

Dr. Genovefa Kefalidou
Module Convenor for CO2104

CO2104: User Interface (UI) Design and Evaluation

Coursework 2 RESIT: Medium-Fidelity Design Portfolio, Heuristic Evaluation and Assessment Criteria

Topic:

Present a Design Portfolio on producing a medium-fidelity prototype (Wireframing) for a desktop Web-based Music/Film play list and demonstrate a Heuristic Evaluation for it

(Word limit: 3,000 (with +/-10% deviation allowance))

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

Coursework weight: 30%

This CW1 addresses the following Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs):

Dr. Genovefa Kefalidou
Module Convenor for CO2104

Perform UI Prototyping using different tools and at different fidelities
Design considering different visualisation techniques and evaluate UIs

The submission will take place via the Blackboard site – please submit in time and not the last minute (please see the end of the document for information on late submission penalties)

Please submit via the module's Blackboard page using the submission link titled "CW2 - RESIT - Submission Link Medium-fi Design Portfolio and Heuristic Evaluation"

What is a Design Portfolio?:

A Design Portfolio is a **collection of prototype designs** of an interface application/technology/service/concept. User Interface (UI) and Interaction and User Experience (UX) designers utilise design portfolios to showcase their creativity and capabilities in designing interactive systems that enhance user experience (UX). Another key aspect of design portfolios is that they are used to demonstrate clear case studies where the ID/UX designer has successfully applied user-centred design approaches and methods to generate the presented (prototype) designs.

What is the Design Portfolio and Heuristic Evaluation that I need to produce for CW2?:

For CW2 you are expected to create a design portfolio **for a typical a desktop Web-based Music/Film play list (not mobile-based) and perform a Heuristic Evaluation (HE).**

Your design portfolio **must include the following (these are the requirements of your design portfolio):**

- **Clear, well-structured and presented Introductory paragraph (1 paragraph)** where you **explain the topic of application/technology** (in this case the web-based Music/Film play list system), explaining **the motivation** behind designing such a system and its **key user requirements**.
- **The medium-fidelity prototype development (i.e. Wireframes).** All your prototype designs need to be accompanied by a text walkthrough (in the main text of the document) and annotations on your wireframes describing what they are about and what interactions they accommodate. It is very important you demonstrate clear flow when presenting that. To do so, you need to set a clear scenario and context of use to map the wireframes. You are expected to include rationale and explanations for every UI design choice you make. All produced wireframes need to demonstrate all the inputs, processes and outputs, and need to match the end-user and functional requirements. You need to provide wireframe screens for all the presented UI features and functions of your Web-based desktop **Music/Film play list**. You need to present **at least 5** different wireframe screens. You can include mobile-based wireframe screens if you deem necessary but you need to provide a clearly expressed rationale for doing so. Please note that **is essential to present and produce standard web-based desktop wireframes for your Music/Film play list**
- **Clear, separate section within your portfolio where you present and discuss the Heuristic evaluation of your designed system/wireframes (this part can be called 'Wireframes Evaluation')**
- **Clear, well-written Discussion** section on your evaluation findings where you provide clear recommendations on how you can address in practice all the heuristic violations of your wireframe prototype
- **Clear, well-structured and presented Conclusion paragraph (1 paragraph)** where you summarise what you produced in your design portfolio, the rationale behind it and the heuristic evaluation results.

Dr. Genovefa Kefalidou
Module Convenor for CO2104

How should my Heuristic Evaluation section look like?

Your Heuristic Evaluation section in CW2 should be comprised of the following:

- You need to **use Nielsen's 10 Heuristics** (as presented within our lectures and tutorials)
- A **walkthrough heuristic by heuristic** where you 1) present the related wireframes to demonstrate the issue (either positive or negative – you need to evaluate both the positive and negative aspects of your designed wireframes) 2) provide the Severity Ranking (as presented in Week 4's lectures and tutorial) – please see below:

Severity Rating	Description
0	I don't agree that this is a usability problem at all
1	Cosmetic problem only. Need not be fixed unless extra time is available on project
2	Minor usability problem. Fixing this should be given low priority
3	Major usability problem. Important to fix, so should be given high Priority
4	Usability catastrophes. Imperative to fix this before product can be released

Note: You need to provide explanations on why you provided the specific ranking – you need to demonstrate your rationale behind each ranking.

The marking rubric can be seen below (next page)

Dr. Genovefa Kefalidou
Module Convenor for CO2104

	between user requirements and produced wireframes.	produced wireframes.				user requirements and wireframes is present.		s is present.		s is present.
Quality of Execution	Exceptional professional quality (visual and structural) of produced wireframes that exceed the set requirements. Visual and structural design demonstrates insight, critical thinking and no design	Outstanding professional quality (visual and structural) of produced wireframes that exceed the set requirements. Visual and structural design demonstrates insight and no design biases.	Excellent professional quality (visual and structural) of produced wireframes that fulfill the set requirements. Visual and structural design demonstrates insight and minimal design biases.	Very good quality (visual and structural) of produced wireframes that fulfill the set requirements. Visual and structural design demonstrates clarity of design thinking. Limited errors or miss-outs	Good use and demonstration of required UI structure and visuals throughout. Most visual and structural design can be easily understood and viewed. Some of the required wireframes have been produced. Some errors or miss-outs are present	Some UI structure and some UI visuals has been produced and demonstrated. Some visuals and structural design can be understood and viewed. Limited required	Some elements of requested structure and visuals are present but parts of the presented wireframes require restructuring and/or revisualising to allow them to be understood. The number of wireframes is not the requested one. Many errors or	Minimal structure and visuals are presented. Features are missing or not presented appropriately. Sections of the wireframes cannot be understood	Wireframes and/or sections of them are missing. Only a few sections can both be understood, viewed and relate to the design topic. Wireframe requirements are not met at all. All the design is full of omissions and/or errors. The number	No meaningful wireframes related to the design topic. Wireframe requirements are not met at all. All the design is full of omissions and/or errors or the actual

	biases. No errors or miss-outs	No errors or miss-outs	No errors or miss-outs			wireframes have been produced. Some errors or miss-outs are present.	miss-outs are present.	d and/or viewed and/or do not relate to the topic. The vast majority of the design is full of ommision s and/or errors. The number of wireframe s is not the requested one.	of wireframes is not the requested one.	design is missing. The number of wireframe s is not the requested one.
Walkthrou ghs and Report (30%)										

<p>Showing Understanding</p>	<p>Exceptional presentation and inclusion of walkthroughs in main text and annotations on the wireframes going beyond the asked requirements. Exceptional clarity and explanations. Demonstration of deep understanding of the design presented and the rationale behind each of the wireframe features.</p> <p>Wireframes in-text walkthroughs and annotations demonstrate learning beyond</p>	<p>In-text walkthroughs and wireframe annotations make sense, are relevant, insightful, they go beyond the asked requirements and demonstrate outstandingly logical flow of interactions and behaviours within the designed prototype. All in-text walkthroughs and wireframe annotations are justified or explained showing deep understanding and insightful points. All wireframe features are walkthrough</p>	<p>Wireframes in-text walkthroughs and wireframe annotations demonstrate understanding and design considerations that are beyond what is directly required for the submission. The walkthroughs and annotations are all relevant to the topic and perfectly match all the presented wireframes and all their features/functions.</p>	<p>Confident, inclusive, to-the-point and clear in-text walkthroughs and wireframe annotations are being presented for all requested wireframes and for every feature of each wireframe. Clear and logical flow of interactions and behaviours are present consistently throughout all wireframes. Walkthroughs and annotations are all relevant to their respective wireframes.</p>	<p>Most aspects of the presented wireframes are walkthroughed in the main text and provided in the wireframe annotations at a depth sufficient to make sense and see the flow of interactions and behaviour. Some wireframe features are presented superficially or not clearly. In-text walkthroughs and wireframe annotations are relevant to the topic.</p>	<p>Some aspects of the presented wireframes are walkthroughed in the main text and provided in the wireframe annotations at a depth sufficient to make sense and see the flow of interactions and behaviour. Some wireframe features are presented superficially or not clearly. Some in-text walkthroughs and wireframe annotations are</p>	<p>Limited aspects of the presented wireframes are walkthroughed in the main text and provided in the wireframe annotations at a depth sufficient to make sense and see the flow of interactions and behaviour. Most wireframe features are presented superficially or not clearly. Few in-text walkthroughs and wireframe annotations are relevant to the topic.</p>	<p>It's not clear that the student understands the produced wireframes and are not able to walkthrough them and/or annotate them sufficiently to make sense. Any annotations and in-text walkthroughs presented are not matched at all to the designed prototype. Not requested in-text walkthroughs and wireframe annotations are included.</p>	<p>Little evidence of understanding and presenting the in-text walkthroughs and wireframe annotations. Any annotations and in-text walkthroughs presented are not matched at all to the designed prototype. Not requested in-text walkthroughs and wireframe annotations are included.</p>	<p>No evidence of understanding and presenting the in-text walkthroughs and wireframe annotations. No annotations and in-text walkthroughs are presented alongside the designed prototype.</p>
-------------------------------------	---	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Dr. Genovefa Kefalidou
Module Convenor for CO2104

	expected undergraduate level.	ed and annotated.				relevant to the topic.				
--	-------------------------------	-------------------	--	--	--	------------------------	--	--	--	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Quality of Writing</p>	<p>The choice of words in the report, visuals of walkthroughs and annotations and structure make this enjoyable and informative for both experts and undergraduates. Quality, features coverage and length is excellent and as requested. Exceptional clarity in expression.</p> <p>No grammar or language errors.</p>	<p>Report, Walkthrough text and annotations are easy and enjoyable to read. Features coverage and length is excellent and as requested. Excellent clarity of expression and structure.</p> <p>The use of language and structure in the annotations and in the in-text walkthroughs enhance the reader's understanding.</p>	<p>Writing is clear and concise as well as inclusive to all the presented features. Length is excellent and as requested.</p> <p>Structure and content presented is as requested in the CW2 handout.</p>	<p>All writing can be understood. Few grammar or language problems. Length is within the +-10% allowance.</p>	<p>Successful use of required structure throughout and appropriate content. Most writing can be easily understood. Length is within the +-10% allowance.</p>	<p>Structure has been used (e.g. sections, paragraphs, annotations and in-text walkthroughs).</p> <p>Most of the writing can be understood with some effort. Length is within the +-10% allowance.</p>	<p>Some elements of requested structure and content are missing, but parts of the document require restructuring or rewriting to allow them to be understood. Expression issues that impact on clarity are present. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.</p>	<p>Minimal structure. Some sections (including in-text walkthroughs and wireframe annotations) are missing.</p> <p>Sections of the report cannot be understood or do not relate to the topic. Expression in writing is not clear. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.</p>	<p>Many sections are missing. Only a few sections can both be understood and relate to the CW2 topic. Expression in writing is not clear. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.</p>	<p>The vast majority of the sections are missing. No meaningful content related to CW2. Writing and structure is confusing. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">Heuristic Evaluation (30%)</p>									

<p>Showing Understanding</p>	<p>Exceptional and professional execution of HE. All heuristics have been addressed correctly, accurately and inclusively (i.e. covering both positive and negative design issues). Insightful points are made.</p> <p>Demonstration of learning and understanding of the execution of HE is present beyond expected undergraduate level and the CW2 requirements.</p>	<p>HE presented is justified, accurate and complete (i.e. addresses all the presented features and wireframes) showing deep understanding and careful reading/studying of how to execute HE. All heuristics have been addressed and in an inclusive way (i.e. covering both positive and negative design issues). HE presented goes beyond the CW2 requirements.</p>	<p>HE presented show that is beyond what is directly required for the submission. All heuristics have been addressed correctly, accurately and inclusively (i.e. covering both positive and negative design issues). All HE results make sense and are logical.</p>	<p>Confident, accurate HE for each feature of each wireframe. All heuristics have been addressed correctly, accurately and inclusively (i.e. covering both positive and negative design issues).</p>	<p>All heuristics have been addressed correctly, accurately and inclusively (i.e. covering both positive and negative design issues) for most of the features of each wireframe. Most heuristics are applied at a depth and breadth sufficient to explain and present them.</p>	<p>Some heuristics have been addressed superficially, mechanically or not clearly to some of the features of some of the wireframes. Some understanding of applying HE successfully is present.</p>	<p>Few heuristics have been addressed superficially, mechanically or not clearly to some of the features of some of the wireframes. They do not cover both negative and positive aspects of the wireframes. Limited understanding of applying HE successfully is present.</p>	<p>It's not clear that the student understands HE evaluation for the wireframes and/or apply the HE requirements as set in CW2.</p>	<p>Little evidence of understanding how to conduct HE and/or apply the HE requirements as set in CW2.</p>	<p>No evidence that the student understood HE.</p>
-------------------------------------	--	--	---	--	---	---	---	---	---	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Quality of Writing</p>	<p>The choice of words and structure make this enjoyable and informative for both experts and undergraduates. It is exceptionally clear how the HE was conducted. Length and content quality is exceptional and as requested.</p> <p>No grammar or language errors.</p>	<p>Text is easy and enjoyable to read. Length and quality of content is excellent and as requested. Outstanding clarity.</p> <p>The use of language and structure enhance the reader's understanding and helps them understand the full evaluation of the prototype.</p>	<p>Writing is clear and concise. Length and content quality is excellent and as requested. Excellent expression in writing.</p> <p>Structure presented is as requested in the CW2 handout.</p>	<p>All writing can be understood. Few grammar or language problems. Length is within the +-10% allowance.</p>	<p>Successful use of required structure throughout and appropriate content. Most writing can be easily understood. Good expression. Length is within the +-10% allowance.</p>	<p>Structure has been used (e.g. sections, paragraphs).</p> <p>Most of the writing can be understood with some effort. Most of the HE report requirements as set in CW2 have been addressed. Length is within the +-10% allowance.</p>	<p>Some elements of requested structure and content, but parts of the document require restructuring or rewriting to allow them to be understood. Some clarity issues in writing. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.</p>	<p>Minimal structure. Sections are missing.</p> <p>Parts of HE cannot be understood or do not relate to wireframes. Many clarity issues. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.</p>	<p>HE sections are missing. Only a few sections can both be understood and relate to the wireframe prototypes. Major clarity issues. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%.</p>	<p>No meaningful content related to HE. Major clarity issues. Length is not as requested and beyond the acceptable threshold of +-10%. HE sections are missing. No evidence that the student conducted HE.</p>

Dr. Genovefa Kefalidou
Module Convenor for CO2104

Note: For information on late submission penalties, 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>