Usability Studies: Grading Sheet

Student IDs	Group #
Stadent 103	CI CUP //

	Missing	Incomplete portions	Satisfactory
Completeness of Report		•	
scenario	0	0	0
methodology	0	0	0
observations	0	0	0
interpretations	0	0	0
suggested improvements	0	0	0
conclusions	0	0	0
Appendix 1: Comparison	0	0	0
Appendix 2: Raw data			
Comments:			

Graphics of work	Ugly	Okay	Looks Great.
packaging (cover, etc)	0	0	0
typography	0	0	0
illustrations, if any	0	0	0
use of white space	0	0	0
overall appearance	0	0	0
length	0 (too short or long)	0	
Comments:			

Literary Quality	Poor: get help	Ok, but proof read	Great
spelling/typos	0	0	0
grammar	0	0	0
paragraph structure	0 (sloppy)	0	0
section structure	0 (poor flow)	0	0 <i>(natural flow)</i>
clarity of writing	0 (hard to read)	0	0 (easy to read)
style and interest	0 (boring)	0	0 <i>(interesting)</i>
verboseness	0 (far too wordy)	0	0 (every word counts)
Comments:			

Turn over...

Technical Quality	Poor.	Okay	Great
scenario	0 (poor background)	0	0 (explained system & point of report)
methodology	0 (didn't summarize)	0	0 (concise description of methods used)
observations	0 (hard to understand)	0	0 (good summary of observations)
interpretations	0 (little insight added)	0	0 (strength/weaknesses identified/generalized)
suggested improvements	0 (poor/minor)	0	0 (excellent low-cost design changes)
conclusions and recommendations	0 (didn't conclude)	0	0 (summarized results and recommendations)
Appendix 1	0 (little insight added)	0	0 (excellent discussion of methods)
Appendix 2	0 (poorly organized)	0	0 (shows good record- keeping)
Sample tasks	0 (no/poor tasks)		0 (excellent sample tasks)
Questionnaire	0 (irrelevant questions)	0	0 (highly relevant questions)
Thoroughness of treatment	0 (superficial)	0	0 (balanced depth & breadth)
Comments:			