

SECTION	EXCEPTIONAL 6	MERITORIOUS 5	HIGHLY COMPETENT 4	COMPETENT 3	PASS 2	FAIL 1
Updated storyboards (20%)	All screens and control sequences with full discussion of all design decisions	All screens and control sequences with most design decisions noted	Some extra screens and control sequences, most design decisions noted	All basic screens with control sequences: major design decisions noted	All basic screens but no control sequences	One or two basic screens, no control sequences
Discussion of changes (10%)	All changes considered in depth; resulting interface is both usable and provides a good experience	Justification considers multiple options, all of which are clearly linked to theory	Justification may consider several possibilities; may include links to theory	Changes noted with basic justification	Changes noted but not justified	No changes noted; changes actually weaken design
Feedback (20%)	Full discussion of feedback collection AND responses.	Good discussion of either collection OR responses with acceptable coverage of the other	Usability AND emotional feedback collected; some description of method	Usability OR emotional feedback collected; some description of method	Usability OR emotional feedback collected; no discussion of method	No feedback collected from other people.
Data collection (20%)	Full treatment of data collection with examples of expected impact	Multiple methods with focussed ideas on what they might produce; may include examples	Three or more methods; some idea of how the data can be used	Two methods; may have some idea of what they produce	One method	No data collection discussion
UX vs. ID (20%)	Full nuanced treatment of similarities and differences	Includes links to the literature when considering the differences	Uses examples from the assignment to highlight differences between UX and ID	Identifies several differences between UX and ID	Recognition of importance of user sentiments	No consideration of the differences
Breadth of research (5%)	All references are journal/white papers or books	Most references are journal/white papers or books	Half of references are journal/white papers or books	Some references are journal/white papers or books	Only references websites	No references
Writing / Document Presentation (5%)	Reads like a technical review article	Good use of signposting; good use of English; tables of figures and tables	Clear sectioning of content; labelling of tables and figures; reasonable English	Some labelling of tables and figures; clearly needs spell- and grammar- checking	Basic use of introduction, body and conclusion; English is comprehensible.	No clear structure; incomprehensible

Excellent level of detail in the screenshots. There should be more discussion of how user feedback has led to changes in the full-colour version compared to the wireframe version in assignment 1. Good user testing, although using the SUS and UEQ would give you standardised scores that allow the app to be compared with others.. Some good points raised relating to usability and UX (and the one about sans-serif fonts being easier for people unfamiliar with traditional English writing forms is excellent). Good consideration of data usage – the ‘report a problem’ is a great idea. More links to the literature, especially when justifying changes and design choices, would be helpful.