

Criterion referencing grid for CMP2006 Semester A Assignment - Human-Computer Interaction Learning outcomes:

- deploy human factors principles in the analysis and evaluation of computer systems
- apply user-centred practice in the analysis and evaluation of software systems

Achievement of these learning outcomes is assessed by completion of the unit coursework assignment. The assignment requires you to perform a usability evaluation and comparison of two web sites. The evaluation is in two parts: an ‘expert’ evaluation, and a user study. The assessment criteria for both parts are included on this grid.

<b>Assessment criteria for Part 1</b>	<b>Fail</b>	<b>Pass 3<sup>rd</sup></b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>1st</b>
brief description of chosen web-sites giving purpose, functionality and expected user groups	No information given	Basic information given			Brief but clear information giving web site purpose, audience and functionality
‘expert’ usability evaluation of web sites: one or more of HTA, heuristic evaluation, state transition diagrams etc	No technique has been successfully or correctly applied	One or more evaluation techniques has been applied, but the approach is incorrect or superficial.	Some standard evaluation techniques used, broadly correctly, but the analysis is partial.	Good use of a range of methods.	Comprehensive, accurate and detailed analysis, using a range of methods, supported by standard documentation.
write-up and discussion of the expert evaluation and the issues raised	No attempt to report or discuss issues	Minimal and superficial report	Some good analysis, but very partial and incomplete.	Good discussion and analysis, but lacks the breadth and depth that would have earned 1st	Critical analysis and discussion of the interfaces, drawing on characteristics revealed by the analytical techniques, and showing in-depth understanding of the issues
appropriate use of references (parts 1 & 2)	No references used or given	Very limited reference list	Basic references, presentation poor	Good references, presentation unconventional	Appropriate citation and referencing, good range of sources, appropriate format

<b>Assessment criteria for Part 2</b>	<b>Fail</b>	<b>Pass 3<sup>rd</sup></b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>1st</b>
Methodology: objectives outlined; user group(s) selection process outlined; including ethics issues; standard tasks, evaluation methods and metrics given together with their rationale.	Little or no methodology information.	Methodology section is limited and partial. There is little rationale or detail.	Methodology section is partial, but contains detail and rationale.	The methodology section is given and is broadly good, but may contain omissions in some areas.	Full and comprehensive methodology is given: the aspects to be studied; rationale for their selection; user groups involved; selection of test subjects; test methodology; standard task(s); data collection instruments and metrics outlined.
Research instruments, eg questionnaires, etc	No usable documentation. No evidence of a test process having been conducted	Test documentation is very basic; validity and reliability poor	At least some of the documentation is sound and fit for purpose, although there may be some errors.	Some good test instruments and documentation.	Well designed test instruments: comprehensive, valid, reliable, usable and fit for purpose
Test implementation process	No account is given.	Implementation detail is scanty, or of poor quality.	Adequate implementation process is adequately described.	Good process, well described.	Fully detailed and documented account of sound test implementation is given.
Presentation and analysis of results	None given.	Slight and superficial report.	The results are poorly presented - little discussion or analysis	Most results are well presented and discussed.	Detailed and perceptive analysis and discussion of test results.
Conclusion and summary	None or very inadequate.	Minimal and superficial.	The report lacks breadth and depth, but contains some fair analysis.	The report is good, but lacks breadth and depth in some sections.	Analytical and useful discussion of the user study and its results, with conclusions/suggestions for further investigation.