Dr. Genovefa Kefalidou
Module Convenor for CO2104

CO2104: User Interface (UI) Design and Evaluation

Coursework 1 RESIT: Annotated Bibliography

Topic for your Annotated Bibliography:

"Write an Annotated Bibliography for 10 research papers that published results from studies that used the method of Participatory Design in their research"

Submission Deadline: **Thursday 20th August 2020, 16:59**

Please submit via the module's Blackboard page using the submission link titled "CW1 - RESIT - Submission Link Annotated Bibliography"

CW1 weight: **30%**

Total word length: 3,000 words (i.e. 300-word paragraphs x 10 papers)

Intended Learning Outcomes:

- Be exposed to and be able to summarise, assess and reflect on theories, principles, methods and practices of Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) and User Interface (UI) Design

Dr. Genovefa Kefalidou
Module Convenor for CO2104

- Understand how design methods are applied in research practice and within real-life projects

Notes/Requirements for Submission:

- **Each Annotated Bibliography** (i.e. the written paragraph for each of the 10 papers) **must be 300 words long** – there is an allowance of +-10% for the length of each but please remember that 300 words is not long for summarising, reflecting and assessing a single paper so if your annotated bibliography for each paper is less than the requested 300 word length then possibly this means that you do not cover really the key things that the paper says
- **Please use your own words to write the Annotated Bibliographies.** Ensure you rephrase what the authors of the papers say. **If you do not do this then you run the high risk of plagiarism. Plagiarism should be avoided at any cost as it is an offence.** For more information on plagiarism and for an online course please visit the following university links:
  https://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/assessments/plagiarism
  https://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ld/resources/study/plagiarism-tutorial
- **Please do not use direct quotes from the actual papers –** rephrase what you read
- **Please search (and use) research papers only** (this is for your own benefit as they tend to be smaller in length and neater to understand) – **please do not use Chapters or websites or Wikipedia**
- Please **use any citation style you wish as long as you are consistent** with it throughout the submission
- **Please do not rephrase the abstract of the papers you find** and present these as part of your annotated bibliography summaries. **Remember, as your Week 1 Lab handout says, an annotated bibliography is comprised of 3 parts: 1) Summary; 2) Evaluation/Assessment; 3) Reflection**
- **Each paragraph for each of the 10 papers you find should have all the above 3 parts i.e. 1) Summary; 2) Evaluation/Assessment; 3) Reflection –** please refer to Week 1 Lab handout on how to write these
- **Please read carefully the Week 1 Lab handout –** you can find it on our Blackboard page here:
  https://blackboard.le.ac.uk/webapps/blackboard/content/listContentEditable.jsp?content_id=_2007278_1&course_id=_20769_1&mode=reset
  All the information regarding what Annotated Bibliography is can be found there (alongside with associated resources)

- The format that your Annotated Bibliography should have should be the following:

[paper 1 full citation] followed by:
[block of text/paragraph of the paper 1]

Dr. Genovefa Kefalidou
Module Convenor for CO2104

See for an example from one of my papers below:

Maxwell, D., Woods, M., Makri, S., Bental, D., Kefalidou, G., & Sharples, S. (2012, September). Designing a semantic sketchbook to create opportunities for serendipity. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual BCS Interaction Specialist Group Conference on people and computers* (pp. 357-362). British Computer Society.

Commented [KG(1): Paper Citation

The authors present their design of a semantic sketchbook mobile application to support serendipity. Their research is driven from existing literature that suggests reflection and connection-making can promote serendipity. In their application design they incorporated a notebook-like feature alongside with goal-oriented features. More specifically, the functions of their designed application were: navigation, searching, archiving, sharing, editing, drawing and collage. Furthermore, as prior research also utilised, the semantic sketchbook allowed users to enter notes through different modalities such as text, audio and video, while it also supported sharing notes with other users and customising notes. The underlying mechanism of this application was based on semantic processing of the users' notes. To do so they used tagging of relevant keywords and goals and then applied Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques to derive to more serendipitous results. The authors emphasise the challenges in design for developing systems that support serendipity as serendipity is a slippery term. Their reported next steps included adding notions of 'play' into their design and running studies to examine effects of notifications on serendipitous encounters but also to test novel evaluation methods.

Commented [KG(2): Summarising

The present paper is very succinct and well-structured (which is a strength) and examines a very interesting (and difficult) concept i.e. serendipity (which can be a weakness). In places, it is a bit difficult to follow because of being not familiar with the concept of serendipity. More information on the prototype design process would also be useful. The paper's audience includes HCI professionals such as interaction designers, information technologists, researchers and academics interested perhaps in information management.

Commented [KG(3): Evaluating

What I gained from the paper is an understanding of what serendipity is but also helped me to reflect on how to design for difficult concepts. Because serendipity is not that thoroughly researched in HCI field, the contributions of the paper are rather unique and useful and provide a novel perspective in design. I will be probably use it later on when I am identifying user requirements for my task manager application.

Commented [KG(4): Reflecting

- **Please submit your CW1 in time through the Blackboard dedicated submission link – please do not leave it until the last minute.** If you submit late (i.e. after the set deadline), penalties in marking will have to be applied. Please see below for more information:

The marking rubric can be seen below (next page)

3

Dr. Genovefa Kefalidou
Module Convenor for CO2104

Classification		First			Upper Second (2.i)	Lower Second (2.ii)	Third	Compensated Fail	Fail		
	Mark *	up to 100	80s	70s	60s	50s	40s	to 35	35 to 20	10s	Below 10
	Band	Exceptional	Outstanding	Excellent	Competent	Satisfactory	Adequate	Marginal	Little effort	Non-adherence	Nominal
Evaluation (30%)											
Showing Understanding		Depth and breadth of understanding beyond the scope of just summarising the paper. Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are evaluated. Assessing the paper demonstrates learning beyond expected undergraduate level for Year 2.	Evaluation points regarding the paper are justified or explained showing deep understanding and insightful points. Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are evaluated.	Paper evaluation shows that is beyond what is directly required for the submission. Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are evaluated.	Confident, accurate evaluation of each aspect of the paper(s). Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are evaluated.	Most aspects of the paper(s) are evaluated at a depth sufficient to explain them. Some aspects are evaluated superficially or not clearly. Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are evaluated.	A superficial or unclear evaluation of many aspects of the paper(s). Some papers selected are relevant to the topic. Some papers are evaluated.	A little understanding and demonstration of evaluation are shown. Papers selected are not relevant to the topic. Not requested number of papers are included.	It's not clear that the student understands the paper(s) to evaluate them. Papers selected are not relevant to the topic. Not requested number of papers are included.	Little evidence of understanding the paper(s) to evaluate them. Papers selected are not relevant to the topic. Not requested number of papers are included.	No evidence that the student understands the paper(s) to evaluate them. Papers selected are not relevant to the topic. Not requested number of papers are included.

Quality of Writing	The choice of words and structure make this enjoyable and informative for both experts and undergraduates. Length is excellent and as requested. Use of own words. No grammar or language errors.	Text is easy and enjoyable to read. Length is excellent and as requested. Use of own words. The use of language and structure enhance the reader's understanding.	Writing is clear and concise. Length is excellent and as requested. Use of own words. Structure presented is as requested in the CW1 handout.	All writing can be understood. Few grammar or language problems. Length is within the +-10% allowance. Use of own words.	Successful use of required structure throughout and appropriate content. Most writing can be easily understood. Use of own words. Length is within the +-10% allowance.	Structure has been used (e.g. sections, paragraphs). Most of the writing can be understood with some effort. Use of own words. Length is within the +-10% allowance.	Some elements of requested structure and content, but parts of the document require restructuring or rewriting to allow them to be understood. Use of own words in writing is not clear. Presence of direct quotes in writing. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.	Minimal structure. Sections are missing. Sections of the bibliography cannot be understood or do not relate to the paper(s). Use of own words in writing is not clear. Presence of direct quotes in writing. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.	Sections are missing. Only a few sections can both be understood and relate to the paper(s). Use of own words in writing is not clear. Presence of direct quotes in writing. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.	No meaningful content related to the paper(s). Use of own words in writing is not clear. Presence of direct quotes in writing. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%. Sections are missing.
Reflection (25%)										

| | Depth and breadth in self-reflecting on the paper(s) beyond the scope of just summarising the paper. Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are reflected upon.

Assessing the paper demonstrates learning beyond expected undergraduate level for Year 2. | Self-reflection points regarding the paper(s) make sense and are relevant, are justified or explained showing deep understanding and insightful points. Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are reflected upon. | Paper(s) self-reflection shows that is beyond what is directly required for the submission. E.g. the student demonstrates through their self-reflection connection to other related concepts/points/papers. Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are reflected upon. | Confident, personal, individual self-reflection of each aspect of the paper(s).Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are reflected upon. | Most aspects of the paper(s) are reflected upon at a depth sufficient to the reflection to make sense. Some aspects are reflected upon superficially or not clearly. Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are reflected upon. | A superficial or unclear reflection of many aspects of the paper(s). Some papers selected are relevant to the topic. Some papers are reflected upon. | A little understanding and demonstration of reflection are shown. Papers selected are not relevant to the topic. Not requested number of papers are included. | It's not clear that the student understands the paper(s) to reflect upon them. Papers selected are not relevant to the topic. Not requested number of papers are included. | Little evidence of understanding the paper(s) to reflect upon them. Papers selected are not relevant to the topic. Not requested number of papers are included. | No evidence that the student understands the paper(s) to reflect upon them. Papers selected are not relevant to the topic. Not requested number of papers are included. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Showing Understanding** | | | | | | | | | | |

Quality of Writing	The choice of words and structure make this enjoyable and informative for both experts and undergraduates. Length is excellent and as requested. Use of own words. No grammar or language errors.	Text is easy and enjoyable to read. Length is excellent and as requested. Use of own words. The use of language and structure enhance the reader's understanding.	Writing is clear and concise. Length is excellent and as requested. Use of own words. Structure presented is as requested in the CW1 handout.	All writing can be understood. Few grammar or language problems. Length is within the +-10% allowance. Use of own words.	Successful use of required structure throughout and appropriate content. Most writing can be easily understood. Use of own words. Length is within the +-10% allowance.	Structure has been used (e.g. sections, paragraphs). Most of the writing can be understood with some effort. Use of own words. Length is within the +-10% allowance.	Some elements of requested structure and content, but parts of the document require restructuring or rewriting to allow them to be understood. Use of own words in writing is not clear. Presence of direct quotes in writing. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.	Minimal structure. Sections are missing. Sections of the bibliography cannot be understood or do not relate to the paper(s). Use of own words in writing is not clear. Presence of direct quotes in writing. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.	Sections are missing. Only a few sections can both be understood and relate to the paper(s). Use of own words in writing is not clear. Presence of direct quotes in writing. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.	No meaningful content related to the paper(s). Use of own words in writing is not clear. Presence of direct quotes in writing. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%. Sections are missing.
Summary (45%)										

Showing Understanding	Depth and breadth of understanding beyond the scope of just summarising the paper. Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are summarised.\n\nComplete and accurate summary of all the paper(s) points demonstrates learning and understanding of the topic presented beyond expected undergraduate level for Year 2.	Summaries presented are justified, accurate and complete showing deep understanding and careful reading/studying of the paper(s). Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are summarised.	Paper summaries show that is beyond what is directly required for the submission.Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are summarised.	Confident, accurate summaries of each aspect of the paper(s). Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are summarised.	Most aspects of the paper(s) are summarised at a depth and breadth sufficient to explain and present them. Some aspects are summarised superficially, mechanically or not clearly. Papers selected are relevant to the topic. All ten papers are summarised.	Superficial or unclear summaries of many aspects of the paper(s). Some papers selected are relevant to the topic. Some papers are summarised.	A little understanding and demonstration of capability to summarise the paper(s) are shown. Papers selected are not relevant to the topic. Not requested number of papers are included.	It's not clear that the student understands the paper(s) to summarise them. Papers selected are not relevant to the topic. Not requested number of papers are included.	Little evidence of understanding the paper(s) to summarise them. Papers selected are not relevant to the topic. Not requested number of papers are included.	No evidence that the student understands the paper(s) to summarise them. Papers selected are not relevant to the topic. Not requested number of papers are included.

Quality of Writing	The choice of words and structure make this enjoyable and informative for both experts and undergraduates. Length is excellent and as requested. Use of own words. No grammar or language errors - the report is fully comprehensible.	Text is easy and enjoyable to read. Length is excellent and as requested. Use of own words. The use of language and structure enhance the reader's understanding.	Writing is clear and concise. Length is excellent and as requested. Use of own words. Structure presented is as requested in the CW1 handout.	All writing can be understood. Few grammar or language problems. Length is within the +-10% allowance. Use of own words.	Successful use of required structure throughout and appropriate content. Most writing can be easily understood. Use of own words. Length is within the +-10% allowance.	Structure has been used (e.g. sections, paragraphs). Most of the writing can be understood with some effort. Use of own words. Length is within the +-10% allowance.	Some elements of requested structure and content, but parts of the document require restructuring or rewriting to allow them to be understood. Use of own words in writing is not clear. Presence of direct quotes in writing. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.	Minimal structure. Sections are missing. Sections of the bibliography cannot be understood or do not relate to the paper(s). Use of own words in writing is not clear. Presence of direct quotes in writing. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.	Sections are missing. Only a few sections can both be understood and relate to the paper(s). Use of own words in writing is not clear. Presence of direct quotes in writing. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.	No meaningful content related to the paper(s). Use of own words in writing is not clear. Presence of direct quotes in writing. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%. Sections are missing.

Dr. Genovefa Kefalidou
Module Convenor for CO2104

Penalty regulations for late submissions

According to University Senate regulations 7.91 to 7.96. Please see below:

"If you hand in your work late, without a good reason for doing so, your mark will be reduced in line with the University's penalties scheme for late submission of coursework. See Senate Regulation 7.91 to 7.96.

If, however, life has conspired against you to prevent you from meeting an assignment deadline don't despair. The University recognises that students may suffer from a sudden illness or other serious or significant event that is unforeseen and/or unpreventable and which adversely affects their ability to complete an assessment; in such cases the University's mitigating circumstances regulations and procedures may be applied. You'll need to complete a Mitigating Circumstances Form and submit it with supporting evidence to your department."

" a deduction of 10% of the maximum mark available from the actual mark achieved by the student shall be imposed upon expiry of the deadline;

a further deduction of 5% of the maximum mark available from the actual mark achieved by the student shall then be imposed on each of the next subsequent working days;
the subsequent 24 hour periods described under (b) above shall apply from the expiry of the initial deadline. For example, where a deadline is 14:00 on Wednesday, a 10% penalty shall be deducted at 14:01 on Wednesday, and a subsequent 5% shall be deducted at 14:01 on Thursday;

under (a) and (b) above penalties shall be applied until the pass mark for the assessment has been reached (40% for undergraduate work and 50% for postgraduate work), after which point no further penalties shall be applied unless the work is deemed to be a non-submission"

More information on the above can be viewed at:

https://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/assessments/late-submission

In case of resits, please see here: https://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/assessments/results