Individual Observation and Reflection - 10%

	Unacceptable (0)	Poor (1-3)	Average(4-6)	Good (7-10)
Depth of reflection (10 marks)	• Most of the reflection is unclear and irrelevant to the topic. • No attempts to demonstrate connection between observations to learning outcomes.	• Repetition of what was written in the group write-up with little or brief mention about own experiences. • Unclear connections are made between what is learned about the topic and their observation/experience.	• Describes in detail some specific ideas or issues from own experience. • Makes a general connection between what is learned about the topic and their observation/experience. • Materials in the portfolio are used to explain the connection between their observation and topics.	• In-depth synthesis of thoughtfully selected aspects of experiences related to the topic. • Makes clear connections between what is learned about the topic and their observation/experience. • Materials in the portfolio and own accumulated artefacts are used to explain the connection between observation and topics.
Self-criticism (10 marks)	• No attempt at self- criticism. • No awareness that there is a relationship between own preconceptions and assumptions and their own design practice.	• Evidence of some attempt at self-criticism. • Little awareness of how own assumptions and preconceptions affects their design practice.	• Student questions own actions, and preconceptions. • Awareness of how design practice is formed.	• Student questions own actions and preconceptions. • Awareness of how design practice is formed. Describe ways that they can improve current design practice as a result of own questioning.
Language and Presentation (5 marks)	• Full of spelling and grammatical errors. • Use of many incomplete sentences and inadequate proofreading. • No organisation of thoughts and	• Proofread with some glaring spelling and grammatical errors. • Frequent lapse in clarity and accuracy. Minimal organization of thoughts and presented facts. Readers have difficulty picturing what was being described and/or why it was included in the writing. • A piece of writing that has little value to the authors and a challenging read for readers.	• Few spelling and grammatical errors. • Some organisation in thoughts and presented facts in an attempt to describe abstract concepts. Readers can sometimes create a mental picture of the situation being described. Explanation of some concepts are clear at some places and unclear at others. • A challenging read for readers but useful piece of writing for the author.	• No spelling and grammatical errors. • Language is clear and expressive. Readers can create a mental picture of situation being described. Abstract concepts are explained accurately. Explanation of concepts makes sense to an uninformed reader. • A piece of writing that useful to the authors and an enjoyable read that readers wish for more.

	presented facts. • Writing have little value to the writers. Confusing read for author himself and readers.			

Checklist

1. PACT Analysis
2. List of requirements
3. Hierarchical Task Analysis (HTA)
4. Interviews
5. Surveys/Questionnaires
6. Observation
7. Contextual Inquiry
8. Affinity diagrams
9. Quantitative analysis techniques
10. Personas
11. Scenarios
12. Sketches
13. Storyboard
14. Paper prototype
15. High-fidelity mock-up
16. Video prototype
17. Heuristic Evaluation plan
18. Cognitive Walkthrough
19. Usability testing plan

Group Website - 15%

	Poor (0-5)	Average(6-10)	Good (11-15)
Design Process (12%)	• Major stages of the design process undertaken by the team is briefly mentioned. There is little connection between what was claimed to be done and the artefacts submitted on the website. • No or little discussion on how events that occur during design affect the team's subsequent actions. • No justification is provided as to why the tools are used during the design process. If justification is provided, they are mostly irrelevant to what the team actually intends to do. • No or little relationship between artefacts and the design process undertaken by the team.	• All stages of the design process is described in detail with an occasional disconnection between what have been done and the artefacts submitted on the website. • Significant events that happen during execution and its implication to the team's subsequent actions is sometimes discussed. • Justification is provided for some tools used and its purpose during each stage of design. • Most artefacts are referenced, where relevant, to support actions taken during the design process.	• All stages of the design process is described in detail. It is obvious to both readers and student what happened during the design process. Work is fully supported by relevant artefacts. • Significant events that happen during execution and its implication to the team's subsequent actions is discussed. • Justification is provided for all tools used and its purpose during each stage of design. • All artefacts are referenced, where relevant, to support all actions taken during the design process.
Language and Presentation (3%)	• Full of spelling and grammatical errors. Use of many incomplete sentences and inadequate proofreading. • Website is shoddily put together. It is difficult to tell the purpose of the website and to locate the needed information.	• Few spelling and grammatical errors. • Some thought is put into the organization of the contents on the website. There is an occasionally disconnection in the flow of information on the website. Readers have difficulty determining sometimes what happened during the design process and what have been done.	• No spelling and grammatical errors. • The organization of the content is well-thought of. Readers can easily navigate through the website and feel as if they were part of the design team.