MSc AISD - INDIVIDUAL WORK (50%)

Alan Dix & Corina Sas

For your individual work you are to perform some partial implementation, evaluation and broader critique of the systems designed in your groups.

This will be evaluated primarily through a written report, but as part of this you will need to submit some supporting materials from the work you have done (e.g. code).

THINGS TO DO

(1) build a prototype implementation of the designed system or a part of it.

An example of the kind of thing we are thinking of can be found at:

http://www.hcibook.com/alan/teaching/MScHCI/alarm-demo/alarm.html

Notice the way the code is structured (a struggle in places) to organise the code into sections that correspond roughly to Seeheim?? or MVC paradigms.

The example is in JavaScript, but you can use anything you can demo so long as it has some real code (not just hyperlinks). Java with AWT/SWING, JavaScript, VB, ... Director or Shockwave would be fine if you use these.

If you like the group could decide to prototype different parts of the system so that you end up with a prototype that covers more of the whole system, or you can work independently. If you do decide to work more as a group you must have parts that are individual and you must identify them in the report and in the code.

We will organise a period in week 10 or early next term when you can do a brief demo to us and your colleagues of your prototypes. However, note you will not be assessed on the quality of this prototype more on the way in which you describe the way you have decided on this prototype (e.g. process rather than end-product).

(2) perform an 'expert' evaluation of the design using either heuristic evaluation or cognitive walkthrough (see chapter 9, section 9.3).

You should document the evaluation systematically (probably tabular) and include this as an appendix to your report. This may be of a part of your system, as a detailed evaluation of the entire system is likely to be too voluminous. However, this does not need to be the same part as you choose to prototype. We are interested in the detail and quality of your evaluation not volume. As a guide if you find your systematic evaluation is more than say 4 pages of tables, you have probably done enough ... but in order to find interesting things do choose parts of your system that are different from one another. Also be careful not to simply say "everything is OK" - easy to do as it is a system you have been designing!

(3) write a report!

based on the above and the groupwork ... see below ...

THE REPORT

The report should contain the following sections (approx sizes in 'standard' pages of text):

(i) introduction (half to 1 page)

short reminder of your group design, plus introduction to rest of report

(ii) prototype implementation (1 or 2 pages)

discuss the structure of this and any issues you had whilst coding this, make use of the models and architectures discussed on "Day 1" to help you discuss your work. Explain the rationale of the proposed architecture, possibly after exploring other options in the design space. Include an appendix with any code you want to refer to in this section.

(iii) evaluation (1 or 2 pages)

discuss interesting problems or issues that arose during your 'expert' evaluation. You do not need to list everything - your systematic response will be in the appendix, but instead focus on interesting points. If (amazingly) all your evaluation answers are 'that's OK', then choose some of the more questionable parts and justify your positive responses.

(iv) critique of use of notations (1 or 2 pages)

In your groupwork you used various notations and methods. Discuss some interesting points from this, either things that arose during the group exercise (e.g. "when we did the HTA we suddenly noticed that X wouldn't work when doing more complex tasks") or may be things that you have noticed yourself after (e.g. "table Y shows the state model being played alongside our scenario" , "at step 7 the state model doesn't do what we intended".

(v) summary (half to 1 page)

highlight most interesting issues and problems, including anything not covered by above such as lessons you learned, how can the system be extended, what could have been done differently.

(v) references

use a standard style (e.g. Harvard) – see your research methods self-study materials.

(vi) appendices (as long as they are!)

your evaluation (form (2) above) and code (full code should be submitted electronic only, but include sufficient in the report to make it readable on its own)

Example Mark Sheet Used for MSc Individual Component

MSc HCI Module – Individual marks

name / number: **--name--** group: **--group number--**

(i) **Introduction/Summary** **A–E**

-- brief comments --

(ii) **Prototype implementation** **A–E**

-- brief comments --

(iii) **Evaluation** **A–E**

-- brief comments --

(iv) **Critique of use of notations** **A–E**

-- brief comments --

(v) **Appropriate use of references** **A–E**

-- brief comments --