

Assignment 1: Stakeholder research, requirements analysis, and design.

Jane Reid & Juan Alvarado

January 2021

In this assignment, you will identify primary stakeholders and other stakeholders for your project. This will help you understand their needs based on the stakeholder's characteristics and the tasks they perform and present an initial design. This assignment is worth 10% of your module mark.

PART 1: Overview of your stakeholder group [15 marks]

Identify a primary stakeholder. An appropriate primary stakeholder is:

- Specific
- Knowable
- Interesting to you

Write an overview (500-750 words) on your stakeholder group, summarising what you know about them.

Grading:

11-15: Good – excellent.

- A good choice of stakeholder (specific, knowable).
- A good summation of their needs.
- Writing focuses on the essential aspects of the group, presents known data concisely.
- Conclusions are credible.

5-10: Satisfactory.

- Stakeholder lacks specificity, or they were hard to research, resulting in inadequate data.

- Does not concisely summarise known data/requirements; is vague.
- Conclusions lack credibility.

0-4: Unsatisfactory.

- Stakeholder choice was inappropriate.
- Known data/requirements absent or inadequate.
- Conclusions not credible.

PART 2: Identify and describe wider stakeholders [15 marks]

List your secondary stakeholders, tertiary stakeholders, and facilitating stakeholders.

Please write a brief (max 100 words) description of each stakeholder group and their position in the interaction context. Who are they and how do they relate to the interaction.

Grading:

11-15: Good – excellent.

- All stakeholder groups accounted for.
- Indicated members are appropriate and complete (no obvious omissions).
- Reasoning for why they belong there is sound.
- Concept of how stakeholders relate to the interaction is credible and realistic.
- Writing is concise and arguments well-formed.

5-10: Satisfactory.

- Stakeholder groups may be underpopulated (major components missing).
- Inadequate reasoning for why members are in stakeholder groups.
- Concept of how stakeholders relate to the interaction lack credibility.
- Writing quality has mistakes.
- Arguments not well-formed/vague.

0-4: Unsatisfactory.

- Stakeholder groups missing.
- Populated with entirely inappropriate members and obvious members missing.

- Reasoning for why stakeholders are in these groups is missing.
- Concept of how the stakeholders relate to the interaction is not credible.
- Writing quality poor.
- Arguments are very poorly formed.

PART 3: Data gathering [25 marks]

- Write 100 words describing the data-gathering technique(s) you used and why.
- Write 500 words summarising the results of your data gathering. What did you find out?

Grading:

18-25: Good - excellent.

- Excellent summary of the data gathering techniques used.
- The group used excellent reasoning for using these techniques. The group used these techniques appropriately.
- Results summary includes credible data, and useful information has been extracted.
- The meaning of this data has been synthesised and useful, credible conclusions have been drawn.
- If there were significant gaps, they applied more research instead of guessing.

10-17: Satisfactory.

- Summary of data gathering techniques used but lacks detail.
- Some reasoning for using these techniques.
- Problems with applying techniques; major errors (bad questions, wrong techniques).
- Results summary includes irrelevant data.
- Conclusions are questionable.
- Meaning of the data has been inadequately synthesised, and conclusions are not credible.
- Gaps in data were not addressed by more research, and there is evidence of guessing or overreach.

< 10: Unsatisfactory.

- Summary of data gathering techniques is absent or does not provide any detail.
- Absent or inadequate reasoning for using stated techniques.
- Techniques were sloppily or badly used (gathered irrelevant data, did not ask actual stakeholders, badly formed/absent questions).
- Results summary is irrelevant.
- Conclusions not credible/incorrect.
- Meaning of the data has not been synthesised, no analysis applied.
- Gaps in data were addressed by guessing/fiction.

PART 4: Requirements development on your primary stakeholder [10 marks]

Consider only your PRIMARY stakeholder. For each of the requirements in the Requirements Development Model (remember, these requirements can be seen as stakeholder characteristics we use to understand them, see lecture 1), consider what you found out from your data gathering. Write 50-100 words for each requirement, based on your data.

Grading:

7-10: Good - excellent.

- All requirements are present.
- All requirement summaries are credible.
- Writing is concise.

4-6: Satisfactory.

- Some requirements missing.
- Some requirements summaries are not credible/incorrect.
- Writing is not concise; lacks precision.

< 4: Unsatisfactory.

- Many (>3) requirements are missing.
- Most/all summaries are not credible/incorrect.
- Writing lacks any precision.

PART 5: Design [25 marks]

Using everything you now know, produce a design.

- a) There should be ONE design, either for phone or tablet. Write a rationale (max 200 words) on why your primary stakeholder would benefit from the design decisions you made.
- b) Create a rendering of your app's first screen (this should not be a loading screen, but the first functional screen that is presented to the person using it). Render this in whatever way allows you to create the most detail. This might be digital (using Photoshop, Illustrator, Inkscape or similar), but doesn't have to be. In the past, beautifully detailed renderings have been created with pencil on paper, cut and paste, and other techniques. This is about communicating the layout, functionality, and aesthetics of your design. You are being evaluated on the clarity and detail of your ideas, and how your design decisions link to what you know about your stakeholder.
- c) Consider the task "Find today's temperature" (you might sketch a task model for this). What does the user have to do for each step? Show each rendering in sequence, briefly explaining what needs to be clicked on, and what happens next (this is sometimes called a Storyboard).
- d) Write a 100-word summary, briefly describing what your app does, and how it benefits your stakeholder.

Grading:

18-25: Good - excellent.

- One design present, in phone or tablet resolution. The rationale for this choice is well-formed and credible.
- Design rendering communicates the interface features with clarity and detail.
- Links to the needs of the primary stakeholder are obvious and reasonable.
- Aesthetics of the design are very good.
- Task for "find today's temperature" is well thought out (even if it means simply opening the app to the first screen – the task doesn't have to be complicated!) The parts of the interface involved are well indicated, and the explanation is clear.
- The summary of benefits to the stakeholder is concise and credible.

10-17: Satisfactory.

- One design present, in phone or tablet resolution. The rationale for this choice is not detailed or credible.

- Design rendering communicates the interface features but lacks some clarity and detail.
- Links to the needs of the primary stakeholder are lacking somewhat in logic or reasoning.
- Aesthetics of the design are adequate – no significant problems but not exceptional.
- Task for "find today's temperature" is vague or incomplete. Active parts of the interface lack clarity.
- The summary of benefits to the stakeholder lacks precision and credibility.

< 10: Unsatisfactory.

- Design is not in phone or tablet resolution. The rationale for this choice is unacceptable.
- Design rendering does not communicate the function with clarity or detail.
- Links to the needs of the primary stakeholder are absent or incorrect.
- Aesthetics of the design are poor.
- Task for "find today's temperature" is not well thought out. The parts of the interface involved are not indicated, and the explanation is not clear.
- The summary of benefits to the stakeholder is vague, imprecise, not credible

PART 6: Project roadmap [10 marks]

Sketch out a road map of how you will achieve what you have proposed, and division of tasks between team members. Identify areas that you see being problematic, such as skills you don't have in the group. Articulate these with a strategy to overcome them.

Grading:

7-10: Good - excellent.

- Clear thought about tasks and requirements is evident, and all group members have been considered
- Areas of weakness are well articulated, and a clear sense of how to find solutions is present.
- Rigour is applied to the timeline – progress is charted, and the milestones are clear.

4-6: Satisfactory.

- Tasks and requirements are not thoroughly considered, or unrealistic.
- All group members have not been considered
- Areas of weakness are vague or imprecise
- Strategy for finding solutions is not adequate
- No thought about progress or milestones is present

< 4: Unsatisfactory.

- Tasks and requirements are very vague
- The group doesn't mention skills within the group.
- Areas of weakness are absent or too vague
- No clear sense of how to find solutions is present.