

Rubric Interaction Design 1.4								
Prototype + Design document		v2.3	22/23					
Overall Grading		One or more of the No Show conditions do apply. When there is no design document and/or prototype handed in the submissioncan not be graded, resulting in a 1.	One or more of the Insufficient conditions do apply.	Some or more of the Questionable conditions do apply.	Most of the Sufficient conditions do apply.	Most of the Good conditions do apply. The rest as Sufficient.	As Good and many of the Excellent conditions apply.	In order for a group to achieve a <i>Sufficient</i> grade, none of the worked out scenarios (individual contributions) should be assessed as <i>Insufficient</i> and no more than one of the worked out scenarios should be assessed as <i>Questionable</i> .
Aspect		No Show	Insufficient	Questionable	Sufficient	Good	Excellent	max points
Number of test scenarios worked out/designed		No prototype was handed in	Fewer scenarios have been worked out (unannounced) than there are group members.	Sufficient scenarios have been worked out but the selection does not include the mandatory scenarios.	The number of worked out scenarios corresponds to the number of group members.	At least as <i>Sufficient</i> and the level of detail and complexity corresponds to the test scenarios.	At least as <i>Good</i> and the level of detail and complexity surpasses the test scenarios.	10 (Group)
Flow		No Figma prototype or a low fidelity prototype was handed in. It is unclear who created the flow.	The flow in the product does not, or insufficiently, support the tasks, to be derived from the scenario used.	The flow in the product does support the tasks (to be derived from the scenario used) only mechanically or sequentially.	The flow in the product does support the tasks and the required actions of the user sufficient.	The flow in the product does support the tasks and the required actions of the user well. The flow offers an alternative sequences of completing a task that is logical and relevant (with attention to improved efficiency.) The correct precondition are outlined and the design fits the indicated device. The design allows the user to do their tasks efficiently.	as <i>Good</i> and in addition the impact (technical and functional) of the used scenario on other relevant scenarios or tasks within Chapeau restaurant is worked out or described.	10 (Individual)
Look of the product (the visualization)		No Figma prototype or a low fidelity prototype was handed in.	Look: The product looks visually immature because 1/ a unambiguous and clear visual line is missing in text, layout of interactive elements, alignment and visual hierarchy. 2/ The product looks like a combination of different sub-products with different design styles and not as one consistent system. 3/ The relevant available data is not or is insufficiently applied. Overviews and list (inventory, orders, bills) do not contain enough items to give a realistic impression of the product in operation. 4/ The design of the product is not inline with the dimensions of the intended device.	Look: Two of the four elements mentioned are worked out at the level of <i>Sufficient</i> , the rest as <i>Insufficient</i> .	Look: The product has a clear and unified visual style. The design is consistent and supports the user in performing his task and interpreting feedback. Layout is clear (also with lists), text is readable, interface elements are unambiguous, alignment is correctly applies. The dimensions of the intended device are respected.	Look: At least as <i>Sufficient</i> with the following additions. The look and feel is appropriate to Chapeau and clearly supports the user in performing his tasks efficiently and flawlessly.	Look: At least as <i>Good</i> with the following addition. Th interface elements used in the product match with the style(guide) of the intended the device. The system has a realistic and professional appearance throughout the prototype.	10 (Group)
Feel of the product (the interaction design)		No Figma prototype or a low fidelity prototype was handed in.	Feel: 1/ The product lacks a clear and recognizable interaction design. The flow is unclear and/or rigid. 2/ The product looks like a combination of different sub-products with different styles in navigation and interaction. 3/ Multiple user interface elements have been used that are not appropriate for the purpose they were used for .	Feel: one of the tree elements mentioned at <i>Insufficient</i> are worked out at the level of <i>Sufficient</i> , the rest as <i>Insufficient</i> .	Feel: The product has a clear and recognizable interaction design. The product clearly looks like a whole (a consistent system). The interface elements are appropriate/efficient for the purpose they were used for.	Feel: The product has a very clear and recognizable interaction design. The flow is clear and tolerant to users. The use of user interface elements reflect an understanding of the user's goal and the function of interface elements.	Feel: The product has a very clear and recognizable interaction design. The flow is clear and tolerant to users. Interface elements fit seamlessly with the context and platform for which it was designed.	10 (Group)
Content		No Figma prototype or a low fidelity prototype was handed in.	The content does not match the information from the briefing. No text or placeholder text has been used (lorum ipsum, repeating text, lines, gibberish) within the interface.	The content is only partly realistic. Part of the data does not match the information from the briefing.	Content in the interface is realistic and matches to the information from briefing.	As <i>Sufficient</i> and the content has been handled in a smart way to support the tasks of the users.	At least as <i>Good</i> in addition the language of the interface itself is also consistent.	10 (Group)
Tone of voice / Language		No Figma prototype or a low fidelity prototype was handed in.	The tone of voice is technical, user-unfriendly, patronizing or hostile. Terminology is applied inconsistently and many generic terms and/or very specific jargon are used.	The tone of voice contains inconsistencies in language use. The tone is in some cases unprofessional or not appropriate in the context.	The tone of voice and terminology are consistent, professional and appropriate within the context.	The tone of voice and terminology is consistent, professional and friendly, fits in well with the context.	The tone of voice and terminology is consistent, professional and friendly, fits <i>perfectly</i> with the context.	10 (Group)
Design Process		Non of the intermediate assignments where handed in. No Design document with attachments was handed in.	There is little or no insight into the design process. The end result looks and feels like a first sketch. No or qualitatively insufficient earlier versions of the design have been shared. Some of the intermediate assignments are missing. The design document is incomplete, not all (intermediate) assignments have been incorporated into the design document.	The end result shows no progressive insight. For example, there are design flaws in the prototype that have been discussed in class or indicated in feedback. Intermediate assignments are of insufficient quality and not improved since the first version. Feedback, information from the lessons, has not been incorporated into the design document or has not been incorporated adequately.	The work has been done iteratively and feedback is integrated into the intermediate assignments and the end result. Both in the design document and in the Figma Prototype. The design document, with attachments, was updated weekly and submitted on time.	As <i>Sufficient</i> : The end result also testifies to an investigative attitude, good coordination between team members. The intermediate assignments are of above average quality. This is also reflected in the design document. The design document is pleasant to read and consistently constructed.	As <i>Good</i> : in addition where also different sources (mentioned/cited) have been used to optimize the design.	60 (Group)