


| | |
|-------|------|
| Grade | 70 % |
|-------|------|

| | |
|-----------|------------------------------|
| Graded on | Tuesday, 8 May 2018, 5:01 PM |
|-----------|------------------------------|

| | |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Graded by |  Christina Keating |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|



General Specifications

Overall great topic, very relevant to current efforts within the University of Bath. Strengths of the report include the background (introduction) and how you've weaved in appropriate references throughout the report. Thinking beyond the screen and leveraging further technologies is excellent. Throughout, the report shows rigour in the work done and a high understanding of the topics covered and the methods used.

Weakness is that it is quite difficult to follow the narrative of the structure. A clear roadmap would have improved the read of this: structuring the report like a story detailing how you chronologically went through the design process: background, how requirements were gathered, what methods were used for this, what the outcome of this was, how the results were used to create prototypes, evaluation of prototypes, re-design, etc. Excessively large images in the appendices! Some sections are very well written and others have quite awkward English: make sure you proofread throughout so the report sounds like a coherent piece of work.

Background, domain and identification of users and stakeholders

Great references, the introduction shows a strong understanding of the domain and problem area. Good use of references throughout, perhaps talk more about 'trigger'. Context (section 1.2) seems to describe the final solution – possibly give an indication of the goal and then show the process taken to achieve the goal? Requirements gathering (section 1.3) seems a little out of place between intro and overview of persuasive systems – for someone not involved in the project from start to finish, it might be easier to follow had you started with background, goals and existing systems and then gone into the design process. Good review of existing solutions, a critique of these could naturally lead to a brief overview of how your solution will be better/different.

Development of user requirements

Very strong description of requirements, descriptive and thought through. It is difficult to understand how these requirements were elicited, did you do interviews, questionnaires or brainstorm these? Were users involved? Methodology (section 3) seems a little repetitive; an indication of how many participants you had and how you ran the sessions would have been good to see.

Storyboards and prototype design (key characteristics and design rationale)

Good use of storyboards and sketches and good identification of key characteristics gathered from participatory design sessions. Design rationale?

Evaluation, analysis and re-design

Good use of multiple evaluation methods. Empirical evaluation well written, easy to follow and good analysis. A summary of findings rather than writing stories about each participant might have been a better representation. Note: section 5.2.2. Interview or questionnaire? These are 2 different methods of gathering data. Note: you haven't kept your participants anonymous as you've numerically identified them in the images. Make sure you say "a participant".

Feedback
comments