# User Experience Design Practical Assignment – Semester Project

## Assignment Overview

This semester project combines theory and practical application of User Experience Design (UXD). Students will critically analyze poor UX, conduct user research, design personas, evaluate accessibility, and propose a redesign through wireframes and testing strategies.  
  
The project has two components:  
- Part A (Group – Theory, 40%)  
- Part B (Group – Practical, 60%)

## Part A: Theoretical Component (Group – 40%)

Each group must submit a written report (1,800–2,200 words) covering:

1. UX Principles & Critique (15%)  
 - Explain key UX/UI principles: usability heuristics, user-centered design, and accessibility.  
 - Critically evaluate the impact of poor vs good UX using at least two real-world examples (positive and negative).

2. User Research & Personas (10%)  
 - Summarize user research methods (interviews, surveys, observation).  
 - Explain the role of personas and journey maps in guiding UX decisions.

3. Accessibility in UX (15%)  
 - Discuss WCAG (Web Content Accessibility Guidelines) guidelines and inclusive design.  
 - Reflect on the importance of accessibility from both ethical and business perspectives.

## Part B: Practical Component (Group – 60%)

Students will work in groups of 4–6 (aligned with class groups) to simulate a real-world UX redesign project.

1. Problem Identification (10%)  
 - Select a local product/service with poor UX in South Africa (e.g., government site, transport app, campus system).  
 - Document UX/UI issues using screenshots and notes.

2. User Research & Personas (15%)  
 - Conduct at least 3 interviews/surveys per group.  
 - Create 2–3 personas and a user journey map for the selected product/application.

3. Accessibility Audit (10%)  
 - Perform a checklist-based audit linked to WCAG (contrast, font readability, navigation, screen-reader compatibility).  
 - Summarize findings in a short report.

4. Redesign Prototype (15%)  
 - Create low-fidelity wireframes (hand-drawn or Figma/Balsamiq).  
 - Show how the redesign addresses UX/UI problems and accessibility gaps.  
 - Develop a short usability test plan.

5. Final Project Report & Presentation (10%)  
 - Compile all outputs into a professional report (max 25 pages).  
 - Deliver a 15-minute group presentation at the end. (powerpoint)

## Marking Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Poor (0–1) | Satisfactory (2) | Good (3) | Excellent (4–5) |
| UX Principles & Critique (15%) | Weak definitions, no examples | Basic definitions, limited examples | Clear explanation with some critique | Strong theoretical grounding, critical insights, strong examples |
| User Research & Personas (25%) | No real research, generic personas | Minimal research, weak personas | Adequate research, relevant personas | Strong research, creative personas, insightful journey map |
| Accessibility Audit (10%) | No audit or poor effort | Superficial audit | Covers key checks | Comprehensive, insightful, linked to redesign |
| Redesign Prototype (15%) | No/poor redesign | Minimal redesign, unclear fixes | Adequate redesign addressing issues | Strong redesign with clear improvements & usability plan |
| Final Report & Presentation (10%) | Disorganized, missing sections | Basic structure, weak visuals | Well-structured, coherent | Professional report, engaging presentation |
| Theory Writing Quality (15%) | Weak grammar, no structure | Acceptable but limited | Clear structure, good referencing | Excellent academic writing, well-referenced |

## Submission Format

- Part A (Group): Word/PDF report (1,800–2,200 words).  
- Part B (Group): Report (max 25 pages) + presentation slides.  
- Referencing: Harvard style.  
- Due Date: [Will be announced]

## WCAG Accessibility Checklist (Level A & AA)

### 1. Perceivable

☑ All images have alt text (text descriptions).

☑ Videos have captions/subtitles.

☑ Text is resizable (up to 200%) without breaking layout.

☑ Good color contrast (text vs background: at least 4.5:1).

☑ Content is not conveyed by color alone (e.g., errors also show text/symbols).

### 2. Operable

☑ All functionality can be used with a keyboard only (no mouse required).

☑ Users can pause, stop, or hide moving/scrolling content.

☑ No “time traps” (users are not forced out due to time limits).

☑ Clear, consistent navigation menus.

☑ Links are descriptive (avoid “click here”).

### 3. Understandable

☑ Language of the page is identified (e.g., <html lang="en">).

☑ Content uses clear and simple language.

☑ Forms have labels and instructions.

☑ Error messages are clear and helpful.

☑ Navigation and layout are consistent across pages.

### 4. Robust

☑ Pages are coded to work with assistive technologies (e.g., screen readers).

☑ Markup follows standards (HTML, ARIA roles).

☑ No major validation errors in the code (can check with W3C Validator).

✅ Conformance Levels to aim for:

- Level A → Basic accessibility (minimum).

- Level AA → Recommended standard (widely adopted).