



Semester B Assessment 2 for CMP2006 HCI, Computers & Society

There are two assessments (coursework submissions) in Semester B for CMP2006. Each is worth 25% of the total unit mark. This document describes the second of these two assessments – hereafter referred to as Assessment B.2.

Summary

The objective of this assessment is to introduce you to *ethical computing* – and to encourage you to take account of legal and professional issues when designing socio-technological systems. You will choose one of three possible project scenarios, which are presented to you below, and analyse the ethical issues arising from the chosen project and give suggestions on how to deal with them in a professional manner.

The Learning Outcome covered by this assessment is:

[LO4] assess the impact of legal framework and professional practice in the design and implementation of technological systems

The Project Scenarios

The three project scenarios are as follows:-

- 1) This project aims to understand the usability of web services from the perspective of both older people (aged between 60-80 years) and younger people (aged between 10-16 years). The methodology will include (i) verbally interviewing volunteer participants from each age group to determine their usage and opinions of web services such as online shopping (ii) videoing of volunteer participants from each age group during a set of sample web tasks – such as making an online purchase (iii) publishing findings in public (such as in the media, on your own website, or in conferences and peer reviewed journals). The aim is to recruit participants through advertisements in the local paper.
- 2) This project aims to evaluate a mobile pervasive game using a set of volunteer participants. The game involves each participant roaming the city of Lincoln with a WiFi enabled PDA. The PDA will be running a piece of software within which 'lives' a virtual creature – the virtual creature can only survive by accessing a different unprotected WiFi outlet every 10 minutes. The longer the creature survives – the higher the game score. Players can also publish the location of unprotected WiFi spots on the game's website to assist other players. The aim is to recruit participants from the undergraduate student population at the University of Lincoln and to encourage people to take part by offering several small prizes for the highest game scores achieved during the evaluations.
- 3) This project aims to develop and evaluate a Web2.0 website which will offer support, information and diagnostic tools for people (and their families) that have a long-term debilitating medical condition. In particular the site will offer user-forums and self-assessment tools for people to pre-diagnose and monitor their condition. The site will be database driven and is inspired by other previous initiatives such as PatientsLikeMe.com. The project will involve the development of the prototype website followed by a 'live' trial period during which a group of participants with the relevant condition will be recruited and expected to explore and utilise the functionality of the site. During this period the site will also be made publicly accessible and its presence publicised in relevant magazines and other publications.

The Ethical Approval Form

Most organisations which undertake studies involving people and technology will have developed their own ethical approval forms and procedures – usually the person proposing the project, or experiment, will fill out an ethical approval form which is then considered by an ethics committee – the job of this committee is, ultimately, to accept or reject the project proposal based on whether or not it is ethical to proceed. For this coursework you will complete a fictional ethics form which asks that you take an independent view of a project and its ethical implications. In particular you must identify the ethical issues arising from the project and also identify ways of improving the project's methodology to improve its ethical validity. Three separate forms –one for each project scenario- is available on Blackboard – these forms are identical except for their opening sections which repeat the project descriptions given above. You must download the correct form for the project scenario of your choosing and complete the remaining (pink) sections. Suggested (approximate) word counts for each section are given in parentheses at the beginning of each section.

Hand-in Details and Marking

You must hand-in a hard copy of your completed form to the faculty office by the delivery date given on Blackboard. Your hand-in should not be bound in any way other than by using a corner staple. Individual extensions to the hand-in deadline will not be given or even discussed by the unit leader. Your assignment will be marked using the associated Criterion Reference Grid (CRG).

**Assessment B.2 for CMP2006 (HCI, Computers & Society)
Criterion Reference Grid (CRG)**

This assessment is worth 25% of the total unit mark.

Your assignment will be marked using the following, **weighted**, criteria:-

Criteria	LO	Weight	Fail	Pass (3 rd)	2.2	2.1	1st
Discussion of ethical issues arising from project	4	0.3	Does not identify any relevant ethical issues	Only identifies one or two relevant issues and lacks any insightful discussion	A range of ethical issues are identified and discussed	Most relevant ethical issues are identified with good supporting discussion for each.	All reasonable relevant ethical issues are identified with excellent, comprehensive and insightful discussion
Description of required changes to, or clarifications of, methodology before project can proceed	4	0.2	No appropriate changes are presented.	Some relevant changes are given but justification for these is cursory or lacking.	A number of relevant changes are given with adequate justification of each	Most required changes are identified and given along with appropriate justification	All required changes are identified and given along with excellent and comprehensive, insightful discussion
Suggestions for safeguarding well-being and anonymity of participants	4	0.3	Does not identify any relevant suggestions	Only identifies one or two relevant suggestions and lacks any insightful discussion	A range of suggestions are identified and discussed	Most relevant suggestions are given with good supporting discussion for each.	All reasonable relevant suggestions are identified with excellent, comprehensive and insightful discussion
Suggestions for online resources	4	0.2	Does not identify any relevant resources	Only identifies one or two relevant resources and lacks convincing justification	Three appropriate resources are suggested and justified using some relevant discussion for each	Three appropriate and reputable resources are suggested and justified using comprehensive and relevant discussion for each	Three highly appropriate and reputable resources are suggested and justified using excellent, insightful and comprehensive discussion for each