
Coursework commentaries 2016–17

CO3348 Interaction design – Coursework assignments 1

General remarks

This coursework required students to read a journal paper on interactive questionnaires and to write an essay critiquing the design methods used in the paper. Students were further required to reflect context in their local communities, with respect to design issues. Good answers demonstrated understanding of the original paper and developed further insights from research.

Comment of specific comments

The most common weakness shown were:

- insufficient links to the local situation
- limited insights from further investigation
- lack of a coherent argument.

Submissions which were off topic, demonstrated limited ability to critique, lacked a conclusion, or were too short in length, were also marked down.

Other general faults included use of informal style, poor structuring (i.e. poor use of sections and subsections), poor grammar/spelling. Some submissions were penalised for poor practice on citation and referencing.

Average submissions described the guidelines presented in the paper, and discussed these guidelines in relation to the target group (i.e. their local population). Better answers provided further evidence from the literature, with appropriate in-text citations and detailed references. Good answers extended this, including a review of related work, with in-depth analysis of publicly available data backed up with findings from the literature. They also outlined issues that might arise with local users, together with possible solutions to these problems.

Outstanding answers included some preliminary data-gathering, retrieving information from the local population, to establish real issues that would need to be investigated further, prior to design.

Coursework commentaries 2016–17

CO3348 Interaction design – Coursework assignments 2

General remarks

This coursework required students to apply a range of design methods for an interactive questionnaire. The specification included identification of users and task scenarios, identification of an appropriate data structure that the interactive questionnaire would capture, design mock-up sketches (e.g. storyboards, wireframes) with justifications and finally a critique of the work. Students needed to apply a range of design methods; in particular to identify users and task scenarios, identify an appropriate data structure that an interactive questionnaire would capture, design mock-up sketches (e.g. storyboards, wireframes) with justifications and finally a critique of the work.

Comment of specific comments

The most common weakness was mock-ups that were hard to read and cluttered or lacked internal and external consistency. The next most common weakness was lack of critique. Submissions that were either too short or off topic were also marked down.

Other general faults again included use of informal style, poor structuring (i.e. poor use of sections and subsections), poor grammar/spelling. Some submissions were penalised for poor practice on citation and referencing.

Many submissions which received average marks were the result of students providing designs, but not providing reasons (i.e. justifications) for their design choices.

Good answers included realistic and useful personas, original design scenarios informed by guidelines from the original journal paper (see Coursework 1), together with derived insights and 10–20 mock-ups including wireframes, storyboards, screen flows with varied fidelity (low and high). High marks were given where mock-ups adhered to design principles (e.g. consistency) and explained as part of the design justification, and user interface considerations included layout and UI elements (e.g. icons, fonts, etc.).

Outstanding submissions were informed by both the original journal paper and wider reading. Many also included diagrams of the user flow (rather than just wireframes), a well-defined data structure and included explicit comparison with the interactive questionnaire in the journal paper.