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**Assessment Task**

**DESIGN BRIEF AND TERMS OF REFERENCE**

This project aims to research and analyse the UX Strategy for the Solent University Alumni Association (SUAA). A project Gantt chart will be needed to produce a work plan for the 3 K word final report. Weekly progress will be shared in each class session and online. Students will do a case study analysis of the Solent University Alumni Association current

website [https://www.solent.ac.uk/alumni](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.solent.ac.uk%2Falumni&data=04%7C01%7Canthony.basiel%40solent.ac.uk%7C2789547ed0e3420b337308d9880ef1f0%7Cd684e4cd491a4577bf33546478d72e3c%7C0%7C0%7C637690420065216565%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=yk8mFKyQBidv6NN4qXKCnsEzlqgbZMIF9w2NzMzpKHA%3D&reserved=0) and related services / resources. The main university contacts at this time are Mike Toy (SUAA manager) and Mark Humphrys (Marketing Manager). Please coordinate your communication with these staff members so we don’t send too many individual emails. Their support time is limited as our ‘clients’.

This is a summary of the overall assessment tasks:

1. A market research study will be done with at least 1 other university similar to SU.
   1. Conduct a review of the Solent University mission, vision, value etc. statements in light of corporate social responsibility to identify any gaps.
   2. Critically compare this to at least 1 comparable UK university.
   3. Critically compare this website to at least 1 other UK university alumni website. NOTE: figures and tables can be put in the report appendix to save on word count.
2. Review the SUAA website ([https://www.solent.ac.uk/alumni](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.solent.ac.uk%2Falumni&data=04%7C01%7Canthony.basiel%40solent.ac.uk%7C2789547ed0e3420b337308d9880ef1f0%7Cd684e4cd491a4577bf33546478d72e3c%7C0%7C0%7C637690420065216565%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=yk8mFKyQBidv6NN4qXKCnsEzlqgbZMIF9w2NzMzpKHA%3D&reserved=0) ) for UX strategy including the services and resources offered.
3. The data collected and analysed will help inform some recommended changes to the resources e.g. UX designs
4. All ethical guidelines for research and NDA (non-disclosure agreements) or data protection policies will be followed. e.g. consent forms for current Computing students will be used to get primary data on the current website and resources, compared to the student's recommendations.
5. Students will compile short interview questions for Mike and Mark as part of the business and website review process to submit as a group (not individuals).
6. Any surveys or interviews will done with current students (prospective alumni), not with SU graduates due to data privacy regulations.
7. A 3K word summary report will be provided based on last year's assessment to provide consistency as detailed below.

NB: Recommendations will not be implemented. A summary presentation video will be made from student submissions.

The project will be broken into four distinctive parts, which are explained below.

# Part 1 – Introduction to System

Deliverable 1000 Words

Part 1 will be the assimilation of relevant information about the functionality of the system and requirements for the interface based on the type of user and frequency of use and clearly defined business goals. This section aims at what stockholders/shareholders want? An introduction should be provided to introduce your team idea, what solution it solves using context analysis or based on gain and pain model.

Introduction should provide answers to the following questions:

What is the context? Who are the users? What is the system? What is the problem? Why is it important?

Who should benefit from it?

What impact does technology have on that context? What is the feature list comparison of existing systems?

# Part 2 – User Research Analysis

Deliverable 1000 Words

In UX, it is important to understand who the users are and what are their needs. In order to do that you should utilise a variety of UX methods, minimum required:

1. Contextual Interviews - Enable you to observe users in their natural environment, giving you a better understanding of the way users work.
2. Surveys - A series of questions asked to multiple users of your idea.

You should produce a valid list of user groups (Demographics, Geographic, Psychographic and behavioural) attributes table. You must also produce a list of user needs in a form of a table.

# Part 3 – User Journey

Deliverable Poster/Video

At this point, as per part 1 and part 2, you should have two essential UX outcomes available, User Research findings in a form user needs and objectives and a clearly defined business goal. In this section, you are required to produce a fully detailed **user journey** including all the following elements:

1. User Persona (Minimum 2 persona representing two typical user groups)
2. User Scenario (Minimum 2)
3. User Goals
4. Flow of Tasks/Information/Screens/IXDs/Contents/Information Architecture
5. Empathy Mapping
6. Usability Metrics

Make a short video (no more than 5 minutes) to explain these elements.

The web link to the video will need to be included in the final report for Part 3 of the assessment

template.

# Part 4 – Prototype

Deliverable prototype

Part 4 will be the production of a prototype. You are required to produce the prototype interface using an appropriate prototyping tool. Each team member is responsible for ensuring that their design area is prototyped. Populate your interface prototype with example data sufficient to demonstrate the prototypes functionality.

1. <https://gomockingbird.com/home>
2. <https://www.fluidui.com/>
3. <http://www.foreui.com/>
4. <https://www.uxpin.com/>
5. <http://www.hotgloo.com/>
6. <https://moqups.com/>
7. <http://www.justinmind.com/>

You will be required to demonstrate your software prototype in your normal Tutorial, times to be advised during class by the unit tutor. Please make sure that your prototype is accessible online. Make sure that when you chose the prototyping tool to consider whether it could be exported and extracted for SOL submission. Alternatively, a web link of the prototype needs to be valid for at least 90 days.

# Part 5 – Usability Testing

Deliverable 1000 Words

Part five will be the usability testing. As part of your interface implementation process, you will have to test your interface. Your will be responsible for what UX or Usability testing you carrying out, and accordingly, design the test and have it approved by your tutor. You should recruit participants to test the project, with predefined demographical criteria, you will be responsible to bring them to the lab and test your interface. Data analysis of this part should inform the final design, and this should be documented in 1000 words report supported with heat maps and gaze plots.

Usability testing metrics:

* + Layout: Inability to detect something users need to find; Aesthetic problems; Unnecessary Information.
  + Terminology: Unable to understand the terminology.
  + Feedback: User does not receive relevant feedback or it is inconsistent with what the user expects.
  + Comprehension: Inability to understand the instructions given to users on the site.
  + Data Entry: Problems with entering information.
  + Navigation: Problems with finding users way around the test site/system/software.

**Assessment criteria**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **F** |
| **Analysis of User experience requirements, usability planning & design (ref L.O. K1,C1,P1)** | | | | |
| Able to critically analyse UX problem and conduct a thorough analysis, plan & design of a development problem, select effectively between different alternatives and provide justification in the context of problem and in the light of existing HCI theory.  To include: User analysis, task analysis, screen designs, windows hierarchy diagrams etc. More complete designs will include establishment of usability requirements for subsequent evaluation. | Good understanding of UX analysis techniques and methodologies evidenced by set of UX analytical artefacts. Able to apply a suitable, logical series of steps effectively and consistently in providing a solution to a usability & interaction/ software development problem.  To include: User analysis, task analysis, screen designs, windows hierarchy diagrams. | Able to recognise a UX  research issues and apply a series of steps in providing a solution to a  usability & interaction  development problem.  However, analysis or  design may be weak in  parts or use of the  methodology inconsistent.  To include: User analysis,  task analysis, screen  designs, windows hierarchy  diagrams. | Can identify some key elements of the HCI problem and plan a set of actions to achieve that task based upon a given method. Although sufficient has flaws in elements and/or actions, and/or method. Analysis has the minimum required elements that exceed the threshold. | Identification,  analysis, planning of  a poor standard  which does not meet  or address problem  area. Does not reach  required threshold.  Doesn’t include UX  artefact. |
| **Implementation of Design and Evaluation (ref L.O. K1,C1)** | | | | |
| Able to produce a usable and robust interface with fully functional components from a given specification fully informed by evaluation.  Demonstrates exceptional skill in the use of the visual development environment. Comprehensive and thorough evaluation and usability testing. | Can implement a design spec. in full, within a visual environment well-informed by evaluation while respecting good professional HCI principles and practice. Some robust usability evaluation / testing. | Can implement an HCI problem solution from a design specification informed by evaluation. The specification may not be implemented in full and/or the system may not be sufficiently robust. Some evaluation / testing will have been carried out. | Can apply visual environment design tools  and techniques in solving a structured and/or user  related problem informed by evaluation. However, the solution may be partial or may employ only a subset of the appropriate techniques. Evaluation superficial, marginal testing. | Does not reach required threshold. Implementation & evaluation inadequate. |
| **Identification and appraisal of key areas of work (ref L.O. C1,P1)** | | | | |
| Able to define and conduct a rigorous critique of key areas in the context of very clearly defined HCI issues and to evaluate the solution and the solution strategy with reference to existing theory. Able to assess the implications of adopting alternative solution strategies | Able to define and reflect upon key areas in the context of well- defined HCI issues and provide a critical assessment of actions taken. Able to identify alternative solution strategies. | Able to define and reflect  on key areas in the context of recognized HCI issues.  Some solid critical  evaluation against original  requirements though this  could be extended. | Able to describe and partly reflect on some key  elements within the HCI  area. Definition and critical evaluation is superficial. | Does not reach  required threshold.  Identification &  appraisal of a poor  standard which fails  to reach required  threshold. |
| **Knowledge and Understanding & Contribution (ref L.O. C1,T1)** | | | | |
| Demonstrates a detailed recognition and knowledge of theory & practice in the context of human digital interaction and an in-depth identification and understanding of oncepts. Has the ability to synthesize and apply information in the solution of a problem in conjunction with team. Makes a full well managed & positive contribution to work produced by group. Is able to reflect fully on how contribution is made with fully referenced clear example artefacts. | Comprehensive overall understanding of issues & practice in the context of human digital interaction with a software model. Has read around the subject and is able to integrate and organise information. Has clearly worked with the team and made a significant contribution to group/team work. Able to reflect on how contribution is made with referenced examples. | Demonstrates familiarity with issues and practice in the context of human- digital interaction with a software model. Reasonable familiarity with recommended reading. Some gaps in significant areas. Contribution to group is acceptably managed with some gaps in depth and breadth. Written reflection of contribution is constructed clearly with some gaps and few example artefacts which may not be clearly referenced. | Satisfactory understanding and identification of HCI issues, design capabilities , evaluation issues and functionally of the interface and software model but lacking in depth and breadth. Minor contribution to group. Poor written reflection on work contributed to group with little or no example artefacts, poor referencing. | Does not reach  required threshold.  Inaccuracies /  omissions in areas of  theory & practice may  be substantial with  irrelevancies.  Struggles or fails to  engage with  concepts, issues  within HCI. Very  little or no reflection  on contribution with  no example artefacts. |
| **Presentation & planning (ref L.O. C1,P1,T1)** | | | | |
| Comprehensive, detailed,  coherent, & consistent  throughout with no errors of rationale reasoning or fact, Very well planned. | Provides a coherent  clear well planned  whole. Consistent in  rationale, reasoning,  Planning. | Provides a coherent style  and structure for the  subject in hand with some  structural and information  defects. Well planned. | Meets the basic uidelines  for a given presentation and presentational style.  Evidence of planning. | Does not reach required threshold. Aspects substantially unclear, incoherent or missing |

**Learning Outcomes**

This assessment will enable students to demonstrate in full or in part the learning outcomes identified in the Module descriptors.

# Late Submissions

Students are reminded that:

1. If this assessment is submitted late i.e. within 5 working days of the submission deadline, the mark will be capped at 40% if a pass mark is achieved;
2. If this assessment is submitted later than 5 working days after the submission deadline, the work will be regarded as a non-submission and will be awarded a zero;
3. If this assessment is being submitted as a referred piece of work then it must be submitted by the deadline date; any Refer assessment submitted late will be regarded as a non-submission and will be awarded a zero.

[https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-](https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/2o-assessment-principles-regulations-temporary-amendments-for-covid-19-contingency-plans.pdf) [handbook/2o-assessment-principles-regulations-temporary-amendments-for-covid-19-](https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/2o-assessment-principles-regulations-temporary-amendments-for-covid-19-contingency-plans.pdf) [contingency-plans.pdf](https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/2o-assessment-principles-regulations-temporary-amendments-for-covid-19-contingency-plans.pdf)

# Extenuating Circumstances

The University’s Extenuating Circumstances procedure is in place if there are genuine circumstances that may prevent a student submitting an assessment. If students are not 'fit to study’, they can either request an extension to the submission deadline of 5 working days or they can request to submit the assessment at the next opportunity (Defer). In both instances students must submit an EC application with relevant evidence. If accepted by the EC Panel there will be no academic penalty for late submission or non-submission dependent on what is requested. Students are reminded that EC covers only short term issues (20 working days) and that if they experience longer term matters that impact on learning then they must contact the Student Hub for advice.

Please find a link to the EC policy below:

[https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-](https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/2p-extenuating-circumstances.pdf) [handbook/2p-extenuating-circumstances.pdf](https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/2p-extenuating-circumstances.pdf)

# Academic Misconduct

Any submission must be students’ own work and, where facts or ideas have been used from other sources, these sources must be appropriately referenced. The University’s Academic Handbook includes the definitions of all practices that will be deemed to constitute academic misconduct. Students should check this link before submitting their work.

Procedures relating to student academic misconduct are given below:

[https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/4l-](https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/4l-student-academic-misconduct-procedure.pdf) [student-academic-misconduct-procedure.pdf](https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/4l-student-academic-misconduct-procedure.pdf)

# Ethics Policy

The work being carried out by students must be in compliance with the Ethics Policy. Where there is an ethical issue, as specified within the Ethics Policy, then students will need an ethics release or an ethical approval prior to the start of the project.

The Ethics Policy is contained within Section 2S of the Academic Handbook: [https://staff.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/2s-](https://staff.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/2s-solent-university-ethics-policy.pdf) [solent-university-ethics-policy.pdf](https://staff.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/2s-solent-university-ethics-policy.pdf)

# Grade marking

The University uses a letter grade scale for the marking of assessments. Unless students have been specifically informed otherwise their marked assignment will be awarded a letter grade. More detailed information on grade marking and the grade scale can be found on the portal and in the Student Handbook.

[https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-](https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/2o-annex-3-assessment-regulations-grade-marking-scale.docx) [handbook/2o-annex-3-assessment-regulations-grade-marking-scale.docx](https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/2o-annex-3-assessment-regulations-grade-marking-scale.docx)

# Guidance for online submission through Solent Online Learning (SOL)

<http://learn.solent.ac.uk/onlinesubmission>