

Marking Grid – UXD 1

Name PETER DAVIES

Grade 90%

SECTION	EXCEPTIONAL 6	MERITORIOUS 5	HIGHLY COMPETENT 4	COMPETENT 3	PASS 2	FAIL 1
1) Site Descriptions (10%)	6+ similarities or differences	4 similarities or differences	2 similarities or differences	Material provided in task description	Names and dates only	None supplied
2) User Groups (15%)	Consideration of further factors	Consideration of differences in naïve / experienced groups	Consideration of cross-over between the groups	Detailed description of the two main groups	Brief description of the two main groups	None supplied
3) UX Elements (30%)	Identifies and discusses >6 elements. Includes naïve and experienced users	Identifies and discusses 6 elements. Includes naïve and experienced users	Identifies and discusses 5 elements. Includes naïve and experienced users	Identifies and discusses 4 elements. May include naïve and experienced users	Identifies and discusses 3 elements. May include naïve and experienced users	Identifies and discusses <3 elements
4) UX Element Interaction (10%)	>4 examples, fully referenced	4 examples, fully referenced	3 examples, fully referenced	2 examples, fully referenced	1 example, fully referenced	0 examples
5) Problem UX Elements (15%)	>4 examples, fully referenced	4 examples, fully referenced	3 examples, fully referenced	2 examples, fully referenced	1 example, fully referenced	0 examples
6) Game Impact (10%)	>4 examples, fully referenced	4 examples, fully referenced	3 examples, fully referenced	2 examples, fully referenced	1 example, fully referenced	0 examples
7) Breadth of research (5%)	All references are journal/white papers or books	Almost all references are journal papers or books	Two thirds of references are journal papers or books	Half of references are journal papers or books	Only references websites	No references
8) 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

Comments

Excellent consideration of similarities and differences.
 Astronomy, not astrology. 😊 Good linkage to Nielsen's heuristics, but too much time on 'this could Ingress' interface design be due to an appeal to 'tribal' norms within the SF fan community? Such graphic design is familiar to a lot of films and games of the genre.
 Error messages - should 'you have failed to do X' count as an error message?
 Good commentary on the change to Ingress Prime.
 More consideration of the differences between naïve & experienced users would be useful, but the UX feature work is solid. Good range of issues identified.
 Well presented, but check your apostrophes. References are a bit heavy on news sites
 Excellent piece of work - well done.