

CSC8022 – Human-Computer Interaction

Coursework 2 – Report (Weighting 100% of module mark)

Title: Report

Description: In this coursework there are two (2) components.

Part 1 – write a summary of the history of HCI and its importance to contemporary computing (1000 words max).

Part 2 – conduct and report a usability evaluation of an app of your choice. You must correctly use the Cooperative Evaluation method. (1000 words max)

Part 1 - A summary of the history of HCI and its importance to contemporary computing (1000 words max).

You are expected to plan and write a 1000-word **report** that critically explores the history of HCI and its importance to a particular aspect of contemporary computing.

You will select a particular area of contemporary computing to focus your writing on. For example:

- AI and Machine Learning in home or workplace
- Social Media
- Smart Cities
- Platform Economies
- Health technologies
- Or something of your choosing

Your report could focus on methods, techniques, or concepts from HCI as well as technical and design aspects. Either way, you will use the range of literature – including key concepts, theory, tools, and case studies, to develop your report that **demonstrate that you understand how interactive technologies have evolved over time**. You may also consider the opportunities and challenges for your chosen aspect of contemporary computing, focusing on the importance of HCI going forward into the future. The report should:

- i. Introduce an element of contemporary computing and its relevance to HCI.
- ii. Describe the area of focus and its impact in the world.
- iii. Provide a brief history of HCI as a background to this aspect of computing and evaluate the impact of HCI on it now.
- iv. Conclude with a summary of this part of your report highlighting the key points and/or arguments set out.

The report should utilise external sources (e.g., grey literature, academic articles, news articles, reports, etc.) to develop analysis and make critical points about your chosen element of computing.

The report will be created for a general audience, avoiding jargon and technical language where possible, and will be expected to clearly demonstrate understanding and applications of key concepts of HCI as they relate to your chosen topic.

Format: Reports should use the template provided. Do not include your name anywhere on the document.

Marks available: 100

Submission details: Coursework is to be submitted as an MS Word doc (e.g. .docx) file, on NESS.

Deadline: Friday 23rd February 2024

Word limit: for whole coursework is 2000 words, not including section or table headings in report template.

Under the word limit	No Penalty: <i>In not making use of the full word count, students may have self-penalised their work. If students have been able to achieve the requirements of the assessment component using fewer words than allocated, they will not be penalised.</i>
Up to 10% over word limit	No Penalty: <i>Situation flagged by tutor in feedback but over-run is tolerated and no deduction is made from the final mark for the affected component.</i>
More than 10% over the word limit	Deduction of marks: <i>10% of the total marks available for the affected component shall be deducted from the assessment mark.</i> <i>For clarity: a piece of work which would have scored 65% for that component but that has a word count greater than 10% of the prescribed word limit will be allocated 55%; a piece of work which would have scored 45% for that component but that has a word count greater than 10% of the prescribed word limit will be allocated 35%.</i>

Contact: Any questions about the coursework please contact me david.kirk@newcastle.ac.uk

Marking Criteria: See tables below.

Part 1 – History and contemporary relevance of HCI (50 marks available)

Marking Criteria: The following grade descriptor is used for marking part 1 of the coursework – which is more essay like. The descriptions for each category are intended as a ‘best fit’. It is inevitable that responses will have characteristics of more than one of the descriptions, or that not all aspects of any one description are met, in which case academic judgement is used to assign a mark based on the overall quality of the work. Once a grade is selected it will then be divided by 50% to give a **mark out of 50** for this component of the coursework.

Class	Regular Grade Boundaries	Criteria
Distinction	90-100	A brilliant piece of work of outstanding quality and innovation. Has total control of all relevant material. Shows outstanding insight and an ability to structure and synthesise material. Work of the highest order. The candidate could be expected to achieve no more. Expression / style / grammar outstanding.

Distinction	80-89	An outstanding piece of work. Has total control of relevant material and shows an excellent synthesis of factual and conceptual components. Work of a very high order. Expression/style/grammar excellent.
Distinction	70-79	An excellent piece of work. High level of understanding of all relevant material with excellent, relevant use of referencing and examples. Communicates clearly and effectively using a coherent structure showing insight and perceptiveness. A commendable degree of academic originality. Expression/style/grammar excellent.
Merit	65-69	A very good piece of work. Demonstrates all the qualities of 60-64 level essay to a higher degree of development. Evidence of good background reading beyond the materials suggested. Sustained argument throughout.
Merit	60-64	A good piece of work. Shows a firm grasp of the majority of the relevant material. Argues well and effectively. Is able to criticise and evaluate material. Well-structured and shows evidence of wider background reading. Correctly and appropriately referenced. Some evidence of originality of thought. Expression/style/grammar good.
Pass	55-59	A competent piece of work which shows reasonable understanding of the material and presents it satisfactorily with appropriate examples and referencing. Structure is apparent and there is a coherent (though possibly weak) argument with adequate conclusion. Evaluative/critical /analytical skills present but not highly developed. No obvious weaknesses except a lack of originality. Expression/style/grammar moderately good.
Pass	50-54	An adequate piece of work which shows some structure, relevant use of examples and evidence of background reading. Some limited referencing. Limited evidence of independent thought and the development of a substantiated argument. Conclusions not well developed. Expression/style/grammar adequate.
Fail	45-49	Marginal fail. Argument obscure, weak or unbalanced. Only partially relevant. Has major omissions. Some understanding, reflection, structure and referencing. Partially successful attempt to use relevant examples and facts. Some reading. Conclusions weak. Expression/style/grammar limited.
Fail	40-44	Clear fail. Some relevant material, few or no relevant examples. Little or no attempt to relate this to the question. Very little reading. Many unsubstantiated remarks. Naïve – <i>i.e.</i> simplistic and lacks control / awareness of the subject material and reflective thought. Referencing poor. Limited understanding. Lacks a structure. Material not well organised. Expression/style/grammar weak.
Fail	34-39	Clear fail. Little or no reading at an appropriate level. Some material of relevance but with major omissions and errors. Generally unsatisfactory but with redeeming features. <i>e.g.</i> some evidence of preparation, some limited understanding, some reflective thought. Expression/style/grammar poor.
Fail	30-34	Unsatisfactory. Lacking evidence of preparation, evaluative or reflective skills. Largely irrelevant. Little or no understanding.

		Expression / style / grammar / presentation very poor. Hardly any, or no, evidence of reading / organisation.
Fail	16-29	Wholly unsatisfactory, little or no evidence of preparation, analytical or evaluative skills. No evidence of understanding of the material or ability to structure or present material. Hastily thrown together. Presentation poor. Expression/style/grammar extremely poor
Fail	0-15	Very little material; or irrelevant or incomprehensible material.

Part 2 – Usability Evaluation (50 marks available)

Marking Criteria:

Report form correctly completed (5 marks)

- A – Excellent, all elements correctly completed
- B – Good completion of form fields – with occasional omissions
- C – Mistakes present in most areas of form
- D – Large areas of the form missing / left incomplete
- E – Report form not used

Executive summary (10 marks)

- A – Excellent / insightful summary of key issues found in the analysis and the major fixes required
- B – Good summary of key issues found, lacking in either the summary of issues or detail of fixes
- C – Average summary of the issues, maybe missing points of value or obvious fixes
- D – Weak summary of the issues, some points made but hard to follow, not clearly written, missing issues or fixes or both
- E – Attempt to provide a summary but largely absent and/or incoherent

User test details (10 marks)

- A – Excellent, complete and highly detailed description of the study details
- B – Very good description of the study details, lacking or improvable in some small area
- C – Average description of the study details, possibly with some significant omission
- D – Weak description of the study details that is hard to follow
- E – Attempt to provide study details but largely or completely absent and/or incoherent

Evaluation results (25 marks)

- A – Excellent observations brilliantly documented with appropriate and justified severity ratings
- B – Good observations of usability issues, with clear documentation and severity ratings present
- C – Average observations of user issues, with some problems with description and/or documentation, severity ratings partial or missing
- D – Weak observations, hard to follow or understand, documentation poor or missing, no severity ratings
- E – No user issues documented, or some present but too poorly described to follow and understand, little or no documentation.