

Assignment 3: Evaluation

Jane Reid & Juan Alvarado

February 2021

In this final assignment, you will evaluate the app you have built. You will perform this analysis using **Heuristic Evaluation**, and propose improvements based on your findings. This assignment is worth 10% of your module mark.

PART 1: Summary of your evaluation. [10 marks]

Write a paragraph summarising what you did, what you found, and what you suggest. It should be cohesive and concise. **Write this part last!**

Max. word count: 200 words

Grading:

7-10: Good – excellent.

- Summary of your evaluation is concise.
- Activities, findings and re-design suggestions are effectively communicated.

3-6: Satisfactory.

- Summary of your evaluation is the right length but doesn't contain enough information or is somewhat vague.
- One part missing from the summary.

0-2: Unsatisfactory.

- Summary of your evaluation is the wrong length and doesn't communicate the activities and results, is completely vague.

PART 2: Evaluation Process [15 marks]

Write about 300 words describing how you carried out your evaluation.

Grading:

11-15: Good – excellent.

- Process is well described and complete.
- Activities described are heuristic evaluation being carried out correctly.

5-10: Satisfactory.

- Process description is somewhat incomplete or vague.
- Process as described contains minor errors/omissions.

0-4: Unsatisfactory.

- Process description is entirely vague or lacks major components.
- Process as described contains major errors/omissions.

PART 3: Findings [25 marks]

After you have done your evaluation, collate the results and tell us the problems you found - what heuristics do they violate, and what are the severity ratings? Tables can really help to organise findings from multiple evaluators, so they're cohesive.

Your job in this section is to make sense of the evaluation for the reader credibly and understandably. Let us know what your results mean and why. You've gathered data during your evaluation, now synthesise it and tell us what it means, and why.

This section should be very well organised and should include screenshots to illustrate your findings. **Don't make your assessor imagine what you mean or expect that they'll dig through your code or start up your app - they're relying on you to communicate it to them.**

Excluding tables, this section should be about 500 words, but the amount of space you need very much depends on your app. Aim to be thorough and well-organised but as concise as possible.

Grading:

18-25: Good - excellent.

- Findings demonstrate a thorough evaluation process was undertaken.
- Findings are collated and very well-organised, easy to read and understand.
- Screenshots illustrate problems.
- Violated heuristics are stated, along with severity ratings, and are credible.

9-17: Satisfactory.

- Findings demonstrate the process was undertaken but lacked rigour.
- Findings are collated but not very well organised.
- Some screenshots missing.
- Violated heuristics are stated with severity ratings but are incorrect or not credible.

0-8: Unsatisfactory.

- Findings demonstrate process was not carried out correctly and lack rigour.
- Findings are not well organised, or incomplete.
- No screenshots.
- Violated heuristics and/or severity ratings are missing or not credible.

PART 4: Proposed improvements [50 marks]

Based on your evaluation, propose improvements to your app.

You will be marked on the following:

- How appropriate these changes are for your stakeholder?
- How in-depth your thinking is in your proposed solutions. Saying “It needs a menu” isn’t enough - what kind of menu? Where is it? What information will it hold? How will it help your stakeholder? What will it look like? How will it work?

The number of proposals for improvement is up to you. As a benchmark, consider doing three and each one (excluding labels and notes on diagrams) to be a maximum of 250 words. Remember: Show, don’t just tell - think about how you can make your reader picture what you mean and really understand it. Most people who read your work may be very technical but aren’t experts in your field - you’re the expert, and it’s your job to communicate clearly and convincingly.

Grading:

36-50: Good - excellent.

- Thorough description of improvements that are understandable for the reader.
- Improvements serve the stakeholder and address the problems found.
- Screenshots/diagrams clearly illustrate the improvement.

16-35: Satisfactory.

- Improvements are present but not well described, lack illustration, or do not entirely address the problem found.
- Improvements lack consideration of the stakeholder.
- Screenshots are missing or incomplete, or lack description.

0-15: Unsatisfactory.

- Improvements are not well described or are not understandable.
- Improvements do not address the problems found.
- Improvements do not consider the stakeholder.
- No screenshots or illustrations at all.