|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Team:** | | **Part 1 Evaluation**  **See Project** [**Description**](https://sites.google.com/view/riarriaga/courses/part-1-description?authuser=0) **for IMPORTANT Details**  **Also, see general considerations below** |
| **Points**  **Earned** | **Points**  **Possible** | **Description of Criteria. Note that marks for grammar and presentations can be deducted from each section.** |
| **4.5** | **5** | **An overview of the problem the system addresses (why it is needed), the task that will be accomplished with the system, who will use it (update the wiki)**  **Including the role of sustainability**    **GRADING NOTES:**  **Well written. You’ve done a good job of setting the context with the problem space, expected users, and their painpoints.  Sustainability goals were missing, and found at the very end of the document.** |
| **9** | **10** | **A brief description and justification of the methodology. This includes a discussion of the techniques used to gather information and their effectiveness. It should also summarize the results from any studies you conducted (quantitative or qualitative)**  **GRADING NOTES:**  **You’ve done really well in describing the iterative process of designing your research methodology, summarizing findings, and tying them back to your earlier areas of interest.** |
| **13** | **15** | **A description of the important characteristics of the users of the system (10), including other stakeholders (5).**  **GRADING NOTES:**  **You’ve demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the design space and the multiple stakeholders involved! The personas do a good job of building empathy with the motivations and pain points of the stakeholders. Could try adding more contextual information in the first two!** |
| **18** | **20** | **A task analysis consisting of a description of the important characteristics of the tasks performed by users (5).**  **A description of important characteristics of the task environment (2.5), including the larger social or technical environment (2.5) with which your system will interact.**  **A simple structured task analysis or some other appropriate diagram or description of the task structures (5) .**  **GRADING NOTES:**  **Check comments on doc.** |
| **9.5** | **10** | **At least four detailed usage scenarios that highlight the important characteristics and environment of the task (2.5 each)**  **GRADING NOTES:**  **Check comments on doc.** |
| **9** | **10** | **An analysis of two existing systems; including a discussion of the constraints (functional, non functional, etc).**  **GRADING NOTES:**  **A good competitive analysis of the websites out there.You’ve spent a lot of effort on critiquing the actual UI, well done! Some context into what attributes were you specifically looking at would be nice! (ex: ease of signing up to volunteer)  A major part of the content in the constraints section was essentially talking about the limitations of the project that you faced as a team. This section was meant to be about the constraints affecting your design space.** |
| **14** | **15** | **An initial list of usability criteria and how it will be assessed**  **Yes, this is where Norman comes in!**  **GRADING NOTES:**  **Good usability goals, which also tie in well with your findings. A few areas would benefit from more specific detail, but the intentions are correct!** |
| **10** | **10** | **A discussion of the implications/limitations of what you learned above.**  **What are the limitations of your methodology used?**  **A reflection on part 1, such as what you found difficult, interesting, etc.**  **Relevant References**    **GRADING NOTES:**  **Relevant design implications that are evidence-based!** |
|  | **MINUS**  **POINTS** | **Individual deductions: 1 point will be deducted for each missing homework and participation assignment.**  **Everything that each individual member produces in this class must be in the report (can be in appendices).** |
| **87** | **100** | **TOTAL**  **GENERAL NOTES:** |

**GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS**

**These are things that we have noticed while working with each team and reviewing in-progress reports.**

1. **Continuity: Are themes, writing styles, etc, consistent throughout the entire report? For example, once you've defined who your primary, secondary, and tertiary stakeholders, are they referenced accurately throughout the rest of the report? Do sections written by different members read the same way?**
2. **Flow: Each individual section should flow clearly. Do you have introductory paragraphs introducing what you are talking about in each section and why? Does the larger narrative of your report clearly articulate how you went from a problem statement to your research to your design implications?**
3. **Systematic, iterative approach: Do you describe in detail the process by which you arrived at your final products for each section (i.e. questionnaires, HTAs, etc)? Was there clear evidence of iteration occurring? Do you demonstrate a clear understanding of the value of each exercise?**
4. **Evidence: When you make claims, are they backed up by external resources? When you write implications, are they supported by all the work you did in the report?**

**Think: Have you demonstrated that you have internalized concepts from class and studio? And are using those concepts in a thoughtful way to investigate your problem space?**

**We recommend discussing each of the concepts above as a team. It's very important that everyone is aligned on these things.**