

CSC 484 Assignment 2, Poster Session Evaluations and Team Questionnaires

ISSUED: Monday, 28 April 2008
DUE: General Evaluations: On or before 11AM Monday 5 May, via handin
Team Questionnaires: On or before 11AM Monday 5 May, via team-specified means
POINTS POSSIBLE: 100
WEIGHT: 20% of Assignment 2

Instructions

Listed below are nine general criteria for evaluating the storyboards presented in the poster sessions. The criteria are based on the best-practice guidelines presented in the Truong storyboarding paper (week 3 of the weekly readings). The guidelines are discussed further in the Lab notes for week 4.

You must complete a total of five separate evaluations, one for each presenting team, except your own. The evaluations must address each of the nine criteria listed below. In the documents you hand in, include the bold-face headings for each criterion, with your evaluation for each criterion under its heading. Do not include the italicized descriptions of the criteria.

Submit your evaluations by *11am Mon 5 May*, as pdf files, via handin on vogon, to the assignment "a2-eval". The submit file names correspond to the team names: swat, iwimp, menupad, gatekeeper, mobility, and 2d3d. So, for example, if you're a member of the swat team, your handin command looks like this:

```
handin gfisher a2-eval iwimp.pdf menupad.pdf gatekeeper.pdf mobility.pdf 2d3d.pdf
```

These Criteria Compared to Team Questionnaires

The evaluation criteria listed below ask general questions about project *presentation*. Your team questionnaires should ask specific questions about project *content*. For example, your questionnaire can ask what poster viewers think about certain specific features of your proposed project. What specific features do they like or dislike? Would viewers find the results of your project useful in their own lives?

You can also ask any other questions, as long as they don't duplicate the questions that these general evaluation criteria ask. The "Other Remarks" criterion asks for remarks that are not covered by the general criteria or in the team questionnaires. Hence, the goal is not to ask redundant questions, or have to provide redundant answers.

It is up to each team to determine how its questionnaire will be distributed and collected. Each individual must deliver two copies of the completed team questionnaires -- one to the team, and one to me.

The General Evaluation Criteria:

1. Level of Detail

Did the poster have the appropriate level of detail? If too much or too little detail, give specific examples where this occurred. Provide constructive criticism for how to remedy any problems you observed in the area of too much or too little detail.

2. Text and Graphics

Did the poster have an appropriate mix of text and graphics? If too much or too little of either, give specific examples where this occurred. Provide constructive criticism for how to remedy any problems you observed in the area of text and graphics.

3. Environment and People

Did the poster include depictions of environment and people appropriately? If there were no such depictions, and they were not necessary, then say so (i.e., it's OK that environment and people did not appear). If environment and people were shown in an unhelpful way, or were not shown but should have been, give examples of where this occurred. Provide constructive criticism for how to remedy any problems you observed in the area of environment and people.

4. Passage of Time

Did the poster include depictions of the passage of time appropriately? If there were no such depictions, and they were not necessary, then say so (i.e., it's OK that time passing was not shown in the poster). If passing time was shown in an unhelpful way, or was not shown but should have been, give examples of where this occurred. Provide constructive criticism for how to remedy any problems you observed in the area of depicting the passage of time.

5. Team Presentation

Were the presenting team members helpful? Did they answer your questions well? Did they make the topic sound interesting? If there were any problems in these areas, provide constructive criticism for how the poster session could have been better presented by its design team.

6. Layout, Aesthetics, and Design Quality

Was the poster well put together, was the quality of the artwork and prose good? If there were any problems in these areas, provide constructive criticism for how the design quality of the poster could have been improved.

7. Enjoyment

Did you enjoy the poster session? Provide specific examples of what you enjoyed, and/or constructive criticism about what you did not enjoy and how it could have been made more enjoyable.

8. Other Remarks (Optional)

Provide any other remarks that were not covered above, or in the team questionnaires.

9. Overall Rating

Rate the poster session overall on a 1 to 10 scale, 1=poorest rating, 10=best rating.