

UT-AUSTIN ISCHOOL SYLLABUS
INF385T RAPID PROTOTYPING & LEAN UX METHODOLOGY
FALL 2022 DRAFT OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2022

DETAILS

Important note: The information presented in this syllabus is subject to expansion, contraction, change, or stasis during the semester. In case of conflict between versions, the copy on Canvas takes precedence.

Course Number. 28555

Prerequisites. TBA

Time. TH 1530–1830

Place. UTA-I.208

Dates. 22 AUG 2022–5 DEC 2022

Final Exam. Take-home, due 11 DEC, 11:59PM

Instructor. Mick McQuaid

Email. mcq@utexas.edu

Office. 1616 Guadalupe St, Room 5.402

Office Hours. 1300–1500 hrs, WED & FRI or by appointment

DESCRIPTION

With the success of software delivery methods such as Agile, design teams have had to adapt how they work within software delivery teams as the traditional design cycles are not well suited for rapid iteration. With the popularity over the last few years around Lean UX continuing to build as well as other variations (Design Sprints, Rapid Customer Feedback, MVP, etc.) it is advantageous for designers to get up-to-speed on these methodologies to further enable their skillsets.

The class will cover three major areas:

1. introduction to basic design concepts such as composition, color theory, interactions
2. the Lean UX methodology, history, predecessor, pros/cons, and adaptations on Lean UX and case studies from companies such as Google
3. the application of rapid prototyping using the latest design tools and methods

MATERIALS

No single textbook will suffice for such a rapidly changing subject. Instead, many sources must be consulted with the guidance of the instructor. These include Baker (2017), Buxton (2007), Cockton et al. (2016), Cooper et al. (2014), Goodman, Kuniavsky, and Moed (2012), Holtzblatt, Wendell, and Wood (2005), Holtzblatt and Beyer (2016), Lazar, Feng, and Hochheiser (2017), Matsudaira (2019), Patton (2014), Rubin and Chisnell (2008), Shneiderman (2017), Spiekermann (2014), and Wixon (2003). Students will need to make extensive use of Google and Wikipedia, as well as popular design websites such as A List Apart, Behance, and dribbble, in addition to readings provided on Canvas.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

The student successfully completing this class will:

- understand the benefits, drawback, history, and application of lean methodologies
- have experience implementing multiple projects using the techniques learned

- gain real-world experience with outside ‘clients’ to help build their confidence and portfolio with actual industry experience

CLASS FORMAT

This is a hands-on, project focused course, so attendance and participation in class are critical to individual success in this course and to the success of the course. You need to come to class prepared to participate in small group and full class discussions and project work, to complete all required readings prior to class, and to submit assignments on time.

Prior to most class meetings, you will submit a weekly design challenge in Canvas based on that week’s topic. We will start each class with a group critique of the designs for that week pulling from your submissions.

This semester will focus on one project for the semester that will result in a complete portfolio piece.

SCHEDULE

Week 1 (25 Aug)

Design Thinking Exercise — Introductions — Syllabus — Canvas — Design Principles — Design Challenge 1

Week 2 (1 Sep)

Story Mapping — Patton (2014) — Scenarios — Design Challenge 2

Week 3 (8 Sep)

Mood boards — Design Inspiration — Sketching — Crazy Eights — Design Challenge 3

Week 4 (15 Sep)

Working with clients — Greever (2020) — Design Challenge 4

Week 5 (22 Sep)

Agile Development — Prototyping definitions — Buxton (2007) — Design Challenge 5

Week 6 (29 Sep)

Prototyping elements — Color — Typography — Layout — Animation — Design Challenge 6

Week 7 (6 Oct)

How Might We (HMW) statements — Ideation — Diverging & Converging — Prototyping Levels — System diagramming — Becker (2020) (Ch 7) — Design Challenge 7

Week 8 (13 Oct)

Accessibility — Design Challenge 8

Week 9 (20 Oct)

Leading a prototyping workshop — Robert Stackowiak (2020) Chapter 2 — Design Challenge 9

Week 10 (27 Oct)

Formative & Summative Testing — Design Challenge 10

Week 11 (3 Nov)

User testing processes

Week 12 (10 Nov)

User testing tools — OBS — Mr Tappy — Eye trackers

Week 13 (17 Nov)

Summary — User testing report is due

Week 14 (24 Nov)

Thanksgiving Break

Week 15 (1 Dec)

Presentations

GRADING

I plan to grade assignments within two weeks of their due date except where circumstances interfere. The grading scale used along with the grade components follow.

- A \geq 90.0%

- B $\geq 80.0\%$ & $< 90\%$
- C $\geq 70.0\%$ & $< 80.0\%$
- D $\geq 60.0\%$ & $< 70.0\%$
- F $< 60.0\%$

Class Attendance and Participation (20%). Your attendance and class participation grade will be calculated by multiplying the numerical assessment of your class participation by the percentage of classes that you attend (with exceptions made for documented, university recognized absences as noted above). Regular attendance and active participation in each class session are critical for receiving a good grade in this course. For example, if you actively participate in each class meeting, you will receive a full letter grade higher than if you were to skip half of the classes or to be half-awake for all of the classes.

Design Challenges (40%). Most weeks, you will submit a design challenge in Canvas.

You will form groups. Each group will be assigned a week to formulate the design challenge for that week and present the design problem to the class. You should draw on problems you experienced during your internships, at work, or an issue you've seen in your daily interactions with artifacts in the world. You will not be required to submit your own designs for the week where you are the creator of the challenge. Instead you will evaluate the designs of the other groups.

Your weekly design challenges will be completed using the design tool of your choosing. To receive full credit, your weekly submission must answer the design challenge as presented. The deliverables will vary from week to week but may be a prototype or a tool used in prototyping. Your concepts are due by Monday by 9pm via Canvas, preferably in both a video of you talking through your solution as well as the solution document. For most weeks, that document can be a link

to a Figma prototype or a Figjam page, but the formulating group may require a different kind of document.

That week's formulating group will then review the submissions and come to class prepared to present a ranked top 4 list that they find the most compelling.

The week's formulating group will provide two documents, (1) the slideshow presentation (in pdf format) of the top four submissions, and (2) a critique of each of the eight submissions. The critique document(s) may be produced in any form but should be delivered as a pdf, like the presentation. If the critique document is provided as a single document, each group's critique should start on a separate page, so that the individual critiques can be shared with just the relevant group.

I'll keep score over the course of the semester and the person with the most top 4 appearances will get...something :)

Course Project (40%). Grade components are:

- 30 percent: choice of solution, did you solve the right problem?
- 40 percent: thoughtfulness of solution, is your solution a good one?
- 30 percent: craft of solution, did you apply your design skills well?

POLICY ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Students who violate University rules on academic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary penalties, including the possibility of failure in the course and/or dismissal from the University. Since such dishonesty harms the individual, all students, and the integrity of the University, policies on academic dishonesty will be strictly enforced. For further information, please visit the Student Conduct and Academic Integrity website at: <http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/conduct>.

ACCOMMODATIONS

Any student with a documented disability (physical or cognitive) who requires academic accommodations should contact the Services for Students with Disabilities area of the Office of the Dean of Students at 471-6259 (voice) or 471-4641 (TTY for users who are deaf or hard of hearing) as soon as possible to request an official letter outlining authorized accommodations.

RELIGIOUS HOLY DAYS

Religious holy days sometimes conflict with class and examination schedules. Sections 51.911 and 51.925 of the Texas Education Code address absences by students and instructors for religious holy days. Section 51.911 states that a student shall be excused from attending classes or other required activities, including examinations, for the observance of a religious holy day, including travel for that purpose. A student whose absence is excused under this subsection may not be penalized for that absence and shall be allowed to take an examination or complete an assignment from which the student is excused within a reasonable time after the absence.

University policy requires students to notify each of their instructors as far in advance of the absence as possible so that arrangements can be made.

INSTRUCTOR ABSENCE

Section 51.925 prohibits the university from discriminating against or penalizing an instructor who is absent from class for the observance of a religious holy day. Proper notice must be given to the department chair. Prior to the begin of classes each semester, the instructor must provide the department

chair a list of classes that will be missed due to observance of a religious holy day. The list must be personally delivered, acknowledged and dated by the chair, or sent via certified mail, return receipt requested.

Consistent with regular university policy, the instructor is responsible for finding a qualified substitute UT Austin instructor for any missed class(es).

PERSONAL PRONOUNS

Professional courtesy and sensitivity are especially important with respect to individuals and topics dealing with differences of race, culture, religion, politics, sexual orientation, gender identity & expression, and nationalities. Class rosters are provided to the instructor with the student's legal name, unless they have added a "chosen name" with the registrar's office, which you can do so here: https://utdirect.utexas.edu/apps/ais/chosen_name/. I will gladly honor your request to address you by a name that is different from what appears on the official roster, and by the pronouns you use (she/he/they/ze, etc). Please advise me of any changes early in the semester so that I may make appropriate updates to my records. For instructions on how to add your pronouns to Canvas, visit <https://utexas.instructure.com/courses/633028/pages/profile-pronouns>. More resources available on the Gender and Sexuality Center's website, <https://www.utgsc.org>.

BASIC NEEDS SECURITY

Any student who faces challenges securing their food or housing and believes this may affect their performance in the course is urged to contact the Dean of Students for support. UT maintains the UT Outpost (<https://deanofstudents.u>

texas.edu/emergency/utoutpost.php) which is a free on-campus food pantry and career closet. Furthermore, please notify the professor if you are comfortable in doing so. This will enable him to provide any resources that he may possess.

MENTAL HEALTH INFORMATION

I urge students who are struggling for any reason and who believe that it might impact their performance in the course to reach out to me if they feel comfortable. This will allow me to provide any resources or accommodations that I can. If immediate mental health assistance is needed, call the Counseling and Mental Health Center (CMHC) at 512-471-3515 or you may also contact Bryce Moffett, LCSW (iSchool CARE counselor) at 512-232-2983. Outside CMHC business hours (8am-5pm, Monday-Friday), contact the CMHC 24/7 Crisis Line at 512-471-2255.

REFERENCES

- Baker, Rebecca. 2017. *Agile UX Storytelling: Crafting Stories for Better Software Development*. New York, NY: Apress. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4842-2997-2>.
- Becker, Christopher Reid. 2020. *Learn Human-Computer Interaction: Solve Human Problems and Focus on Rapid Prototyping and Validating Solutions Through User Testing*. Packt Publishing.
- Buxton, Bill. 2007. *Sketching User Experiences: Getting the Design Right and the Right Design*. San Francisco: Morgan Kaufman.
- Cockton, Gilbert, Marta Lárusdóttir, Peggy Gregory, and Åsa Cajander. 2016. *Integrating User-Centred Design in Agile Development*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

- Cooper, Alan, Robert Reimann, David Cronin, and Christopher Noessel. 2014. *About Face 4.0: The Essentials of Interaction Design*. Indianapolis, IN: Wiley.
- Goodman, Elizabeth, Mike Kuniavsky, and Andrea Moed. 2012. *Observing the User Experience: A Practitioner's Guide to User Research*. Waltham, MA: Morgan Kaufman.
- Greever, Tom. 2020. *Articulating Design Decisions: Communicate with Stakeholders, Keep Your Sanity, and Deliver the Best User Experience*. 2nd ed. O'Reilly Media.
- Holtzblatt, Karen, and Hugh Beyer. 2016. *Contextual Design, Second Edition: Design for Life*. San Francisco, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.
- Holtzblatt, Karen, Jessamyn Burns Wendell, and Shelley Wood. 2005. *Rapid Contextual Design: A How-to Guide to Key Techniques for User-Centered Design*. San Francisco, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.
- Lazar, Jonathan, Jinjuan Heidi Feng, and Harry Hochheiser. 2017. *Research Methods in Human-Computer Interaction, 2nd Ed*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley.
- Matsudaira, Kate. 2019. "Design Patterns for Managing Up." *Commun. ACM* 62 (3): 43–45. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3303878>.
- Patton, Jeff. 2014. *User Story Mapping*. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly Media.
- Robert Stackowiak, Tracey Kelly. 2020. *Design Thinking in Software and AI Projects: Proving Ideas Through Rapid Prototyping*. Apress. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4842-6153-8>.
- Rubin, Jeffrey, and Dana Chisnell. 2008. *Handbook of Usability Testing: How to Plan, Design, and Conduct Effective Tests*. Wiley.
- Shneiderman, Ben. 2017. "Revisiting the Astonishing Growth of Human-Computer Interaction Research." *Computer*,

no. 10: 8–11.

Spiekermann, Erik. 2014. *Stop Stealing Sheep, 3rd Edition*. San Jose, CA: Adobe Press.

Wixon, Dennis. 2003. “Evaluating Usability Methods: Why the Current Literature Fails the Practitioner.” *Interactions* 10 (4): 28–34. <https://doi.org/10.1145/838830.838870>.