

CS160 Interactive Prototype #1 Assignment

Grading Guidelines (50 points total)

Problem and Solution Overview (2 points, 1 paragraph)

We awarded the points as follow:

- 1 point – problem statement
- 1 point – solution overview

This section was part of both the individual project proposal and contextual inquiry assignment, so we were somewhat strict when grading this section (for the third time!) in this assignment. Due to the importance of the problem statement to the semester-long project, we will only award partial points if it wasn't clear how the stated problem is indeed a problem. In addition, we will only award partial points for the *overview* if it wasn't clear how the solution relates to the problem or what form (e.g. platform) it took. These are important details that an overview should include.

Tasks (6 points, 1/4 page)

We awarded the points as follow:

- 1 point – description of task #1 (easy)
- 1 point – description of task #2 (medium)
- 1 point – description of task #3 (hard)

- 1 point – do the tasks cover the interesting features of the project?
- 1 point – do the tasks have an appropriate difficulty/complexity specified?
- 1 point – do the tasks altogether form a compelling story for the project?

The last three points above are fairly subjective, so we were lenient in gauging the extent to which the three given tasks met these criteria, and did not require explicit justifications. As explained in sections, the tasks should relate to the problem statement if they are to form a compelling story for the project, and should provide ample coverage of the hi-fi prototype's functionality.

Revised Interface Design (12 points, 1 page plus screenshots/scripts)

We awarded the points as follow:

- 4 points – were appropriate changes made to address the important problems discovered?
- 1 point – are these changes well illustrated with screenshots or scripts?

- 1 point – were the limitations of the lo-fi addressed?
- 1 point – were appropriate constraints from the final target platform considered?
- 1 point – does the design adequately represent the final target platform?
- 1 point – were any non-standard interactions described and justified? (this point was automatically awarded if it's obvious that there were no non-standard interactions)

- 1 point – scenario/storyboard 1
- 1 point – scenario/storyboard 2
- 1 point – scenario/storyboard 3

The major problem that cropped up in this section was that many groups omitted mentioning the limitations of the lo-fi prototype (e.g. difficulty of Wizard of Oz'ing animation), how the interface *design* considered constraints from the final target platform (e.g. screen size), and the various non-standard interaction techniques (if any) applicable to the hi-fi prototypes. These grading criteria were highlighted in the assignment handout, and were covered in section twice.

Prototype Overview and Prototype Proper (15 points, 2 pages)

We awarded the points as follow:

- 1 point – how the tools helped
- 1 point – how the tools did not help
- 2 points – overview of the UI implemented (reference figures or scripts in appendix)

- 1 point – is the prototype accessible, e.g. based on instructions given in README file and copy posted on class Swiki?
- 2 points – can users complete task 1 with the prototype, as in, is prototype working for task 1?
- 2 points – can users complete task 2 with the prototype, as in, is prototype working for task 2?
- 2 points – can users complete task 3 with the prototype, as in, is prototype working for task 3?

- 1 point – what was left out and why? Are they described and justified in the report?
- 1 point – sketches or scripts for unimplemented portions of the interface
- 1 point – does the README file summarize these limitations and any other details needed?
(this point was automatically awarded if it's obvious that the unimplemented functionality do not pertain to the three given tasks)
- 1 point – any Wizard of Oz techniques that are required to make the unimplemented portions work (this point was automatically awarded if it's obvious that the unimplemented functionality do not pertain to the three given tasks)

In section, a student raised a question about the “sketches or scripts for unimplemented portions of the interface.” We clarified that due to the ambiguity, we will grade it as part of this section, and will accept it if reported in either this or the previous section.

A couple of prototypes that were submitted contained bugs. Out of fairness to most groups that beta-tested their prototypes for installation and run-time bugs prior to submission (on the original due date), we decided not to regrade prototypes that were resubmitted (in response to bug alerts from groups performing the heuristic evaluation) with bug fixes. Every group has a responsibility to spend time to test its installation program before submitting it. A prototype with installation and run-time bugs wastes the time of the grader(s) and four students who had to perform heuristic evaluation on it.

Report (15 points, overall)

We awarded the points as follow:

- 1 point – does the report cover all the topics in the outline?
- 1 point – does the organization follow the outline?
- 2 point – are sub-sections used for easy scanning of important parts
- 1 point – does the main portion of the report fall within 4 pages?
- 1 point – good writing

- 3 points – are important figures referenced and placed inline with the text?
- 1 point – did any figure utilize Nielsen's Relevance-Enhanced Image Reduction technique?
- 2 points – is there a complete set of screenshots or scripts in the appendix?
- 3 points – are they clearly annotated?

When determining if “the report cover[s] all the topics in the outline?” we only checked to see if the main sections in the outline were included. We did not deduct points for specific content, as highlighted in the outline, that were omitted since they had been penalized previously in their respective sections.

We enforced the 4-page limit based on the principle that many groups were working within this constraint and no group should be receiving an unfair advantage.

A link to Nielson's homepage that described his Relevance-Enhanced Image Reduction technique was posted on the class newsgroup. We automatically awarded this point to groups that did not apply this technique only if it was not necessary for their screenshots.