CS160 Contextual Inquiry Assignment

Grading Guidelines (55 points total)

<u>Preamble (5 points)</u>

Not every team followed instructions on the assignment handout, e.g. turning in two hard copies, posting their assignments online and giving us the URL (despite a reminder on the newsgroup), etc. We added 5 points to the grading guidelines to emphasize that it *is* important to adhere to the client's instructions when carrying out a project in the real world, when submitting a tender document, when turning in a conference/journal paper, etc. and to seek clarification *ahead of time* in case of doubt.

We awarded the 5 points as follow:

1 point –   two hard copies (this time, we awarded this point to groups that turned in only one hard copy of the storyboard sketches; in future, you should make photocopies of non-electronic material)

1 point –   URL to online copy (this time, we awarded this point to groups that emailed soft copies to us)

1 point –   name and role(s) of each group member

1 point –   overall appearance and neatness of report, and consistency of typesetting (we wanted to emphasize the importance of turning in a professional report; most group's assignment was at least fairly ok, but some have room for improvement)

1 point –   other (many groups had this point deducted because their storyboards exceeded the 6-page limit, contrary to the instructions on the assignment handout)

Please also include your group number on future assignments. No points were deducted this time because it wasn't specified on this assignment's handout.

<u>User group (4 points, one long or 3 short paragraphs)</u>

We awarded the 4 points as follow:

1 point –   rationale behind choice of target customers (not every group stated this, even though it was clearly indicated on the assignment handout; please DO NOT make such oversights in future)

1 point –   background, likes/dislikes and priorities of customer 1

1 point –   background, likes/dislikes and priorities of customer 2

1 point –   background, likes/dislikes and priorities of customer 3

In addition, we took off 1 point if the customers interviewed were not representative of the target users as indicated in the problem statement, to stress that it is extremely important to choose appropriate interviewees. Similarly, this point was deducted if there was no attempt to justify the choice of trivial customers, especially Cal students. This choice is reasonable only if your project specifically targets Cal students, e.g. for educational applications.

Problem and solution overview (2 points, 1 paragraph)

We awarded the 2 points as follow:

1 point –   problem statement
1 point –   solution overview

Due to the importance of the problem statement to the semester-long project, we awarded 0 point for the problem statement if it wasn't clear why the stated problem is indeed a problem. We were especially strict on this part because it was a weakness that surfaced on some individual project proposals, and shouldn't be repeated by now. In addition, we took off ½ point if it wasn't clear how the solution is relevant to the problem or what form it took.

Contextual inquiry interview descriptions and results (10 points, 1 page)

We awarded the 10 points as follow:

4 points –   summary of contextual inquiry process, with demonstration of understanding and/or application of the context, partnership, interpretation and focus principles, and how the interview process was designed for the needs of the specific situation
1 point –   description of environment where contextual interviews were performed
3 points –   identification of common tasks and themes
2 points –   identification of uncommon tasks, events, etc. and their rationales

Task analysis questions (10 points, ¾ page)

We were extremely flexible and lenient in grading this section, since the eleven task analysis questions had to be answered in ¾ page. ☺

Of the eleven task analysis questions, we picked ten that were most relevant to each project, and awarded up to 1 point to each question. ½ point may be deducted for each task analysis question if it could have been but was not backed up with details, evidence or examples from the contextual interviews, or if it wasn't clear that the contextual interview results led logically to them.

Analysis of new and existing tasks (12 points, 1 page)

We awarded the 12 points as follow:

1 point –   analysis of easy task 1
1 point –   analysis of easy task 2
2 points –   analysis of moderate task 1
2 points –   analysis of moderate task 2
3 points –   analysis of difficult task 1
3 points –   analysis of difficult task 2

We were fairly lenient in grading this section, since we do not expect a thorough analysis of six tasks in one page. But we were especially strict in awarding points (or the lack of) for solutions that simply *stated* the tasks without *analyzing* them (½ point for each task stated without analysis), because the same weakness surfaced in several individual project proposals, and should not be repeated at this stage. I had stressed this point in sections too. Analytical writing can be difficult if you haven't done enough of it, so come see us during office hours if you would like some help.

Interface design (12 points, 3 pages)

We awarded the 12 points as follow:

1.5 points –   functionality of artifact
1.5 points –   description of user interface (we were lenient here and did not take off points if a sketch was not provided with the textual description)
1.5 points –   design rationale(s)
2.5 points –   description + storyboard for scenario 1
2.5 points –   description + storyboard for scenario 2
2.5 points –   description + storyboard for scenario 3

We were somewhat strict in deducting points for scenarios that were not concrete and appeared to be extracts from a user's manual. You should understand that a scenario is meant to be a concrete description that *demonstrates* how the interface is used in a given situation, not to *instruct* someone on how to use the interface. We also deducted ½ point for each task that did not cover the easy-moderate-difficult continuum of task difficulty, since it was specifically stated in the assignment handout that scenarios be developed for one task of each difficulty level. We were, however, very lenient in grading the scenarios and storyboards if they were readable.