Marking Details

| **Assignments** | **Deadline** | **Marks** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Task - 1 | End of Week - 3 | 20 |
| Task - 2 | End of Week - 9 | 50 |
| Task - 3 | End of Week - 12 | 30 |
| **Total** | | **100** |

Task-1

## Brief

There are two parts for Task-1. They are as follows:

### Usability Report

A report on what “Usability” means with a focus on your chosen field of studies such as web design, app design, or game design. A minimum of two applications in your respective field of study must be evaluated based on “Schneiderman’s 8 golden rules” and “Nielsen’s usability heuristics”.

### Wireframe

The wireframe for the project you will submit in Task-2. The wireframe can be designed in Balsamiq or any other wireframing tool. They can even be made on paper. But at-least 10 screens have to be represented in the wireframe and that cannot include login/ sign-up.

The report should have a minimum of 1000 words and a maximum of 1500 words.

## Content format for Usability Report

1. Introduction
   1. Brief Introduction to what Usability is
   2. Importance of Usability in your field of study
2. Literature Review
   1. Discuss the work being done in your field of study
   2. Discuss any methodology changes or paradigm shifts in your field
   3. The discussion needs to be backed by at least 2 published journals or research papers
   4. At least 2 products have to be used as examples for discussion
3. Analysis
   1. Perform analysis on the products mentioned in the literature review
   2. The analysis must be based on the Usability Principles discussed in the lecture
   3. Any additional research is appreciated
4. Conclusion
   1. A discussion on usability based on the analysis conducted
   2. The most prominent issues that were discovered during the analysis should be discussed
   3. Provide a brief discussion on which of these issues should you be careful about in your own project
5. References
   1. User Harvard style referencing from at-least 2 sources
   2. Referred sources should be books or published research papers
   3. The references should not be older than 5 years

## Rubric

| Criteria | Rating | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Introduction  ( 2 points) | **2 to >1**  **Proper Introduction**  A proper introduction to usability is provided. The importance of usability in the chosen field of study is provided | | **1 to >0**  **Limited Introduction**  The importance of usability in the chosen field is not relevant. | |
| Literature Review  (4 points) | **4 to >3**  **Excellent LR**  A proper discussion of the chosen field of study. Use of excellent source materials and well-referenced | **3 to 2**  **Good LR**  Either the discussion is limited or the source materials and referencing are limited but the discussion is still relevant to the field of study. | **2 to >1**  **Satisfactory LR**  Both the discussion and referencing are limited but the discussion is still relevant to the field of study. | **1 to >0**  **Limited LR**  Both discussion and references are limited. The discussion is also irrelevant to the field of study. |
| Analysis  (8 points) | **8 to >6**  **Excellent Analysis**  Chosen products are relevant to the field of study. Very little inaccuracies in the analysis. Extra research is conducted. | **6 to >4**  **Good Analysis**  Chosen products are relevant to the field of study. Some inaccuracies in the analysis. Limited or no extra research. | **4 to >2**  **Satisfactory Analysis**  Chosen products are relevant to the field of study. Some analysis is incorrect or irrelevant to the rules. No extra research. | **2 to >0**  **Limited Analysis**  Irrelevant choice of products with respect to the field of study. Most analyses are incorrect or irrelevant. No extra research. |
| Conclusion  (4 points) | **4 to >3**  **Excellent Conclusion**  An excellent discussion of usability based on relevant topics. Shows an excellent understanding of usability. | **3 to >2**  **Good Conclusion**  A good discussion of usability based on relevant topics. Shows a good understanding of usability. | **2 to >1**  **Satisfactory Conclusion**  A limited discussion based on relevant topics. Shows very little understanding of usability. | **1 to >0**  **Limited Conclusion**  A poor discussion on relevant topics. Shows no understanding of usability. |
| Report Formatting  (2 points) | **2 to >1**  **Proper Report Formatting**  A good format has been used and proper presentation methods have been used in the documentation | | **2 to >1**  **Limited Report Formatting**  A limited format has been used and the presentation of the documentation is lacking. | |

Task-2

## Brief

There are three parts to Task-2. They are as follows:

### Interactive Prototype

A fully interactive prototype that gives a clear idea of the application. There are at least 8-10 interactive screens (excluding login/ sign-up) that communicate the idea behind the application.

### Design Process

A proper documentation of the entire design process. Must-haves in the design process:

* Brainstorming
* User Personas
* User Flow/ Task Flow
* Wireframe/ Wireflow
* Moodboard
* Design and Prototype

## Rubric

| Criteria | Rating | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Design Process  (10 Points) | **10 to >8**  **Excellent Design Process**  All steps have been properly used and have one stage of the design process has a clear influence on the next stage of the design process | **8 to >5**  **Proper Design Process**  Some steps have minor issues and/ or some steps of the process don’t have a clear influence on the next stage of the design process | **5 to >2**  **Satisfactory Design Process**  There is improper usage in the steps of the process and/ or the influence of one step of the process on the next step is not very clear | **2 to >0**  **Limited Design Process**  A very surface attempt at the design process with no clear relationship between the multiple stages of the design process. |
| Usability Considerations  (5 Points) | **5 to >4**  **Excellent Usability Considerations**  An excellent demonstration of the usability principles with clear extra effort | **4 to >3**  **Proper Usability Considerations**  A good demonstration of usability principles with minor issues. | **3 to >1**  **Satisfactory Usability Considerations**  Some major and some minor issues in the demonstration of usability principles. | **1 to >0**  **Limited Usability Considerations**  The student has made a surface attempt at an interface and no real work has been done beyond the basic interface. |
| Usability Testing  (5 Points) | **5 to >4**  **Excellent Usability Testing**  The student has utilized relevant testing methodologies and has uncovered significant usability-related issues during testing. | **4 to >3**  **Proper Usability Testing**  Minor issues in the testing methodologies and minor irrelevancies in the issues uncovered during testing. | **3 to >1**  **Satisfactory Usability Testing**  Some major issues in the testing methodologies and major irrelevancies in the issues uncovered during testing. | **1 to >0**  **Limited Usability Testing**  Improper usage of testing methodologies and most issues are purely aesthetic rather than usability related. |
| Accessibility Considerations  (5 Points) | **5 to >4**  **Excellent Accessibility Considerations**  The student has made excellent considerations for accessibility features with respect to the nature of the application. | **4 to >3**  **Proper Accessibility Considerations**  Some accessibility considerations have minor issues and some obvious accessibility considerations have been missed. | **3 to >1**  **Satisfactory Accessibility Considerations**  Very little consideration for accessibility and major issues in the accessibility options chosen. | **1 to >0**  **Limited Accessibility Considerations**  Very superficial and irrelevant attempt at accessibility and shows very little exploration. |
| Accessibility Testing  (5 Points) | **5 to >4**  **Excellent Accessibility Testing**  The student has tested for accessibility scenarios beyond the minimum scope and uncovered relevant issues. | **4 to >3**  **Proper Accessibility Testing**  The student has tested for the minimum scope of scenarios with minor irrelevance in the issues uncovered during testing. | **3 to >1**  **Satisfactory Accessibility Testing**  The student has met the minimum scenario requirements but there are major irrelevancies in the issues uncovered during testing. | **1 to >0**  **Limited Accessibility Testing**  The minimum scenarios have not been met and there are major irrelevancies in the issues uncovered during testing. |
| Prototype Fidelity  (5 Points) | **5 to >4**  **Very High Fidelity**  The prototype displays excellent consideration for depth. The prototype is highly interactive and even minor scenarios have been accounted for. | **4 to >3**  **High FIdelity**  The prototype displays a good consideration for depth. The prototype is interactive for the major task flow. | **3 to >1**  **Normal Fidelity**  Some major areas of the prototype lacks functionality. | **1 to >0**  **Low FIdelity**  The prototype feels like a direct translation of the wireframe and has very little functionality |
| Aesthetics of the prototype  (5 Points) | **5 to >4**  **Excellent Aesthetic**  The prototype has a professional look and feel | **4 to >3**  **Proper Aesthetic**  The interface is well planned but has minor issues. | **3 to >1**  **Satisfactory Aesthetic**  The interface is well planned but has major issues. | **1 to >0**  **Limited Aesthetic**  Very little effort has gone to the aesthetic of the prototype. |
| Questions and Answers  (10 Points) | **10 to >8**  **Excellent Understanding**  The student correctly answered all questions. | **8 to >5**  **Proper Understanding**  The student correctly answered almost all questions. | **5 to >2**  **Satisfactory Understanding**  The student understands some core concepts but misunderstands some other core concepts. | **2 to >0**  **Limited Understanding**  The student has little to no understanding of even the core concepts. |

Task-3

## Brief

Task-3 is a report of your project in Task-2. The report should highlight the practical application of your chosen techniques to your interface and describe the testing methodologies that you utilized. The report should have a minimum of 1500 words and a maximum of 2000 words.

## Content format for Project Report

1. Introduction
   1. A brief paragraph about the interface
   2. The problem that the interface tries to solve and the nature of the solution
2. Design Process
   1. A detailed description of the thought process behind the entire application
   2. Clear evidence of all the Design Process steps mentioned in the report
3. Evaluation and Testing
   1. A clear description of the testing methodologies that were utilized
   2. Include proof of evaluation
4. Conclusion
   1. Discussion of how following the design process made your interface better
   2. Discussion of the flaws that were uncovered in the design and how you can improve the design further
5. Appendix
   1. Include all screenshots of the wireframe, design, and prototype
   2. Include proper labels for all images

## Rubric

| Criteria | Rating | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Introduction  ( 3 points) | **3 to >2**  **Proper Introduction**  A proper introduction to the interface is given. The purpose of the interface is explained clearly and concisely. | | **2 to >0**  **Limited Introduction**  Limited description of the interface. The purpose and target audience of the interface is not clear. | **0**  **No Marks  Incorrect or not done.** | |
| Design Process  (10 points) | **10 to >8**  **Excellent Design Process**  A very well-evidenced, well-planned, and professionally applied design process. | **8 to >5**  **Good Design Process**  A well evidenced and well-planned process with minor issues in the evidence or planning. | **5 to >2**  **Satisfactory Design Process**  A suitable level of evidence and planning but has some major issues. | **2 to >0**  **Limited Design Process**  Very limited evidence and planning in the design process. | **0**  **No Marks  Incorrect or not done.** |
| Evaluation and Testing  (10 points) | **10 to >8**  **Excellent Evaluation and Testing**  Well chosen techniques used and documented professionally. A mature and professional evaluation of all elements. | **8 to >5**  **Good Evaluation and Testing**  Good techniques documented thoroughly. Minor issues in documentation and shows minor issues in understanding. | **5 to >2**  **Satisfactory Evaluation and Testing**  A few relevant techniques were used and presented coherently. Some major issues in the technique or documentation. | **2 to >0**  **Limited Evaluation and Testing**  Some techniques have been tried but not applied well and not documented well. | **0**  **No Marks  Incorrect or not done.** |
| Conclusion  (4 points) | **4 to >2**  **Excellent Conclusion**  An excellent conclusion is drawn relevant to the design process and evaluation and testing. Shows depth understanding of the importance of usability. | | **2 to >0**  **Limited Conclusion**  A conclusion is drawn but few relevant to the design process and evaluation and testing. Shows average understanding of the importance of usability. | **0**  **No Marks  Incorrect or not done.** | |
| Report Formatting and Appendix  (3 points) | **3 to >2**  **Proper Documentation**  A good format has been used and proper presentation methods have been used in the documentation. The images in the appendix also have proper labels. | | **2 to >0**  **Limited Documentation**  A limited format has been used and the presentation of the documentation is lacking. The images in the appendix do not have proper labels | .**0**  **No Marks  Incorrect or not done.** | |
|  |  | |  |  | |

Portfolio Submission

### Brief

* Upload all files from Task-1, Task-2, and Task-3 as a single zip file
* Naming convention for the zip file: <Your University ID>\_<Your Name>.zip

### Warning

* Task-1, Task-2, and Task-3 have to be submitted separately. Portfolio submission cannot count as a substitute for any of the tasks.
* Do not upload a different file than the one you have uploaded in Task-1, Task-2, or Task-3. If found so, the student will be severely penalized and will be failed on this course