate requirements. The background literature lacks relevance and does not or very little support the requirements of a proposed solution (e.g. related work, HCI literature in relation to the product’s context, interaction design theory, cognitive psychology etc.). | Poor review of relevant and appropriate HCI background literature to inform the design of the product and to generate requirements. The background literature has poor relevance and supports the requirements of a proposed solution to a poor standard (e.g. related work, HCI li-terature in relation to the product’s context, interaction design theory, cognitive psychology etc.). | A satisfactory review of relevant and appropriate HCI background literature to inform the design of the product and to generate requirements. The background literature has relevance and supports the requirements of a proposed solution to a satisfactory standard (e.g. related work, HCI literature in relation to the product’s context, interaction design theory, cognitive psychology etc.). | A good review of relevant and appropriate HCI background literature to inform the design of the product and to generate requirements. The background literature has relevance and supports the requirements of a proposed solution to a good standard (e.g. related work, HCI literature in relation to the product’s context, interaction design theory, cognitive psychology etc.). | A very good review of relevant and appropriate HCI background literature to inform the design of the product and to generate requirements. The background literature is very relevant and supports the requirements of a proposed solution to a very good standard (e.g. related work, HCI literature in relation to the product’s context, interaction design theory, cognitive psychology etc.). | An excellent review of relevant and appropriate HCI background literature to inform the design of the product and to generate requirements. The relevance of the background literature is to an excellent level and supports the requirements of a proposed solution to an excellent standard (e.g. related work, HCI literature in relation to the product’s context, interaction design theory, cognitive psychology etc.). | An exceptional review of relevant and appropriate HCI background literature to inform the design of the product and to generate requirements. The relevance of the background literature is to an exceptional level and supports the requirements of a proposed solution to an exceptional standard (e.g. related work, HCI literature in relation to the product’s context, interaction design theory, cognitive psychology etc.). |
| *20 points* | *0-5* | *6-7* | *8-9* | *10-11* | *12-13* | *14-15* | *16-20* |
| **D2 Research   Proposal for an empirical HCI research study** | A detailed proposal for an empirical HCI research study that uses your interactive prototype to test at least one assumption that you have made when designing your prototype is absent or nearly absent. Nearly no details for a research study were presented, including the question(s) or hypothesis that your research study attempts to investigate, who the participants of your study will be, how the study will be run, the data collection, and how you will analyse the data. Little to no necessary instruments and documentation that are required for a usability expert to run the study were created. | A poor proposal for an empirical HCI research study that uses your interactive prototype to test at least one assumption that you have made when designing your prototype. A poor standard and few details for a research study were presented, including the question(s) or hypothesis that your research study attempts to investigate, who the participants of your study will be, how the study will be run, the data collection, and how you will analyse the data. The instruments and documentation that are required for a usability expert to run the study were created to a poor standard. | A satisfactory proposal for an empirical HCI research study that uses your interactive prototype to test at least one assumption that you have made when designing your prototype. A satisfactory standard and some details for a research study were presented, including the question(s) or hypothesis that your research study attempts to investigate, who the participants of your study will be, how the study will be run, the data collection, and how you will analyse the data. The instruments and documentation that are required for a usability expert to run the study were created to a satisfactory standard. | A good proposal for an empirical HCI research study that uses your interactive prototype to test at least one assumption that you have made when designing your prototype. A good standard and some good details for a research study were presented, including the question(s) or hypothesis that your research study attempts to investigate, who the participants of your study will be, how the study will be run, the data collection, and how you will analyse the data. The instruments and documentation that are required for a usability expert to run the study were created to a good standard. | A very good proposal for an empirical HCI research study that uses your interactive prototype to test at least one assumption that you have made when designing your prototype. A very good standard and some very good details for a research study were presented, including the question(s) or hypothesis that your research study attempts to investigate, who the participants of your study will be, how the study will be run, the data collection, and how you will analyse the data. The instruments and documentation that are required for a usability expert to run the study were created to a very good standard. | An excellent proposal for an empirical HCI research study that uses your interactive prototype to test at least one assumption that you have made when designing your prototype. An excellent standard and excellent details for a research study were presented, including the question(s) or hypothesis that your research study attempts to investigate, who the participants of your study will be, how the study will be run, the data collection, and how you will analyse the data. The instruments and documentation that are required for a usability expert to run the study were created to an excellent standard. | An exceptional proposal for an empirical HCI research study that uses your interactive prototype to test at least one assumption that you have made when designing your prototype. An exceptional standard and exceptional details for a research study were presented, including the question(s) or hypothesis that your research study attempts to investigate, who the participants of your study will be, how the study will be run, the data collection, and how you will analyse the data. The instruments and documentation that are required for a usability expert to run the study were created to an exceptional standard. |
| *10 points* | *0-2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8-10* |
| **D3 Evaluation / D6 Employability   Conclusion** | Little to no conclusion drawing together the key facts, little to no critical reflections on the limitations of the work that has been carried out and little to no discussion of potential future work if the project would be developed further. | A poor conclusion drawing together the key facts, poor critical reflections on the limitations of the work that has been carried out and a poor discussion of potential future work if the project would be developed further. | A satisfactory conclusion drawing together the key facts, satisfactory critical reflections on the limitations of the work that has been carried out and a satisfactory discussion of potential future work if the project would be developed further. | A good conclusion drawing together the key facts, good critical reflections on the limitations of the work that has been carried out and a good discussion of potential future work if the project would be developed further. | A very good conclusion drawing together the key facts, very good critical reflections on the limitations of the work that has been carried out and a very good discussion of potential future work if the project would be developed further. | An excellent conclusion drawing together the key facts, excellent critical reflections on the limitations of the work that has been carried out and an excellent discussion of potential future work if the project would be developed further. | An exceptional conclusion drawing together the key facts, exceptional critical reflections on the limitations of the work that has been carried out and an exceptional discussion of potential future work if the project would be developed further. |
| *5 points* | *0* | *1* | *2* | *2* | *3* | *3* | *4-5* |
| **D4 Communication / D5 Referencing   Professional writing and referencing** | A lack of demonstrating a professional writing style, little to no English language proficiency,  Unnecessarily detailed writing or too superficial,  the report lacks professional formatting, largely incorrect or no referencing in Harvard style of academic sources (e.g. journal papers, conference papers, academic books) throughout the report. | Poor demonstration of a professional writing style, poor English language proficiency, poor level of detail or too superficial writing, poor report formatting, poor referencing in Harvard style of academic sources (e.g. journal papers, conference papers, academic books) throughout the report. | a satisfactory professional writing style, satisfactory English language proficiency, satisfactory level of detail and conciseness, satisfactory report formatting, satisfactory referencing in Harvard style of academic sources (e.g. journal papers, conference papers, academic books) throughout the report. | a good professional writing style, good English language proficiency, good level of detail and conciseness, good report formatting, good referencing in Harvard style of academic sources (e.g. journal papers, conference papers, academic books) throughout the report. | a very good professional writing style, very good English language proficiency, a very good level of detail and conciseness, very good report formatting, very good referencing in Harvard style of academic sources (e.g. journal papers, conference papers, academic books) throughout the report. | excellent professional writing style, excellent English language proficiency, excellent level of detail and conciseness, excellent report formatting, excellent referencing in Harvard style of academic sources (e.g. journal papers, conference papers, academic books) throughout the report. | exceptional professional writing style, exceptional English language proficiency, exceptional level of detail and conciseness, exceptional report formatting, exceptional referencing in Harvard style of academic sources (e.g. journal papers, conference papers, academic books) throughout the report. |