



FINAL ASSESSMENT

| | | |
|---------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|
| COURSE | : | GRAPHICAL USER INTERFACE |
| COURSE CODE | : | DRC1413 |
| COURSE COORDINATOR | : | NUR SYAFIQAH BINTI MOHD NAFIS |
| DATE | : | 11 DEC 2023 – 14 JAN 2024 |
| DURATION | : | 4 WEEKS |
| SESSION/SEMESTER | : | SESSION 2022/2023 SEMESTER II |

INSTRUCTIONS TO STUDENTS:

1. This assessment paper consists of FOUR (4) questions. Answer ALL questions.
2. All answers to a new question should start on a new page.
3. All calculations and assumptions must be clearly stated.

APPENDIX:

1. Appendix 1 - Format
2. Appendix 2 - Rubric evaluation

DO NOT TURN THIS PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE TOLD TO DO SO

This assessment paper consists of **TWELVE (12)** printed pages including the front page.

INSTRUCTIONS:

This assessment encompassed 50% of the overall assessment marks. 30% will be assessed individually, and 20% on the group assessment. This assignment is the continuation of Assignment 2: Proposal (User Research and Low Fidelity Prototyping). You are required to do this in a group of TWO (2). The recap of the case study is as follows:

TripOn Sdn. Bhd is looking for participants to help in developing a prototype mobile application that promotes travel and tours. The purpose of the application is to help users achieve their travel and tour goals, whether that is through increasing awareness of healthy saving habits, setting and tracking their goals, flight, and hotel booking, itinerary development, and others. The application could cover one or more of these areas, depending on the target audience and the specific goals of the project.

In this assessment, you are required to complete four (4) questions for visually designing the user interface considering the principles and rules of design.

QUESTION 1**[10 MARKS]**

Your submitted proposal has been approved by top management, and your team is now can start designing the graphical user interface using Figma. Provide the link for the Figma design file and change it to anyone with the link who can view the design. Communicate with your partner by commenting on the Figma design file while developing a prototype design. Content of communication must be easy to understand, relevant to the topics, use a professional tone or language, and must be responded to in a timely manner.

[10 Marks (individual marks)]**QUESTION 2****[30 MARKS]**

Individually, **develop a high-fidelity mock-up** with consideration of the user interface design, colour scheme, font selection, image placement, and overall layout. These elements should be thoughtfully incorporated into the mock-up to create a visually appealing and user-friendly prototype that accurately represents the final product. The design must consider the following elements such as:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| (a) Familiarity and simplicity | [4 Marks (individual marks)] |
| (b) Consistency and efficiency | [4 Marks (individual marks)] |
| (c) Responsiveness and operability | [4 Marks (individual marks)] |
| (d) Design, novelty, and aesthetics | [15 Marks (individual marks)] |
| (e) Innovation and branding | [3 Marks (individual marks)] |

QUESTION 3**[20 MARKS]**

When designing a prototype for a user-friendly mobile application, it's important to ensure that the user interface is intuitive and easy to use. One way to test this is by simulating user interactions and testing the usability of the design. In order to simulate user interaction,

- (a) In a group, simulate the complete prototyping user interface design according to the flowchart in the proposal by considering the principle of visual design.

[10 Marks (group marks)]

- (b) In a group, design a test plan to test the usability and functionality of the user interface design.

[6 Marks (group marks)]

- (c) Based on question 2(c), in a group, conduct a user test plan to test the effectiveness of the user interface design with at least **THREE (3)** testers.

[4 Marks (group marks)]

QUESTION 4**[40 MARKS]**

It's crucial to make sure that a mobile application is not just functional but also enjoyable to use while it's being developed. Testing and analysing the user input on the mobile application's usability, functionality, and user happiness are essential steps in achieving this. To assess user input and feedback,

- (a) Individually, **construct a formative evaluation** for the usability heuristics and aesthetics of user interface design.

[15 Marks (individual marks)]

- (b) Individually, **construct a summative evaluation** for user satisfaction, ease of use, and perceived effectiveness.

[15 Marks (individual marks)]

- (c) Based on questions 3(a) and 3(b), in a group, **conduct a formative and summative evaluation and analyze** user feedback to evaluate the success of user interface design.

[10 Marks (group marks)]**END OF QUESTION PAPER**

APPENDIX 1 – FORMAT

1. Please include the following items in the documents for all questions.
 - a. Cover page
 - b. Table of content
2. Use Times New Roman font, 12pts, and 1.5 spacing.
3. Provide a share link from Figma and FigJam as requested in related questions.

APPENDIX 2 – RUBRIC EVALUATION

Individual Marks

| No | CO | Criteria | Grading Scale | | | | | | Weight (Fullmark) | Marks |
|-------|-----|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|----------------------|-------|
| | | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | | |
| 1 | CO3 | Communication with partners while developing a prototype design. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Easy to understand. - Relevant information and related - Respond in a timely manner (no delay) - Professional tone, appropriate language and respect your colleagues | Communicate clearly with team members in the Figma design file and meet all criteria | Communicate with team members in the Figma Project and meet THREE (3) criteria | Communicate with team members in the Figma Project and meet TWO (2) criteria | Communicate with team members in the Figma Project and meet at least ONE (1) criterion | Communicate with team members in Figma Project but didn't meet any criteria | No communication in Figma project | 2 (10) | |
| 2 (a) | CO1 | Mock-up: Familiarity and Simplicity | The text and design elements are exceptionally familiar and simple, with an outstanding layout that is easy to read and visually appealing | The text and design elements are familiar and simple, with a well-organized layout and easy to-read text that is appropriate for the intended audience | The text and design elements are generally familiar and simple, but may contain some areas of confusion or complexity | The text and design elements are unfamiliar or overly complex, making it difficult for the intended audience to understand the content | The text and design elements are confusing and difficult to understand, with a poorly organized layout and unclear text | The criterion is not present or not adequately addressed in the work | 0.8 (4) | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|------------|--|
| 2 (b) | CO1 | <i>Mockup: Consistency and Efficiency</i> | The design is exceptional in its consistency with promoting high functional efficiency. | The design is highly consistent with promoting functional efficiency. | The design is generally consistent with promoting fair functional efficiency. | The design has some inconsistencies with promoting a lack functional efficiency. | The design is inconsistent with promoting unclear functional efficiency. | The criterion is not present or not adequately addressed in the work. | 0.8 (4) | |
| 2 (c) | CO1 | <i>Mockup: Responsiveness and Operability</i> | The prototype design is exceptional in its responsiveness and operability, providing an optimal user experience across all devices and platforms. | The prototype design is highly responsive and operable, with no significant usability or functionality problems on different platforms. | The prototype design is generally responsive and operable, with no major usability or functionality problems on different platforms. | The prototype design has some responsiveness and operability issues, with some usability and functionality problems on different platforms. | The prototype design is not responsive and has major operability issues, with significant usability and functionality problems on different platforms | The criterion is not present or not adequately addressed in the work. | 0.8 (4) | |
| 2 (d) | CO1 | <i>Mockup: Design, Novelty, and Aesthetics</i> | The design is exceptional in its novelty, visual appeal, and aesthetic quality, with a | The design is novel, visually appealing, and aesthetically pleasing, with a thoughtful use of color, | The design is novel, generally visually appealing, and aesthetically pleasing, with a reasonable | The design somewhat lacks novelty, and visually appealing, but lacks harmony and coherence, and may not | The design is not novel, unappealing and poorly executed, with little consideration for aesthetics, | The criterion is not present or not adequately addressed | 3 (15) | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|------------|--|
| | | | sophisticated and original use of color, typography, and graphics that effectively communicate the intended message | typography, and graphics that effectively communicate the intended message. | use of color, typography, and graphics, but lacks some sophistication or originality. | effectively communicate the intended message. | color, typography, or graphics. | in the work. | | |
| 2 (e) | CO1 | <i>Mockup: Innovation and Branding</i> | The design is exceptional in its level of innovation with the brand identity and guidelines, with a highly cohesive and | The design is highly innovative with the brand identity and guidelines, with a clear and cohesive visual language that reinforces the | The design is generally innovative with the brand identity and guidelines, with a somewhat cohesive visual | The design is not innovative with the brand identity and guidelines and lacks a clear and cohesive visual language. | The design is not innovative with the brand identity and guidelines, with a lack of cohesive visual language and unclear hierarchy | The criterion is not present or not adequately addressed in the work. | 0.6 (3) | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|-----------|--|
| 4 (a) | CO1 | <i>Evaluation: Constructing a formative evaluation</i> | The evaluation is exceptional in its level of clarity and effectiveness, providing a comprehensive and detailed plan for evaluating the usability, functionality, and aesthetics of the interface design. | The evaluation demonstrates a high level of clarity and effectiveness, with only minor areas for improvement. | The evaluation exhibits a reasonable level of clarity and effectiveness, with only minor issues. | The evaluation demonstrates some degree of clarity and effectiveness but falls short in one or more areas. | The evaluation is poorly defined, with unclear objectives, methodology, data collection, analysis, and recommendations. | The criterion is not present or not adequately addressed in the work. | 3 (15) | |
| 4 (b) | CO1 | <i>Evaluation: Constructing a summative evaluation</i> | The evaluation is exceptional in its level of clarity and effectiveness, providing a comprehensive and detailed plan for evaluating the usability, functionality, and aesthetics of the interface design. | The evaluation demonstrates a high level of clarity and effectiveness, with only minor areas for improvement. | The evaluation exhibits a reasonable level of clarity and effectiveness, with only minor issues. | The evaluation demonstrates some degree of clarity and effectiveness but falls short in one or more areas. | The evaluation is poorly defined, with unclear objectives, methodology, data collection, analysis, results, and recommendations. | The criterion is not present or not adequately addressed in the work. | 3 (15) | |
| TOTAL MARKS | | | | | | | | | 70 | |

Group Marks

| No | CO | Criteria | Grading Scale | | | | | | Weight (Fullmark) | Marks |
|-------|-----|---|---|--|--|---|--|---|----------------------|-------|
| | | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | | |
| 3 (a) | CO2 | <i>Simulation: Simulating prototype design for interactivity</i> | The design is exceptional in its level of contrast, scale, unity, hierarchy, and dominance providing a highly engaging and interactive user experience. | The design demonstrates a high degree of contrast, scale, unity, hierarchy, and dominance with only minor issues. | The design exhibits a reasonable degree of contrast, scale, unity, hierarchy, and dominance but may contain some minor flaws. | The design demonstrates some degree of contrast, scale, unity, hierarchy, and dominance but is not highly effective. | The design lacks contrast, scale, unity, hierarchy, and dominance. | The criterion is not present or not adequately addressed in the work. | 2 (10) | |
| 3 (b) | CO2 | <i>Simulation: Designing the test plan for functionality</i> | The design is exceptional in its level of completeness, usability, performance, error handling, and innovation, providing a highly functional and engaging user experience. | The design demonstrates a high degree of completeness, usability, performance, error handling, and innovation, with only minor issues. | The design exhibits a reasonable degree of completeness, usability, performance, error handling, and innovation, but may contain some minor flaws. | The design demonstrates some degree of completeness, usability, performance, error handling, and innovation, but is not highly effective. | The design lacks completeness, usability, performance, error handling, and innovation. | The criterion is not present or not adequately addressed in the work. | 1.2 (6) | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|------------|--|
| 3 (c) | CO2 | <i>Simulation: Conducting User Test Plan for the effectiveness</i> | The test plan is exceptional in its level of clarity and effectiveness, providing a comprehensive and detailed plan for user testing. | The test plan demonstrates a high level of clarity and effectiveness, with only minor areas for improvement. | The test plan exhibits a reasonable level of clarity and effectiveness, with only minor issues. | The test plan demonstrates some degree of clarity and effectiveness but falls short in one or more areas. | The test plan is poorly defined, with unclear objectives, methodology, implementation, analysis, and recommendations. | The criterion is not present or not adequately addressed in the work. | 0.8 (4) | |
| 4 (c) | CO2 | <i>Evaluation: Conducting both evaluation and analyzing user feedback</i> | Extensive and detailed evaluation and analysis, with comprehensive implementation of feedback into design improvements, leading to significant improvements in usability, functionality, and aesthetics. | Thorough evaluation and analysis, with clear implementation of feedback into design improvements | Adequate evaluation and analysis, with some implementation of feedback into design improvements | Some evaluation and analysis conducted, but not comprehensive or detailed | Minimal or incomplete evaluation and analysis, with little implementation of feedback | The criterion is not present or not adequately addressed in the work. | 2 (10) | |
| TOTAL MARKS | | | | | | | | | 30 | |