|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School of Computing and Engineering | |  | | |
| Title | PICTIVE – Interactive Prototype – Evaluation - Report | | | |
| Module | Human Computer Interaction for Information Systems | | | |
| Module Code | CP70049E | | | |
| Module Leader: | Jose Abdelnour Nocera | | | |
| Set by: | Jose Abdelnour Nocera | | | |
| Moderated by: | Parisa Saadati | | | |
| Assignment | Assignment 2 | | | |
| Hand in | This assignment will be submitted via Blackboard and Turnitin | | | |
| Structure of assignment | This assignment has four tasks. Each task has a specific weighting, and its own criteria. The assessments are described below. The learning outcomes of the module are assessed by a successful completion of all the tasks. | | | |
| **Type** | | **Weighting** | **Due Date** |
| Group PICTIVE design. | | 10% | Tasks 1, 2and 3  Sunday Week 12 before midnight  Task 4  Sunday Week 14 before midnight |
| Group prototype development and user testing | | 20% |
| Group User evaluation of prototype | | 20% |
| Individual report reviewing the prototyping experience from designer perspective. (max. 3000 words) | | 50% |
| **Learning outcomes** | LO 1 Understand and demonstrate the ability to apply principles from human-computer interaction to interactive systems design.  LO 2 Evaluate interactive systems quantitatively and qualitatively for their ease of use in organisations.  LO 3 Understand and demonstrate the ability to manage customer-driven interaction during the requirements elicitation stage.  LO 4 Understand and demonstrate the ability to apply the principles of user interface design and information architecture to trans-mediated workplaces.  LO 5 Work co-operatively in a multidisciplinary team to design a user experience that meets the requirements of a target customer group. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task 1** | | | | | |
| **Title** | | **Group work – PICTIVE Design** | | | |
| **Task details** | | **Procedure**  The group must create a low fidelity PICTIVE prototype based on the usability and user experience goals developed in Assignment 1. You should make use of the personas and any other methods you employed e.g. scenarios, etc. The development is a group activity.  Students will work as small groups of designers, usually with two members. Every team will be provided with a separate group area of Blackboard where group documents can be shared and email used to discuss issues about the development.  **The objectives of these activities are:**   * To understand the tools & techniques involved in interface design * To apply HCI theory to a practical prototype development based on a case study provided in Assignment 1 * To develop a low fidelity PICTIVE prototype for the tasks selected | | | |
| **Marking Guide** | | **Criteria** | **Issues** | **Mark** | **Marking breakdown where appropriate** |
| **Presentation** | Does the PICTIVE design and  annotation relate to the key usability and user experience goals, personas and use of the system identified in Assignment 1? | 10 |  |
| **Total** | | **10** |  |
| **Task 1 Grade descriptors** | | | | | |
| In addition to the assessment criteria above the following table may assist you in understanding how we arrive at your final mark. Indeed your final mark should agree with the following grade descriptors, but note that the assessment criteria are the main means of assessment. | | | | | |
| **Mark** | **Descriptor** | | | | |
| **0-24%** | Tasks incomplete or few attempted. Limited conceptual understanding of design or users’ needs. Inappropriate argument leading to unreliable and invalid design decisions. Poor collaboration. | | | | |
| **25-49%** | Tasks incomplete. Some confusion in purpose & aims. Some overall structure and conceptual | | | | |
|  | understanding. | | | | |
| **50-59%** | Demonstrates a limited but accurate level of understanding. Annotation shows understanding of users tasks | | | | |
| **60-69%** | Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of the design guidelines and heuristics. At the upper end there is evidence of thoughtful and measured critical evaluation. | | | | |
| **70-79%** | Demonstrates a clear, comprehensively researched understanding of design and user with some element of critical evaluation. Shows initiative in approach and rigour in the handling of information. | | | | |
| **80% or above** | Design of prototype demonstrates originality and scholarship through a depth of insight and understanding of relevant material. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task 2** |  | | | |
| **Title** | **Group work – Interactive Prototype** | | | |
| **Task details** | The design group will develop an interactive prototype of the application based on the PICTIVE design of task 1 and other documentation produced for Assignment 1. The interactive prototype will need to be suitable for a user testing session. The users will evaluate the prototypes ideally during practical seminars in weeks 11 and 12. Students must attend the demonstration and evaluation sessions to gain any credit for these tasks. This includes acting as a user for another group. A detailed evaluation plan must be included as a deliverable of this task. **Deliverable**   * Interactive prototype. * A detailed evaluation plan, including user profiles, tasks and data collection and analysis forms and templates | | | |
| **Marking Guide** | **Criteria** | **Issues** | **Mark** | **Marking breakdown where appropriate** |
| **Prototype**  **Development** | Have you selected an appropriate design for the application in terms of usability and accessibility?  Is there a clear colour model? | 5 |  |
| **Fitness for purpose** | Does the app support the user’s tasks? | 5 |  |
| **User Testing** | Was the evaluation designed appropriately?  Are test scripts relevant?  Are the data to be gathered useful to inform usability? | 10 |  |
| **Total** | | **20** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Task 2 Grade descriptors** | |
| In addition to the assessment criteria above the following table may assist you in understanding how we arrive at your final mark. Indeed your final mark should agree with the following grade descriptors, but note that the assessment criteria are the main means of assessment. | |
| **Mark** | **Descriptor** |
| **0-24%** | Tasks incomplete or few attempted. Limited conceptual understanding of design or users’ needs. Inappropriate argument leading to unreliable and invalid design decisions. Poor collaboration. |
| **0-39%** | Not all the users’ tasks could be completed or tested. Documentation incomplete and poorly structured. Very limited functionality. App cannot be navigated effectively. Serious deficiencies. |
| **40-49%** | The app will be designed according to some accepted principles. The home page will be designed so that the user understands the purpose of the site. The app will have the capability for the user to complete some tasks. However, many deficiencies can be seen in the implementation of the user evaluations. |
| **50-59%** | The app will be designed according to accepted principles. The home page will be designed so that the user understands the purpose of the site. The app will have the capability for the user to complete some tasks. However, some deficiencies can be seen in the implement of the user evaluations. |
| **60-69%** | The app will be designed according to accepted principles. The home page will be designed so that the user understands the purpose of the site. The app will have the capability for the user to complete some tasks. However, few deficiencies can be seen in the implementation of the user evaluations. |
| **70-79%** | The app will be designed according to accepted principles taking into account important user experience goals. The home page will be designed so that the user understands the purpose of the site. The app will have the capability for the user to complete most tasks. No deficiencies can be seen in the implementation of the user evaluations. |
| **80% or above** | The answer demonstrates exceptional standard of interaction design. The assignment demonstrates a depth of insight and understanding of user evaluation protocols. Documentation provided is clear and easily understandable. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task 3** |  | | | |
| **Title** | **Group User Evaluation** | | | |
| **Task details** | You are required to carry out a user evaluation of the user interface design assigned to you with at least 5 users. You should submit a report of your evaluation, giving data in the form of comments, observations, and usability and UX scores together with evidence to support your ratings. | | | |
| **Marking Guide** | **Criteria** | **Issues** | **Mark** | **Marking breakdown where appropriate** |
| **Analysis and Conclusions** | Do you demonstrate the ability to understand, reflect and evaluate aspects of the prototype?  (Ratings were consistent and related to evidence quoted) | 5 |  |
| **Evaluation** | Was the evaluation well planned?  Was this carried out professionally?  Were the results accurately recorded?  (Knowledge of topic, Depth of understanding) | 3    5    5 |  |
| **Presentation** | Coherence, errors in report, grammar, legibility (Language, style) | 2 |  |
| **Total** | | **20** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Task 3 Grade descriptors** | |
| In addition to the assessment criteria above the following table may assist you in understanding how we arrive at your final mark. Indeed your final mark should agree with the following grade descriptors, but note that the assessment criteria are the main means of assessment. | |
| **Mark** | **Descriptor** |
| **0-24%** | Tasks incomplete or few attempted. Limited conceptual understanding of design or users’ needs. Inappropriate argument leading to unreliable and invalid design decisions. Poor collaboration. |
| **0-39%** | Limited conceptual understanding of design heuristics. Inappropriate argument leading to unreliable and invalid evaluation. Incomplete rating of app. |
| **40-49%** | Some confusion in purpose & aims. Some overall structure to evaluation and conceptual understanding. |
| **50-59%** | Demonstrates a limited but accurate level of understanding of design heuristics. |
| **60-69%** | Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of the heuristics and design. Satisfactorily quotes evidence for evaluation ratings |
| **70-79%** | Demonstrates a clear, comprehensively researched understanding of design heuristics and sites appropriate evidence to support rating given. |
| **80% or above** | Heuristic evaluation demonstrates originality and comprehensive understanding of relevant material. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task 4** |  | | | |
| **Title** | **Individual Report** | | | |
| **Task details** | You are required to prepare an individual report. It should comprise:   * A report of your role as a member of the development team. * An explanation of how HCI theory and UCD principles informed the design * A written strategy between 800 and 1000 words of how UCD and Agile methods could be integrated if this was real life project: benefits and issues. * An analysis of the results of the user evaluation performed as indicated in the plan submitted for task 2 and a list of recommended specific further approaches to redesign that **you think should be carried out** in the next stage of prototyping. * How could the group have performed better? * A summary of the findings. * A list of references. | | | |
| **Marking Guide** | **Criteria** | **Issues** | **Mark** | **Marking breakdown where appropriate** |
| **Scholarship** | Do you explore HCI issues involved in the design through relevant literature and from textbooks? | 15 | Introduction – scope, rationale  [5]  Relevant theories, best practice  [10] |
| **Analysis and Conclusions** | Do you demonstrate the ability to reflect and evaluate aspects of the development and recommend changes? | 10 | Reflection on practice [5]  Conclusions &  Recommendation [5] |
| **Evaluation** | Was the evaluation well executed? Is there evidence to support this?  Were the results accurately recorded? | 20 | Knowledge of topic [10]  Depth of understanding [10] |
| **Presentation** | Coherence, errors in report, grammar, legibility | 5 | Language, style [2]  References & bibliography [3] |
| **Total** | | **50** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Task 4 Grade descriptors** | |
| In addition to the assessment criteria above the following table may assist you in understanding how we arrive at your final mark. Indeed your final mark should agree with the following grade descriptors, but note that the assessment criteria are the main means of assessment. | |
| **Mark** | **Descriptor** |
| **0-24%** | Tasks incomplete or few attempted. Limited conceptual understanding of design or users’ needs. Inappropriate argument leading to unreliable and invalid design decisions. Poor collaboration. |
| **0-39%** | Limited conceptual understanding with possible design deficiencies. Restricted use of widgets/images and inadequate referencing. Inappropriate argument leading to unreliable and invalid conclusions/recommendations |
| **40-49%** | Some confusion in purpose & aims of prototype. Some overall structure and conceptual understanding. Fair use of literature and referencing but arguments sometimes irrelevant, illogical or with unsupported assertions. |
| **50-59%** | Demonstrates a limited but accurate level of understanding design presented in a basic manner. The answer contains relevant interpretation and critical understanding especially at the upper end of the marking range. |
| **60-69%** | Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of the subject presented in a coherent manner. The answer contains evidence of application and interpretation. At the upper end there is evidence of thoughtful and measured critical evaluation. |
| **70-79%** | Demonstrates a clear, comprehensively researched understanding of relevant material with some element of critical evaluation. Shows initiative in approach and rigour in the handling of information. Demonstrates originality of thought together with interpretation and application to the relevant sector |
| **80% or above** | The answer is analytical and critical. The assignment demonstrates scholarship through a depth of insight and understanding of relevant material, which is logically structured, accurate and well referenced. Originality of thought and application is evident. |