Group:	3K	PEIZIQI	WANGQIHANG	ZHANGYIXIANG		
Note: For formatting formula we need to see if we can make it so the No Pass box will be highlighted if 0 is given but blank if the mark box is empty						
Criteria	**No Pass**	**Pass**	**Credit**	**Distinction**	**High Distinction**	**Very High Distinction**
	Less than 50%	**50–59%**	**60–69%**	**70–79%**	**80–89%**	**90-100%**
Storyboards: 30%						
Storyboards - Narrative and Link to User Stories/Personas	Narrative of the storyboards is not clear / storyboard is not linked to user story or persona / storyboard is too short (<3 frames) or there are fewer than one storyboard per team member.	Narrative of the storyboards is somewhat unclear and link to user story or persona is vague. There is one storyboard per team member.	Narrative of storyboards is clear, link to user story/persona is present and there is one storyboard per team member but all focus on very similar user stories/personas.	Narrative of storyboards is reasonably clear and link to user story/persona is reasonably obvious. There is one storyboard per team member that considers different user stories/personas though there are a number of similarities between some storyboards.	Narrative of storyboards is clear and link to user story/persona is obvious. There is one storyboard per team member that considers different types of users and their needs.	Narrative of storyboards is clear and link to user story/persona is obvious. There is one storyboard per team member that meaningfully considers significantly different types of users and their needs.
Storyboards - Description and Presentation	Descriptions do not match storyboard visuals. Storyboards are incomprehensible/messy, or visuals are not actually storyboard (eg. only screen designs/UI). No indication of user's emotions/thought process.	Mostly descriptions of action or UI with little focus on the user's emotions/thought process or their environment. Storyboards are messy.	Roughly even split between screen designs and user/environment. Storyboard is comprehensible but parts are difficult to interpret and/or have insufficient description. Visual presentation of the storyboard could be neater/tidier.	Storyboards focus mostly on the user's thought process/emotions rather than device screens and are generally nicely presented. Text descriptions provide some additional context to the scenario.	Clear text description with consideration of user emotions/thoughts and their environment. Storyboards are clearly drawn and easy to interpret.	Meaningful and clear text description with consideration of user emotions/thoughts and their environment. Storyboards are clearly drawn and easy to interpret.
Storyboards - Accessibility	Accessibility is not considered in any storyboard, or is only addressed in a way that does not affect the user's ability to interact with the app/interface.	Accessibility and impairments are only considered in one storyboard, or are only addressed in an extremely superficial manner.	There are at least two storyboards that consider accessibility but both only consider one type of impairment (eg. vision impairment only) rather than different ones, or accessibility is not well considered.	There are at least two storyboards that consider different impairments or accessibility needs, though with some overlap (eg. two impairments with the same solution) or some issues on how accessibility has been considered.	There are at least two storyboards that consider different types of impairments and accessibility needs. Accessibility considerations are adequate.	There are at least two storyboards that consider significantly different accessibility needs impairments in a meaningful manner.
Low-Fidelity Prototypes: 40%						

Acceptance Criteria	Acceptance criteria for some user stories is not provided or the items listed are not actually acceptance criteria. No attempt at organising the acceptance criteria.	Acceptance criteria for some user stories are vague or unclear. An attempt has been made at organising the acceptance criteria but this has been done incorrectly.	Each user story provides acceptance criteria but some are not complete or clear. A Kanban board has been used, but with several issues.	Each user story provides acceptance criteria but some are not complete or clear. A Kanban board has been used, but with some minor issues.	Each user story provides acceptance criteria, organised using a Kanban board.	Each user story provides complete and clear acceptance criteria, organised well using a Kanban board.
Low Fidelity Prototype - Link to Requirements	Screens included are not linked to user stories or requirements.	Screens included only have a vague link to user stories or requirements.	Screens address one or two user stories/requirements, but include a number of unnecessary elements (eg. unrelated to user stories, low priority functions not addressed in previous documentation).	Screens address a few user stories and requirements, though have some unnecessary or unrelated elements or low priority functions.	Screens address a good variety of user stories and requirements with very few unecessary or unrelated elements.	Screens address a good variety of user stories and requirements.
Low Fidelity Prototype - Design	Prototype is extremely rough and layout/functions are unclear/inconsistent and/or there are numerous/significant usability violations.	Prototype is somewhat complete but inconsistent, and parts are illegible and there are some usability violations.	Prototype is mostly legible, some attempt to represent UI elements, but incomplete or inconsistent or with some minor usability violations.	Prototype is legible and mostly consistent, with some minor design issues, but generally complies with usability principles.	Prototype is clearly designed, consistent UI and realistic proportions. Function and layout of app is obvious and usability principles are complied with.	Prototype is clearly designed to a professional standard, consistent UI and realistic proportions. Function and layout of app is obvious and usability principles are adhered to exceptionally well.
Low Fidelity Prototype - Accessibility	Aspects of the design actively violate accessibility guidelines or principles. Accessibility options are related to the project domain/topic but not to app/interface accessibility.	Accessibility is not well considered or it is implemented in a very shallow/rudimentary fashion; e.g. button to change font size and nothing else, not considering the target group.	Screens address accessibility adequately, but only consider one type of impairment rather than a variety.	Screens address accessibility adequately, considering more than one impairment, but only at a superficial level.	Prototype considers a range of impairments and accessibility needs.	Prototype considers a wide range of impairments and accessibility needs.
Low Fidelity Prototype - Annotations	No or very few annotations, no theories labelled (ie. annotations are interface element labels only).	Some annotations, but few theories labelled and/or theories are not Norman's principles.	Annotations of Norman's principles included, but theory is incorrectly applied.	Annotations included, Norman's principles are mostly applied well aside from some minor issues.	Annotations included as well as accurate and use of Norman's principles in the labels.	Annotations included as well as accurate and meaningful use of Norman's principles in the labels.

Written Report: 30%						
Written Report - Design Choices	Report re-iterates content from previous deliverables without further insight.	Report provides only vague or a small amount of justification for design decisions with little link to user stories or requirements.	Report provides some justification for design decisions with some link to user stories or requirements.	Report provides some justification for design decisions with a solid link to user stories or requirements.	Report provides solid justification for design decisions based on user stories, requirement or acceptance criteria with some further reflections.	Report provides meaningful justification for design decisions based on user stories, requirement or acceptance criteria with detailed further reflections.
Written Report - Theories and Principles	Superficial description of UI only, or theories applied are not Norman's.	Some Norman's principles are mentioned in the report but many are inadequate/vague or applied incorrectly and/or some are repeated.	Some Norman's principles are mentioned in the report but some are inadequate/vague or applied incorrectly.	Norman's principles are mentioned in the report and mostly applied correctly, with a reasonable variety of rules/principles used.	4 Norman's design principles are mentioned in the report and applied correctly.	4 Norman's design principles are mentioned in the report and applied meaningfully and correctly.
Written Report - Accessibility	No explanation/justification of how accessibility has been applied in the prototype screens.	Superficial explanation/justification of how accessibility has been applied in the prototype screens. Fewer than three accessibility principles have been discussed.	Three accessibility/WCAG principles have been discussed, but not in enough detail, or only focuses on one type of accessibility (eg. vision impaiment only) and/or are not applied correctly.	Three accessibility/WCAG principles have been discussed in a reasonable amount of detail and mostly applied correctly, focusing on at least two types of accessibility.	There is solid discussion of how three accessibility/WCAG principles have been applied. Three types of accesibility needs are acknowledged, correctly applied and discussed. Guidelines are spread out evenly across screens.	There is meaningful discussion of how three accessibility/WCAG principles have been applied. A wide variety of accessibility needs are acknowledged, correctly applied and discussed. Guidelines are spread out evenly across screens.

Written Quality	Poor writing, vocabulary not accurate or articulate, poorly structured sentences with frequent grammatical errors. Some deliverables/report sections missing or incomplete. Parts not logically connected.	Acceptable writing, numerous spelling/grammatical errors and/or awkward sentences. All deliverables/report sections present but some are incomplete and/or not in a logical order.	Reasonable writing, vocabulary is generally accurate or articulate, sentences may be long and contain some grammatical errors or contain unnecessary complexity. All deliverables/report sections present and complete, but very standalone or not in a logical order.	Good writing with only a few grammatical errors and overly long sentences. Deliverables/report sections are present and in a reasonably logical order.	High-quality writing, vocabulary is consistently accurate or articulate, clearly structured sentences with none or only a very few grammatical errors. Deliverables/report sections well tied together. Clear flow of ideas.	High-quality writing, vocabulary is of a professional standard with no grammatical errors. Deliverables/report sections well tied together. Clear flow of ideas through all deliverables.
Visual Quality and Narrative Flow	Inconsistencies in visual presentation (ie. different heading styles, mismatched fonts or colours, etc.) and/or no effort made to improve the presentation of the document.	Visual presentation is mostly consistent but very plain, with very little effort put into the presentation.	Partially consistent design language throughout (ie. colours, heading styles, fonts, etc.) but a number of inconsistencies (e.g. images being cut off, etc).	Some effort has been put into the design and presentation (ie. graphics on the title page, matching subheading styles etc) with very few and/or minor consistency issues.	Consistent design language and almost-professional level of presentation (ie. title page template, matching graphical style throughout document).	Visual design and presentation of the document is consistent and professional (ie. appropriate title page template, matching graphical style throughout document).
Mark	73.85		**Late Penalty (days)**			
Feedback	Storyboard comments. First two user stories seem to be related to finding volunteer positions and even the third one as well (it is bit different since it addresses the communication/ busy schedules). First two are about two different volunteer roles but still it is about finding/ searching a volunteer position. Storyboards are sketched meaningfully with good descriptions. However, first two storyboards need more details on the background. Accessibility is considered well (first storyboard on low vision condition). Prototype comments. Acceptance Criteria (AC) breakdown can be done further and some main things are missing, e.g. User story 3 talks about timely updates but none of the acceptance criteria mentiones about it. Also, only 1 acceptance criteria are done (A minimum of 3 acceptance criteria must be implemented per user story). Done criteria should not be shown in 'To do' or either striked off. Some ACs are too broad, e.g. "Show user all the related volunteering positions of animal care", what if the list is too long? are you going to list by pages or is it a scrolling feed? (think these in the next submission). Be specific, e.g. for Alex, where will be the detailed job information is provided? what is the UI element used for that? Regarding the screens, 1 and 2 are are clearly sketched with considerable amount of annotations but the remaining screens need further improvement. 3 and 4 - looks like a plain document apart from the menu below, regarding 4 - could have presented better including more context than only saying Mr. H, etc what are those? Icon next to it is not clear or labelled to understand what it is, what is H to W? Is it part of the UI? 5 and 6 both are bit cluttered (too many elements within the screens), regarding 6 - its not clear what those rectangular boxes are about without any proper labels. For all screens, please consider using proper mobile screen sizes to get a good idea how the phone layout looks like, also, be mindful on the placing of the text-to-speech/ voice interaction button (what does that button exactly does should be clear with its positioning, e.g. should it be at top? or in a separate setting? or for just search or for text elements?). Could have considered more accessibility features given that you focus on low vision users. Very less annotations on the principles. Report comments. Justifications for the user stories and acceptance criteria are fairly written well, could have linked more to requirements (from the previous data collected) as well. Norman's principles are applied with a variety. WCAG 3 principles are explained and applied well. Well written and structured report. Could have included a cover page at the start. Overall recommendation, first two user stories were similar so try to focus on the next submission to address a variety of user needs, beyond searching volunteer positions, e.g. applying, updates, details of a volunteer position, etc.					