Student Name		
Group	**Marking Guide**	
Instructions	**0 = Missing** **1 = Low** **2 = Mid** **3 = High** **Some elements are given marks out of a number other than three to make it easier to mark based on the number of deliverables. This guide is just an example.**	MAX MARK
High Fidelity Prototype - Overall		**10**
2 screens per group member	**Low**: Number of screens provided is under the minimum required, home screen is not included, login screen is included. **Mid**: Minimum required screens, but lacking variety or consistency. Home screen is not included or login screen is included. **High**: Correct number of screens provided depicting variety of functionality, including home screen, with login screen omitted.	
Requirements (relevant to app's intended purpose)	**Low:** Unclear if or how requirements have been implemented. **Mid**: Only one requirement has been implemented or two have been implemented poorly (ie. violating design principles). **High**: Two requirements have been implemented well.	
Layer Depth	**Low:** All designs are only one layer deep. **Mid:** Few designs are more than one layer deep. **High**: Most or all designs are at least two layers deep.	
High Fidelity Prototype - Design		**20**
Navigation	**Low**: No interactive navigation present **Mid**: Navigation design is unintuitive - not clear how to reach some layers. **High**: Navigation allows all layers to be reached with ease.	
Aesthetics	**Low:** Visual design is relatively low in fidelity. **Mid**: Visual design applies design principles to achieve good consistency. **High**: Visual design applies a design style comprehensively to be representative of a real app.	
Accessibility	**Low:** Multiple and/or severe accessibility issues/meets no disability/impairment needs. **Mid**: A few accessibility issues/ meeting few disability/impairment needs. **High:** No or only minor accessibility issues meeting several various disability/impairment needs. At least 3 accessibility guidelines met.	
High Fidelity Prototype - Report		**20**
Implementation/Design Process	**Low:** No reflection on the design process. **Mid**: Very little or only vague reflection on the design process. **High:** Meaningful reflection on the design process..	
1 Guideline/Principle per Screen	**Low:** Some screens are missing guidelines/principles or guidelines/principles are applied and justified incorrectly. **Mid:** Most screens have guidelines/principles but a few are applied and justified incorrectly. **High:** All screens have guidelines/principles which are applied and justified correctly.	
1 change per group member	**Low:** No changes have been suggested/provided. **Mid:** Changes suggested are mostly superficial/insignificant and/or little justification is provided. **High:** All changes are significant/meaningful and have been justified based on theories/principles.	

Discussion of Application of Evaluation Findings to Prototype	**Low:** No or very little discussion of how the evaluation findings could be applied to their prototype. **Mid:** Some or vague discussion of how evaluation findings could be applied to the prototype. **High:** Meaningful discussion of how evaluation findings could be applied to a prototype.	
Group discussion of 3 most severe violations	**Low:** No or very little discussion of the group's 3 most severe violations and/or no recommendations given to fix them (or recommendations are given but are unsuitable and/or not explained or justified). **Mid:** Discussion of 3 most severe violations is present but superficial. Recommendations for fixes are superficial and/or are explained/justified but in limited detail. **High:** Thorough discussion of the 3 most severe violations. Recommendations for fixes are meaningful and justified well.	
Discussion of Similarities/Differences	**Low:** Few similarities and differences discussed, or discussed vaguely. **Mid:** Some similarities and differences discussed but with no reasoning or reflection. **High:** Major similarities and differences discussed with further reasoning/reflection.	
Report Introduction and Conclusion	**Low:** Introduction and conclusion provide little useful context. **Mid:** Introduction and conclusion largely re-iterates information from other deliverables. **High:** Introduction and conclusion provides context and reflection about process and outcomes	
Presentation	**Low:** Multiple grammatical and/or formatting errors, no title page or table of contents. **Mid:** A few grammatical and/or formatting issues, either title page or table of contents is missing. **High:** No or very few grammatical and/or formatting issues, title page and table of contents.	
Heuristic Evaluation		**50**
Neilsen's Heuristics Addressed	**Low:** Very few Neilsen's Heuristics are addressed and/or most are applied incorrectly or vaguely.Few or no screenshots are provided as evidence and/or no screenshots are annotated. **Mid:** Neilsen's Heuristics have been addressed but some applied incorrectly or vaguely. Screenshots are provided as evidence but many are not annotated. **High**: Neilsen's Heuristics have all been applied correctly. Screenshots are provided as evidence and are annotated.	
Design Choice Justifications (for compliances)	**Low:** No or little justification for how design choices create compliance with Neilsen's Heuristics. **Mid:** Some or unclear justification given for the design's compliance with Neilsen's Heuristics. **High:** Meaningful justification given for the design's compliance with Neilsen's Heuristics.	
Severity ratings and recommendations (for violations)	**Low:** No classifications are given and/or no justification is given for classifications. No or few recommendations are given or recommendations are irrelevant/unsuitable. **Mid:** Classifications are provided but many are not justified or explained clearly. Recommendations are explained vaguely and/or have been suggested without consideration of better alternatives. **High:** Classifications for all successes and violations are provided and justified. Recommendations are explained clearly and are meaningful/appropriate solutions to the problem.	

Individual Evaluation Summary Tables - Presentation	**Low:** Summary table incomplete, or unclear due to presentation issues. **Mid:** Summary table complete, there are some formatting or clarity issues. **High:** Summary table is well formatted and clear/easy to understand.	
Introduction and Conclusion	**Low:** Introduction and/or conclusion are missing. **Mid**: Introduction and/or conclusion are present but have no meaningful reflection on findings of evaluation. **High:** Introduction and conclusion are present and have meaningful reflection on evaluation findings.	
PENALTY		**0**
How many days late?	10% penalty per day or part thereof, up to a maximum of seven days. Submissions more than seven days after the due date receive a mark of zero and may not receive feedback.	**0**
TOTAL		**100**