**Marking Rubrics for Milestone 2**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Exceptional: 4.5-5** | **Good: 3.5-4** | **Acceptable: 3** | **Needs work/ Unacceptable: 0-2.5** |
| Content and organization. | Overall the content is complete, relevant, accurate & well organized It is clearly written. | Content is generally complete, relevant, accurate & well organized. The writing style is acceptable. | Content is appropriate but may be disorganized. It is hard to follow the flow of the milestone and the sections. | Content is weak & disorganized.  The writing is confusing with lots of errors. |
| Data Analysis/ Results, and Suggested Features | The results are clear and complete and relate back to the purpose and objectives. The features are clear and clearly tied to the data analysis. | More details for some of the results is needed or there isn’t a clear link to the features to the data. | The results need more details or the features are not clearly linked to the results. | Both the results need further explanation and features haven't been linked to the results. |
| Tasks, Scenarios and Use Cases | There are use cases for 3-4 of identified tasks. The use cases are properly formatted (e.g., numbered with normal and alternative courses). They focus on the interaction between the user (actor) and system. They are clearly defined, ordered, and have reasonable alternative courses identified. These are clearly written. | There are fewer use cases or they have some formatting errors in the proper format (e.g., properly numbered or labeled). Despite the format, they still convey some relationship between the user and the system and have some order or sequence of actions to be accomplished to perform the task. The writing style is acceptable. | The use cases do not focus on the user/system interaction and just describe the tasks to be done without any formatting. | The use cases lack focus or formatting and are completely disorganized with no consideration for the user/system interaction. |
| Prototype  Description and Appendix | The prototype description is well explained and documented with good illustrations. The group considered design aspects of the prototype, and considered the perspective of the users, and type of device. They incorporated the tasks, the use-cases and scenarios into the design It is clearly written. The porotype pages for each use-case are included in the appendix. | The prototype description describes the development the prototype some illustrations may need more work. The tasks and use cases are used, but needed more details about their design decisions, users and device type. The writing style is acceptable. The porotype pages for each use-case are included in the appendix. | There is little explanation of what the group did or how they developed the prototype. There needed to be more details on how the user tasks and use cases match with the prototype. There is limited or no description of the users, and design considerations. There are few or no illustrations. It is hard to follow the writing of the section. Some porotype pages for each use-case are missing in the appendix and need to summitted before the cognitive walkthroughs. | The prototype description lacks explanation and images. There is no/minimal description of how the prototype will be evaluated with use-cases or scenarios. The users and design decisions are not explained. The writing is confusing with lots of errors. And they may be missing update use-cases. Some porotype pages for each use-case are missing in the appendix and need to summitted before the cognitive walkthroughs. |
| Cognitive Walkthrough description | The description is well-defined, well-written, and provides a clear outline of the process that an evaluator will take. | The description is, well-written, and but may need more details of the process that an evaluator will take. | The description needs some work both in details and in writing style. | The description does not represent what an evaluator will do and is confusing and hard to follow. |
| Cognitive walkthrough forms | The Cognitive Walkthrough forms are complete and match all the steps outlined in the use-cases. They include a title, and scenario, persona, use-cases and prototype page #. These are clearly written. All the forms are attached in the appendix. | The Cognitive Walkthrough forms are complete and for the most part match all the steps in the use-cases. The writing style is acceptable and all the forms are attached in the appendix. | The Cognitive Walkthrough forms are not complete Not all the steps from the use-cases are included in the forms. Some groupings of steps are not explained and/or do not match the use-cases. The forms are going to require corrections and additions before they are ready to use them in their evaluation. It is at times hard to follow the writing of the section. And most of the forms are attached in the appendix. | The group may not have used the forms included in the milestone (and will need to transfer their forms). The Cognitive Walkthrough forms are not complete and are missing key information with use-cases missing. The forms show that the group has little or no understanding of how to design the forms or how to use the forms to evaluate their prototype with their use-cases and prototype. The forms will need to be redone before they can proceed with the evaluation process. The writing is confusing with lots of errors. |
| Writing and Organization | The layout, citations, & writing style is outstanding (including spelling and grammar). It is well organized, consistent layout has been proofread, is easy to follow. All appendices (and figures if included) are properly labeled and referred to in text. It feels like a cohesive document (e.g., writing style is consistent). | Layout, citations, & writing style is very good. It is for the most part organized with mostly a consistent layout. The writing may have minor spelling and/or grammar mistakes. Most the appendices/ figures are properly labeled and referred to in text. The paper for the most part feels like a cohesive with minor changes in writing styles. | Layout & writing style is adequate. It needs to be better organized and needs more attention to the layout. The writing has spelling and/or grammar mistakes. Appendices (figures) need better labels and/or need to be referred to in text. The paper lacks cohesion is some parts. | Layout & writing style is unacceptable. It lacks organization and has an inconsistent layout throughout the paper. There are several spelling and/or grammar mistakes that affect the readability. Appendices (figures) have not been properly labeled or referred to in the text. The paper lacks overall cohesion. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Components** | **Points** | **Given Points** |
| Overall Content | 0-5 points \*2 |  |
| Data Analysis/ Results, and Suggested Features | 0-5 points |  |
| Tasks, Scenarios, Use Cases | 0-5 points \*2 |  |
| Prototype Description | 0-5 points |  |
| Cognitive walkthrough process description | 0-5 points |  |
| Cognitive walkthrough sheets | 0-5 points |  |
| Writing Style | 0-5 points |  |
| **MAX Points and Total:** | **45 Points** |  |