***UE – Assignment 1*** ***Name*** Dylan Thomas ***Mark*** ***63***

| SECTION | EXCEPTIONAL<br>6 | MERITORIOUS<br>5 | HIGHLY COMPETENT<br>4 | COMPETENT<br>3 | PASS<br>2 | FAIL<br>1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) Persona definition (20%) | All 4 suitable personae with fully-detailed descriptions and requirements | 4 suitable personae with detailed description and some requirements | 4 suitable personae with more detailed descriptions | 4 suitable personae with basic descriptions | 2-3 personae with basic descriptions; 4 personae but some unsuitable | 1 persona with basic description; totally unsuitable personae |
| 2) Persona Development Process (20%) | Multiple methods with full descriptions and justifications of all actions | Detailed description of multiple methods with justification of methods OR requirements categorisation | More detailed description of multiple methods; may be some requirements categorisation | More detailed description of single method OR brief description of multiple methods | Brief description of a single method of data collection. | Single-sentence level, no justification |
| 3) Information Architecture (20%) | Fully-detailed architecture with discussion of alternatives | Good main headings and main functionality; all functionality covered | Good main headings and main functionality; most functionality covered | Sensible main headings and main functionality | Main headings make sense | Badly thought-out, illogical structure |
| 4) Create 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 |
| 5) Prototype Feedback (10%) | 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 mothod | Usability OR emotional feedback collected; no discussion of method | No feedback collected from other people. |
| 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 |
| 9) 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 |

Good introduction. Remember to include the table of figures as well as the table of contents. I love the potential creepers! 😊 You don't need to explain what the different data collection techniques are, you just need to say how you used them in your work and what the results were. Only talk about the ones you've actually used. Technically things in the appendix don't count towards the marks but provide context. It would be better to put all four user persona screenshots in the main text. Good story map. Good examples of hand-drawn wireframes, although you don't need to do both hand-drawn and hi-fidelity. You should have put the wireframes for the main task of logging in selecting and then playing a game in the main text rather than in the appendix. Remember to justify all of your design decisions with reference to the

literature. There should be a much more detailed description of how you collected feedback on the wireframes – what tasks did you have the users perform; what were their responses? You need to use focus groups or interviews rather than questionnaires for this.