UCLIC

## Assignment Briefing Sheet

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Module Code** | COMP0016 | **Module Title** | Systems Engineering | | |
| **Assignment Title** | Human-Computer Interaction Group Assignment | | | | |
| **Weighting In Module** | 5% | | **Word Count (if applicable)** | | |
| **Set by** | Dr Chris Evans | | **Moderated by** | | Dr Dean Mohamedally |
| **Deadline for submission** | **8/11/2023 16:00hrs** | | | | |
| **Submission Method** | Electronic submission to Moodle | | **Feedback method if not via TurnItIn** | | Turnitin/Moodle |
| **Marks & Feedback** Provisional marks and feedback will normally be returned within one calendar month. Students will be advised via Moodle of any delay. Unless otherwise stated above feedback will be provided via the Moodle TurnItIn assignment where the assignment was submitted. | | | | | |

The assignment involves working as a group to design and evaluate a prototype for your software system. It involves all four stages in the development life cycle: discovering requirements, designing alternatives, prototyping, and evaluation.

This assignment involves one deliverable:

1. A 10-slide HCI report in PowerPoint

This is a group assignment and each group should produce one report.

**Report on HCI Process**
The report should use images and limited text to outline the development of your prototype including the methods used for establishing user needs, sketches, the methods used for evaluation and the outcome of the evaluation. It should summarize data collected at all stages in the life cycle. It should include pictures of users interacting with the prototype. The report should be produced in Microsoft PowerPoint and should be a maximum of 10 slides including references. It will not be necessary to present or narrate the PowerPoint – you just need to submit the report as a file. You should not use videos, transitions or animations in your presentation. Your report should include academic citations and a list of references to relate your work to the academic literature.

| Grade | % Mark range | |
|---|---|---|
| A | >70% | Excellent justification of the choice of methods used for each stage and clear consideration of alternatives. Excellent demonstration of the use of iteration in which previous stages are revisited following the outcomes at a given stage. Very strong evidence that users (or pseudo users) have been consulted wherever possible or necessary. Effective use of personas or scenarios. Excellent attempt at relating the development to the literature on HCI and Interaction Design. Report very clearly shows how a user would interact with the prototype. |
| B | 60-69% | Very good justification of the choice of methods used for each stage and fairly clear consideration of alternatives. Very good demonstration of the use of iteration in which previous stages are revisited following the outcomes at a given stage. Reasonable evidence that users (or pseudo users) have been consulted wherever possible or necessary. Effective use of one persona or one scenario. Very good attempt at relating the development to the literature on HCI and Interaction Design. Report fairly clearly shows how a user would interact with the prototype. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| C | 50-59% | Good justification of the choice of methods used for each stage and reasonable consideration of alternatives. Good demonstration of the use of iteration in which previous stages are revisited following the outcomes at a given stage. Some evidence that users (or pseudo users) have been consulted where possible or necessary. Attempted use of one persona or one scenario. Reasonable attempt at relating the development to the literature on HCI and Interaction Design. Report gives basic indication of how a user would interact with the prototype. |
| D | 40-49% | Too much text on each slide, lack of citations, or little evidence of iteration or user (or pseudo user) involvement. Lack of a persona or a scenario. Lack of justification for the choices made at each stage. Relation to the literature only as an afterthought. Poor flow or difficult to follow. Report gives little indication of interactivity. |
| E | <40% | One or more of the following: no citations, no evidence of iteration, no evidence of user (or pseudo user) involvement, no relation to the literature, or extremely difficult to follow. Report has no indication interactivity. |

**Prototype**
The prototype should be a wireframe (digital) prototype. It should not involve implementation in code. Wireframes may be produced using any software of you choosing, e.g. PowerPoint, Balsamiq. You should make sure that your report describes how interactions would take place, possibly using the "Wizard of Oz" technique to simulate behaviour. The prototype itself will not be assessed, only the report in PowerPoint.

**Ethical Considerations**
Your users (or pseudo users) should be restricted to the client, TAs or other students on the module or perhaps relatives. On no account should any participants be under the age of eighteen. Testing can be conducted remotely or in person.

**Assessment Criteria**
The report will be assessed according to the following criteria. Note that the weighting of these criteria is not specified as there will be some flexibility depending on choice of system or product. The report will be awarded a mark out of 100.

- Evidence of consultation with users at each stage (when appropriate)
- Personas
- Sketches
- Evidence of consideration of alternatives
- Evidence of iteration
- Demonstration of a user interacting with the prototype
- Evaluation of prototype
- Citations and relation to the literature

**Submission**
One person in each group needs to upload the PowerPoint file on Moodle. You should ensure that the members of the group are clearly identified in each.

**Penalties for Over-Length Coursework**
The maximum number of slides is 10. The submission must not exceed the prescribed length by more than 10%. Where submissions exceed the specified maximum length by more than 10%, the score will be reduced by ten marks; but the penalised mark will not be reduced below the pass mark, assuming the work merits a pass.