

P7: Final Report and Presentation

- Assignment Description
- Deliverables & Due Dates
- Grading Rubric

Assignment Description

This assignment will summarize everything you have done throughout the course. There will be two components, a written assignment, and a presentation.

The written assignment will be in the style of a CHI research paper, describing the domain you chose to explore, the generative study that led to your idea, the application (product/service/experience) itself and findings from your usability study, and most importantly findings from your field study, with implications for how you'd update your application/product/service after having run the study.

Most of this text should already be written and the bulk of the effort should just be on getting it into the **SIGCHI template** and improving flow between sections to tell the story of your project in the form of a research study (similar in style to the papers you have read). The SIGCHI template can be found here: [Word](#) / [LaTeX](#) This is the same academic format you'll use to present your research if you continue your career in HCI.

Presentations will take place on the last day of class (December 11th). The presentations will be ten minutes per team. Your presentation should reflect your paper. Specific focus should be given on how you came up with your idea (the generative research and findings), what the solution is, and what you learned from the field study (including quantitative and qualitative findings).

Deliverables & Due Dates

The presentation will be on **Wednesday, December 11 @ 10:00 am**. Final reports are due in Slack by **same date at 11:59pm**.

Please submit a PDF of your written report (P7), any prototypes, as well as presentation slides as well as your team's project milestones P1-P6, on Slack.

Grading Rubric

This assignment is graded on a rubric out of 100 points. It is worth 25 percent of the overall project grade.

Category	Unsatisfactory	Adequate	Good	Very good	Excellent
Paper Generative Study 20 Points	Generative study is not discussed.	Generative study does not have convincing data (not enough users, key findings not explained)	Section does not explore areas of opportunity that led to app idea.	Section only partly motivates application idea. Exact data that led to idea are missing/light.	Generative study is clearly explained, has ≥ 5 participants and clearly states areas of opportunity
Paper App and Usability 20 Points	Usability study is not discussed.	App description is light or it is difficult to understand key features and flows.	Updates to the app after the usability study are not discussed.	Design changes are not properly motivated with data from the study.	App is described in sufficient detail, including main use cases and screenshots. Key findings from the usability study, and subsequent design changes are discussed.
Paper Field Study 20 Points	Field study is not discussed.	Graphs of use from field study are not shown, or do not have sufficient detail (lacking funnels, feature use, etc.)	Study does not have enough data to be convincing (e.g. qualitative themes are not discussed in detail, lacking quotes, fewer than 10 participants)	Method description is weak, or qualitative themes are not well supported.	The field study is described in detail in terms of methods, participants (≥ 10), and specific quantitative and qualitative findings (including graphs). Key metrics about use are included.
Paper Implications 10 Points	Implications not discussed.	Implications are not motivated with data from the field study findings.	Only one well motivated implication is given.	Only two well motivated implications are given.	At least 3 key implications for updates to the app, and more broadly for applications in this domain are listed.

Presentation Motivation 10 Points	There is no motivation for the app in the presentation.	The motivation for the app is not believable.	The data from the generative study is light - no quotes, little on themes.	The methods are not well described but the data is all believable.	The presentation motivates the app using data from the generative study such that the audience is convinced that this is a real need and that your solution meets this need.
Presentation Field Study/ Implications 10 Points	The field study was not discussed.	The field study was only lightly discussed without key quotes or charts.	There were no implications derived from the field study for future design or the quantitative data was lacking in graphs or variety (e.g. missing funnels or key feature use).	The presentation lacked detail on methods or the qualitative themes were not well supported.	The presentation makes it clear what methods were used for the field study, who the users were, and shows multiple quotes from users as well as graphs of usage over time (with corresponding metrics).
Gala Demo 10 Points	The demo did not work or was not shown.	Very little of the prototype was shown (perhaps one main use case).	The demo only showed a few features of the prototype.	The demo made it difficult to understand the key use cases.	The demo of the prototype successfully shows the features and main use case so that the audience can understand what it does and why they might want to use it.

Credit: This material is based on content originally developed by Frank Bentley, Stanford HCI
<https://hci.stanford.edu/courses/cs377u/>