CSCM69 – Human-Centred Perspectives and Methods
Coursework 1, 2020

Introduction
The coursework elements for this module are intended to help get you used to building human perspectives into your work by default. Along the way, they will also help you develop skills in writing, conducting literature reviews, critical analysis, design and presentation.

Coursework 1 is worth 25% of the CSCM69 module, and involves a literature review, a critique of previous work against your own experiences, and a small innovation element.

Specification
Digital communication tools and services such as email and messaging apps have become key parts of our day-to-day lives. But to what extent do they build the human perspective into their designs? Your task in this coursework is to investigate this area, drawing upon both the existing academic research literature and your own experiences with these tools.

It is up to you whether you choose to focus entirely on a single area (such as, say, email or WhatsApp), or whether you take a broader look at the domain. However, please make sure you read the whole of this document (and the marking scheme) before making a choice. In particular, note that you will need to critique a tool that **you** use, so be sure to choose an area that this is the case for!

To help approach the work, there are four sub-tasks that you should undertake:

1. Review some of the academic literature in this area. Look at the support material slides on the CSCM69 Canvas area for some suggestions about how to approach this task. A good starting point is Google Scholar (see https://scholar.google.com). Most sources are normally free or open access whilst on campus or logged into your university account.

2. Synthesising the papers you have read, discuss what the literature says about how to make designs more effective for people. What themes can you see? What are the key useful techniques? What does not work well?

3. Critique a tool in this area that you use yourself. How well does it work? How does it match up to what you found in the research literature? How could it be improved? Do you notice anything interesting that it does that is not in the literature?

4. Design an innovation that would improve the tool you use. This does not have to be a major re-design, but should be more than, say, moving a button to a different place. Draw upon both your own critique and the literature that you have read, justifying your design choice(s).

Deliverables
The deliverable for this coursework is a report, no more than three pages long (not including references), written in the style of a conference paper. Use the CHI Conference Proceedings template (see links on Canvas) to format your document. You can remove or ignore "Author Keywords" and "CCS Concepts" in the template, but should include figures/tables/references as applicable.

The deadline for this coursework is 23rd October 2020, and you must upload your work as a PDF file via the submission page on Canvas.

Support
I'm happy to run other support sessions to help with this work. Please let me know in the CSCM69 lectures and we can arrange suitable times (or I can answer questions in the lecture itself).

Level	Knowledge	Understanding	Skills	Critical analysis	Reflection
70–100% In principle, publishable quality	Comprehensive knowledge of Human-Centred Perspectives and Methods that is current and extends beyond essential materials. Extensive, appropriately-used background material. Potential new or extended knowledge.	Clear evidence of applying and interrelating knowledge relevant to the problem at hand. Strong internal relations, e.g., of theory to practice as appropriate to the coursework.	Clear ability to select appropriate techniques and skills to solve a problem. High literacy and coherent organisation of the coursework. Strong evidence of largely independent, self-directed work.	Original ideas, insights or critical thinking. Clear analysis and construction of arguments. Excellent use of and synthesis of ideas. Strong structure.	Strong element of self-awareness and critical evaluation of own work. Assessment of contribution to the discipline. Objective justifications of opinion.
50–69%	Comprehensive knowledge of essential ideas in Human-Centred Perspectives and Methods. Good background work and understanding of course resources.	Significant application of knowledge to the problem at hand. Thorough grasp of concepts. Good relation of theory to practice.	Good ability to select appropriate techniques and skills to solve a problem. Good literacy and reasonable organisation. Evidence of own initiative and independent work.	Good analysis and critical arguments. Occasional uncritical reliance on accepted arguments. Good structure.	Reasonable self-evaluation and assessment of value of contribution. Justified opinions.
30–49%	Undergraduate-level, incomplete knowledge of ideas in Human-Centred Perspectives and Methods. Some relevant background material.	Some ability to apply knowledge and identify appropriate concepts. Some relation of theory to practice.	Limited selection of techniques or skills. Some problems with language and attempts to organise ideas. Considerable guidance or direction given.	Informed evaluation of facts but no real independent analysis. Reasonable structure and argument.	Incomplete or sketchy evaluation of work. Opinionated, without justification.
0–29%	Lack of essential elements of Human-Centred Perspectives and Methods knowledge. Absence of background work.	Limited application of knowledge. No clear grasp of concepts. No relation of theory to practice.	Poor or inappropriate choice of skills. Poor language. Incoherent organisation. Little or no independent working.	Uncritical dependence on facts or published arguments. Descriptive rather than argumentative. Poor or irrelevant structure and argument.	No or little self evaluation.