



Coursework 2: Evaluation

COMP2044: Human-Computer Interaction (2024-2025)

Matthew Pike

Table of contents

Key Information	1
Task Brief	2
Stage 1: Cognitive Walkthrough	2
Stage 2: User Study	2
Stage 3: System Usability Scale (SUS)	2
Deliverables	2
Group Report	2
Peer Assessment	4
Understanding the Peer Assessment Scale	5
Marking Criteria	5
Academic Integrity and Misconduct	6

Key Information

COMP2044.HCI	Coursework 2: Evaluation
Issue Date	2025-04-07
Due Date	2025-05-08 at 15:00
Weighting	40%
Type	Group-based.
Late Penalty	5% per work day (university standard)
Feedback	15 work days
Feedback Mode	Inline comments and annotated rubric.

Table 1: Key Information for Coursework 2



Task Brief

For this coursework, your group will evaluate a prototype application (APP) developed in Coursework 1. You will be working with the members of your workshop group, which you will find on Moodle. To document your evaluation, your group must produce a report of no more than 3,500 words. This assignment is worth 40% of your final module mark and is designed to simulate a realistic user evaluation experience that you may encounter in future projects or professional settings. The evaluation process consists of three stages, which are detailed below.

Stage 1: Cognitive Walkthrough

In this stage, each group member must perform a “Cognitive Walkthrough” (CW) of **one** other group member’s CW1 prototype. Ensure that each member evaluates a different prototype, and consider the insights gained from the relevant workshop activity when conducting the evaluation. It is for the group to decide which tasks to evaluate, and whether all members will evaluate the same tasks or different ones - but this should be clearly documented in the report.

Stage 2: User Study

Once each group member has completed the Cognitive Walkthrough on a fellow team member’s APP prototype, come together to discuss your findings. As a group, select one prototype for a Cooperative Evaluation. To carry out this evaluation, recruit participants from other groups within the module. Please do not involve participants from outside the module. All participants must complete the consent form found on Moodle.

Stage 3: System Usability Scale (SUS)

Upon finishing the Cooperative Evaluation with a participant, request that they complete the System Usability Scale (SUS) form. Incorporating the SUS results into your analysis will offer an additional data set for evaluation. A template for the SUS form is available on Moodle.

Deliverables

Coursework 2 consists of two deliverables. The first is a group report of 3,500 words. The second deliverable is an individual peer assessment which is compulsory for all group members. Each member must submit a copy of the group report and complete the entire peer assessment form.

Group Report

Submit a single PDF report via the coursework Turnitin submission point on Moodle, ensuring that your report does not exceed 3,500 words. Any words over this limit will not be considered. Your report should include the following sections

- Introduction (~ 200 words)
 - Briefly introduce the purpose of the prototypes



- Outline the research objectives
- Methodology (~ 500 words)
 - Explain the methodology (Cognitive Walkthrough, cooperative evaluation, SUS)
 - Describe your evaluation planning and implementation
- Results (~1,400 words)
 - Identify the prototype chosen for further evaluation and justify the choice (e.g. based on findings).
 - Present the results of the collaborative evaluation and the SUS, including a discussion of the results of stages 2 and 3.
- Discussion (~ 1,400 words)
 - Analyse the findings
 - Summarise key recommendations for improving the design
- References (excluded from word count)
 - There is no set limit for references, but you should include a minimum of 10 academic references.
- Appendices (excluded from word count)
 - Provide evidence of group work
 - Include study notes, SUS responses, etc.
 - Evidence of informed consent from participants

An example template is provided for your reference. Although it is not compulsory to use the template, you must include all the sections outlined in your final report.

When writing your report, follow the scientific writing style as practised in coursework 1 and during the workshop activities. Assume that your reader is an academic with no prior knowledge of the purpose of the APP or the desired outcome of the evaluation. They may also be unfamiliar with the relevant HCI research literature or the techniques used in the evaluation. Therefore, it is important to describe your approach clearly and concisely, including academic references where appropriate. References should be presented and cited using the APA 7 Format (the same referencing we've been using in our workshop activities and coursework 1). Examples of this referencing style are available [on the apa.org website](https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/references/examples)¹. You are encouraged to use [LaTeX](https://www.latex-project.org/)² in combination with [BibTeX](http://www.bibtex.org/)³. [Overleaf](https://www.overleaf.com/)⁴ is a online LaTeX editor that you may find useful when collaborating with your group members.

Each member of the group must submit the group report; failure to do so will result in a zero grade for coursework 2 (for the individual). The Appendices section can be used to include relevant additional evidence and materials, such as images of prototypes, notes taken during the observational evaluation, participant consent forms and so on.

¹APA Style Guidelines - <https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/references/examples>

²LaTeX Typesetting System - <https://www.latex-project.org/>

³BibTeX citation management - <http://www.bibtex.org/>

⁴Overleaf - <https://www.overleaf.com/>



Peer Assessment

All group members are required to complete a peer assessment using Microsoft Forms. Each group will be assigned a unique peer assessment form:

- Group 1 - <https://forms.office.com/r/gWq0qv9tGa>
- Group 2 - <https://forms.office.com/r/TPBNMRpZgj>
- Group 3 - <https://forms.office.com/r/vyRZWmQW2v>
- Group 4 - <https://forms.office.com/r/nBrrAeq1cS>
- Group 5 - <https://forms.office.com/r/HSe6wu5RiU>
- Group 6 - <https://forms.office.com/r/XH62hgYRRZ>
- Group 7 - <https://forms.office.com/r/SFJbsgExu6>



Do not access the peer assessment form of another group

Accessing another group's assessment page is strictly forbidden. Any attempt to submit assessments for other groups will be considered academic misconduct and may result in disciplinary action.

It is compulsory for each member of the group to complete the peer assessment form. Failure to do so will result in a 25% deduction from their individual mark for CW2.

Peer assessments will contribute to the calculation of each individual's mark. A procedure similar to that used for the Year 2 Group Project (GRP) will be adopted. Further information can be found in the GRP Handbook. Group members will assess each other (including themselves) on the following criteria

- Research and information gathering
- Creative input
- Cooperation within the group
- Communication within the group
- Concrete contribution - quality and quantity of tangible contributions to group outputs: writing, evaluating, interpreting and redesigning.
- Attendance at meetings



Peer Assessments are confidential

Please note that peer reviews are confidential. Under no circumstances should you view or request copies of your own or others' peer reviews. The peer review process is designed to be anonymous and confidential, and any attempt to subvert this process will be considered academic misconduct.



Understanding the Peer Assessment Scale

To assess each team member and yourself, complete the provided scale. Keep in mind that your self-evaluation will not be factored into the calculation of your individual final grade.

	None	Lacking	Adequate	Good	Excellent
Research & Information Gathering	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Creative Input	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Co-operation within Group	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communication within Group	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Concrete contribution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attendance at Meetings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Figure 1: Peer Assessment Scale

Use the following guidelines to evaluate each criterion:

- **Adequate** indicates meeting expectations, such as a member who:
 - completed a fair share of the work (9h/week)
 - was reasonable, approachable, and friendly
 - attended most meetings, usually on time, and was absent only with good cause
- **Good** and **Excellent** represent performance above and significantly above this level, respectively
- **Lacking** and **None** represent performance below and significantly below this level, respectively

Keep in mind:

- It's common for a few peers to excel in one or two aspects
- It would be unusual for one of your peers to excel in all aspects
- It would be highly unusual for all of your peers to excel in all aspects
- The Peer Assessment deadline coincides with the main deliverable deadline for this coursework.

! Deciding on the final mark

The Module Convener and the Module Reviewer (another member of academic staff) will carefully check the peer assessments for fairness. If they find discrepancies, they may adjust individual peer assessments or disregard them entirely and award individual marks directly.

Marking Criteria

Your group report will be assessed using a standardised rubric available on the Moodle platform. Each group member will receive an individual mark based on the peer assessment



process described above. The following criteria will be used to assess your project:

Criteria	Weighting
Clear definition of the research aims	10 marks
Accurate and clear description of the methodology	20 marks
Clear presentation of results	20 marks
Discussion of findings in relation to published design guidelines	15 marks
Presentation of key recommendations for improving your design	20 marks
Sensibility of findings and recommendations based on the results you have	15 marks

Table 2: Marking Criteria for Coursework 2

You can expect to receive feedback within 15 working days of the submission deadline. Please note that feedback will not be given during the examination period. Your group will receive written feedback which will be shared with the group via email.

Academic Integrity and Misconduct

All submissions must comply with the University's Academic Misconduct Policy. It is your responsibility to ensure that you are familiar with the policy and that your work meets the required standards.

Please note that the Academic Misconduct Policy has been updated to include a new definition of False Authorship:

False Authorship is where a student is not the sole author of the work they have submitted as their own work. False Authorship is a form of plagiarism but is distinguished by the fact that the student has engaged with an unauthorised or unacknowledged third party and/or software tool to complete an assessment, either in part or whole.

False Authorship can be direct or through a platform or software (such as Course Hero or similar). This may include work produced by another student, an essay mill, a family member or friend, or a tutoring service (such as Chegg, or similar). The use of answers advertised or provided by tutoring services or essay mills is false authorship. As it is the authorship of work that is contested, there is no requirement to prove that the work has been purchased.

False Authorship also occurs where a student has engaged with computer-aided software to complete an assessment, in whole or part, except in cases where this has been permitted by an explicit instruction by the School and/or as part of that assessment. This engagement can be the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) text-generating software (e.g., ChatGPT, Wordtune, chatbots and similar). The submission of work that is generated and/or improved by unpermitted language model software for the purpose of gaining marks will be regarded as false authorship and seen as an attempt to gain an unpermitted academic advantage. For clarity this includes the over-reliance on translation and paraphrasing software (for example Grammarly), including when it is used to conceal the original author or source material.



Source: UoN: Policy on Academic Misconduct⁵

It is your responsibility to ensure that the work you submit is your own and that you are not engaging in any form of academic misconduct. Failure to comply with the Academic Misconduct Policy may result in disciplinary action.

To review the University's Academic Misconduct Policy, please visit the [Quality Manual](#).

⁵University of Nottingham: Policy on Academic Misconduct - <https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/qualitymanual/assessment-awards-and-deg-classification/pol-academic-misconduct.aspx>