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|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome | 4.5-5 | 3.5-4 | 3 | 2-2.5 | 0-1.5 |
| Content is  complete,  accurate, and  well organized. | Definitely  demonstrates  all of these | One of these  factors may be  missing, such  as being well  organized | Two of these factors are partly missing, such as being too short and some inaccuracies | Only one of these factors can actually be considered well done | Paper does  not  demonstrate  any of these  factors at a  university level |
| The Abstract is clear and summarizes the paper within the max. word count. The keywords are relevant. | Demonstrates all of these. | One of these factors may be missing (e.g., keywords are descriptive) | Two of these factors are partly missing, such as missing key point and being too long. | Only one of these factors is actually met. | The abstract is missing or doesn't demonstrate any of these factors. |
| The *Introduction* is clear. It sets the reader up for the paper and topic: explains the purpose of the project, gives a summary of the process, and outlines what will be contained in the paper. | The introduction is complete and easy to follow. | The introduction is clear but may be missing one of these elements or more details is needed. | The introduction is easy to follow but is missing some elements. | The introduction is superficial and needs to set up the paper better. | The introduction is missing/not understandable. |
| The *Background* is well written and organized and uses relevant academic papers that discuss the technical challenges, and potential solution of the topics. | This part is complete, well written and organized, and all papers are relevant. | This part is relatively complete (e.g., maybe missing an obvious challenge) and the most the papers are relevant. | This part is organized but one or two of the papers don’t seem to be relevant or are not academic. | This part needs work. The summary of the challenges and solutions is not explored enough and is lacking in strong and relevant academic papers. | This part is hard to follow, incomplete and lacks academic papers. |
| *The Problem Statement* and *Approach* is complete. It clearly outlines the problem that you are examining and why it is important. It describes how you examined this problem and the main *research questions* that you are hoping to answer through the entire process | All of these topics are explained and the sub-sections are well organized. | All of these sub-sections are at least mentioned, if not thoroughly explored (or, most are fully explored but one may be missing). | The topics may not all fully explained but it is organized in a reasonable fashion. | The paper tendsto focus ononly part ofthese topicsbut it what is presented is well organized. | The paper does not include any or just one of the required topics (sub-sections), none are well explored or well explained. |
| The Context Inquiry process (methodology) is complete and well done. It outlines the research questions for this study, the tasks, the participants, the process, and the tools used, etc.). | The methodology is complete and well explained. | The methodology is complete but parts need better explanation. | The methodology is missing one or two main components (e.g., the study process, justification of study type) | The methodology is missing key elements that makes the process unclear. This section shows a limited understanding of how the study was run or why. | The methodology is missing or so incomplete, it is hard to figure out what was done. |
| *Results and Discussion of the Context inquiry* is well-described, related to the purpose, is complete, the data analysis has relevant visual figures, and it has well-structured. It has guidelines and suggestions for the low-fidelity prototype | All these areas are complete and done at an excellent level. | The analysis section includes a partial description of the process, is mostly complete, relates to the purpose, and includes some guidelines and suggestions. The analysis has some good visual figures. | The analysis process is briefly outlined, shows some understanding of the data, and has some brief guidelines and suggestions. The analysis has few figures. | The analysis shows limited understanding of the data, and only has a few brief guidelines and suggestions that are not backed by the analysis. Few or no relevant images in the analysis. | The analysis shows limited understanding and does not demonstrate an understanding of the data. There are no figures related to the data analysis. The guidelines and suggestions made need to be reworked or are non-existent |
| Study 2 *Prototype Description* is complete, relates to the guidelines of outlines in the results of the contextual inquiry and is well described with relevant screenshots/ images. | This is complete and well explained and relevant to the guidelines. | The prototype description is mostly complete, and most features relate to the guidelines with some screenshots/images. | The prototype description is brief and only partly shows how the features relate to the guidelines with few or reasonable screenshots/images. | The prototype description is very brief and does not relate how the features match the guidelines. There are few or no screenshots/images. | The prototype description is too brief or non-existent and does not relate how the features match the guidelines. There are no screenshots/images. |
| Cognitive Walkthrough *Methodology* is complete and well done. It outlines the research questions for this evaluation, the scenarios and tasks, the participants, the process, and the tools used, etc.). | The methodology is complete and well explained. | The methodology is complete but parts need better explanation. | The methodology is missing one or two main components (e.g., the study process, justification of study type) | The methodology is missing key elements that makes the process unclear. This section shows a limited understanding of how the study was run or why. | The methodology is missing or so incomplete, it is hard to figure out what was done. |
| *Results and Discussion of the Cognitive Walkthrough* is well-described, related to the purpose of the study, and is complete. The data analysis has relevant visual figures, and has a mix of quantitative and qualitative data to report (e.g., the evaluators opinions towards the applications). Your discussion section describes how to improve your existing prototype. This discussion section will show how you answered this study’s research questions. | All these areas are complete and done at an excellent level. | The analysis section includes a partial description of the process, is mostly complete, relates to the purpose, and includes some suggestions for improvements. The analysis has some good visual figures. | The analysis process is briefly outlined, shows some understanding of the data, and has some suggestions. The analysis has few figures. | The analysis shows limited understanding of the data, and only has a few brief suggestions that are not backed by the analysis. Few or no relevant images in the analysis. | The analysis shows limited understanding and does not demonstrate an understanding of the data. There are no figures related to the data analysis. The suggestions made need to be reworked or are non-existent |
| Conclusion and Future Work is sensible and complete and include limitations of the studies. | All these areas are complete and done at an excellent level. | All these areas are complete but may one may need further explanation. | These are included but are brief. | At least two of these areas are briefly discussed. | These are missing or are too brief. |
| Spelling, grammar and writing style | No errors, has obviously been proofread. Writing is formal and appropriate for a report. | There may be one or two errors but overall grammar and spelling is decent. | A few errors should have been better proofread, but readability is not affected. Writing may be too informal. | Many errors, paper was obviously not proofread. Paper is disorganized, no clear topic statement, paragraphs are not organized in a logical way. | Significant number of errors, such that it affects readability |
| Layout of the paper | Follows SIGCHI style per instructions and uses template and all the sections are included. | Follows SIGCHI but may have an error (in referencing for example) | Some of SIGCHI format followed but more than a one/two errors | Significant number of errors in following the template | Does not follow SIGCHI or did not follow template |
| References | There are enough references (minimum 3 to 5 based on group numbers), they are peer reviewed, recent (or seminal) and relevant, follows IEEE or ACM citation style | One of these factors are missing, such as not using enough, or not having recent/relevant sources, improperly formatted | More than one of these factors is missing | References are not of an academic level (such as Wikipedia),and/or not recent/relevant, and/or not enough of them | References may be missing altogether, or may be only a copy and paste of websites (which may require a look as it being plagiarism) |

Grades:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Components** | **Score** | **Total** |
| Content | Out of 5 |  |
| Abstract | Out of 5 |  |
| Introduction | Out of 5 |  |
| Background | Out of 5 |  |
| Problem Statement and Approach | Out of 5 |  |
| Contextual Inquiry Methodology | Out of 5 |  |
| Contextual Inquiry Results and Discussion | Out of 5 |  |
| Prototype Description | Out of 5 |  |
| Cognitive Walkthrough Methodology | Out of 5 |  |
| Cognitive Walkthrough Results and Discussion | Out of 5 |  |
| Conclusion, Future work | Out of 5 |  |
| Spelling, Grammar and Writing Style | Out of 5 |  |
| Layout | Out of 5 |  |
| References | Out of 5 |  |
| **TOTAL** | **Out of 70** |  |