School of Electrical Engineering and Computing

THE UNIVERSITY OF
NEWCASTLE
AUSTRALIA

SENG2260: Human-Computer Interaction

Assignment 1: Low Fidelity Prototyping (20%)

DEADLINE: EOD Friday September 13th 2019

Group name:_____

PROTOTYPING REPORT	POOR	BELOW AVERAGE	AVERAGE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Mark
Heuristic Assessment /15	0-3. Limited or no evidence of heuristic assessment. Ad hoc tasks and/or changes applied. Limited evidence of evaluator involvement.	4-6. Some heuristics applied. Limited scope/poor choice of heuristics. Unrealistic tasks/solutions. Unstructured evaluator participation.	7-9. Evidence of heuristic assessment. Limited evaluation scope/problems found. Evidence of evaluator participation. Mainly descriptive review.	10-12. Evidence of good heuristic assessment. May be limited in scope but well-structured and detailed. Evidence of problem/solution review and evaluator use.	13-15. Comprehensive choice and use of appropriate heuristics. Problems discovered and solutions discussed. Reflective review of assessment.	
Risk Assessment /10	0-2. No or very limited risks identified. Unstructured assessment. No or poor mitigation plan.	3-4. Some risks identified. Limited in scope and/or unrealistic risk scenarios. Brief or limited mitigation plan.	5-6. Evidence of risk assessment. Limited scope or overly basic risk scenarios. Adequate, mainly descriptive mitigation plan.	7-8. Evidence of good risk assessment. Well-structured and detailed. Good risk scenarios supporting realistic mitigation plan.	9-10. Excellent risk assessment with comprehensive risk scenarios and mitigation strategies. Rationale for risk ranking.	
Briefing /5	0-1. No or very limited briefing. Lack of appropriate test information.	2. Poorly structured or overly long brief. Briefing describes how to use the interface or several issues across scope, formatting, level of detail.	3. Adequate briefing document. More than one minor issues with scope, formatting or level of detail.	4. Good briefing document. Clear user instructions. Well formatted with only one minor issue in scope, layout or level of detail.	5. Excellent one page detailed briefing. Appropriate information on background and application purpose.	
Scenario Tasks /10	0-2. No or limited description of scenarios. Limited or unrealistic tasks. Limited relevance for use in prototype. Brief description.	3-4. Poor or overly basic tasks. Limited scenarios. One or more of limited value for prototype improvement, poorly presented, incomplete.	5-6. Details of 3 adequate scenarios tested. Tasks have measurable outcomes. Screenshots/photos of prototype.	7-8. Three good scenarios. Interesting and representative tasks. Well structured descriptions with photos/screenshots	9-10.Excellent representative scenarios with innovative tasks. Excellent description in context of prototype.	
Observations /30	0-6. No or very basic observations. Poor quality/irrelevant problems identified and limited engagement with task. Overly brief and/or poorly structured.	7-12. Basic observations. Limited problems identified. More than one issue from: participants identified, limited detail, poorly presented, incomplete.	13-18. Descriptive overview of observations. Some exemplars of relevant observations and problems identified. Minor issues in level of detail or relevance.	19-24. Structured overview of observations and problems. Detailed exemplars of relevant observation. Reflective discussion.	25-30. Excellent reflective report on usability observations. Comprehensive, detailed and consistent review of testing and significance.	

School of Electrical Engineering and Computing

THE UNIVERSITY OF
NEWCASTLE
AUSTRALIA

Risk Resolution and Prototype Iteration / 25	0-5. No or limited review. Little engagement with existing prototype, testing day and/or other sections. Overly brief.	6-10. Basic risk review. Incomplete or overly basic prototype interaction plan. Unrealistic plan or focus on irrelevant/poorly considered solutions.	11-15. Descriptive review on what was learnt from this prototype. Brief outline of risky features and proposed solutions. Limited description of iteration plans.	16-20. Detailed review on what was learnt from this prototype. Good coverage of risky features and proposed solutions. Description of realistic iteration plans.	21-25. Reflective review on what was learnt from this prototype. Comprehensive overview of risky features and proposed solutions. Detailed rationale for iteration plans.	
Minutes and meetings summary /5	0-1. No or limited meeting summaries. Few meetings and/or limited evidence of group work. No or little evidence of action list review.	2. Limited or very few meetings. Incomplete or very basic meeting notes. Meetings only in lab sessions. Limited evidence of action review.	3. Basic but adequate meeting summaries. Meetings mostly in lab sessions. Basic table format or overly brief. Some action list review.	4. Formal meeting summaries. Descriptive overview of meetings and project progress. Descriptive action list review.	5. Detailed meeting summaries with roles, minutes, action lists. Well structured. Reflection on decisions/group dynamics.	

Mark (%) _____

COMMENTS

NOTE: Submissions after the **deadline** will have marks reduced by **10% per day** late (The weekend counts as 2 days.). We recognize in group work that sometimes not everyone contributes equally to the group tasks. Thus, although groups receive a single mark for their submission, **we reserve the right to vary individuals' marks based on peer feedback from other group members and feedback received from course staff.**