# COMPUTER-SUPPORTED CO-OPERATIVE WORKING
## ELECTRONIC_PORTFOLIO

**Group Project**

This document describes the course-work to be completed by the students who are taking the CSCW module in the academic year 2011/2012.

**Mark component: Group work = 100%[1]  (50% of total module mark)**

Learning outcomes: the students will engage in the user-centered design process of a social computing artifact while trying to apply chief methodologies of CSCW. At the end of the project they should correctly master theatrical based elicitation of requirements, collaboration personas, experience prototyping, and evaluation. The main activity will be the design and evaluation of an electronic portfolio that will certify the activity of a student in order to present them to companies. The portfolio should be enriched by several communication tools in order to foster the creation of a social network between students, students and professors and students and companies.

Deadline: May 28th – the final report will be handed in to Silvia Torsi – alternatively the report need to be submitted at least 2 weeks before the date the students intend to take the exam

Objectives

The project will give the possibility to try on the field some CSCW methodologies while design thinking about a cooperative tool among students, professors, administrative staff and human resources personnel.  The students will produce requirements, personas and prototypes for an electronic portfolio that will provide the human resources of the history of the student in term of works, projects and outcomes throughout his career.

Methodology

The project consists of the following activities

I.      Activity 1:  Acting. The students will make use of theatrical methodologies of HCI in order to make on scene the different stakeholders and the procedures that the certified portfolio should incorporate. The certified portfolio is a crystallization of the whole of the possible relationships between students, teachers, administrative and human resources of the companies. Therefore it is important to forecast the possible activities and communication processes that it should embody. Theater is a possible way to approach this design issue, in order for the different faces of this collaborative work process to emerge.

---

[1] The project will include both individual and group activities. Students will hand-in evidence of their individual work (interview transcripts and data analysis), which will be marked for completeness and accuracy and influence the student's mark in case of discrepancy with the group-work mark (+ - 5%). Students will also be invited to evaluate each group member contribution, including their own. Evidence of exceptional performance or sub-average contribution will be taken into consideration in the final mark.

*II.*      <u>Activity 2: Writing.</u> The following activity will try to make sense of the previous activity while drawing 3-4 sets of collaboration personas. The students will have a selection of materials on how to write a user persona, and will apply the methodology of collaborative personas, which are: descriptions of a community by using the same tools of the classic personas. Those collaboration personas will extensively draw some of the main requirements the system should have.

III.      <u>Activity 3: prototyping.</u> The students will try to prototype the experience of the different possible activities of the different stakeholder of the portfolio workflows. Experience prototyping is a relatively unexplored methodology and consist in overcoming the classical triangle "role-implementation-look and feel" and trying to convey the planned experience of the user. The students will have the possibility to select between different ways to make prototypes (e.g. paper prototypes, scenarios and others) and will experiment their own preferred way to prototype

IV.      <u>Activity 4: evaluation & Debriefing.</u> The student will evaluate the prototypes based on their knowledge of best practices in CSCW design and involving students in a user-based study. In this phase the group will make sense of the whole experience and will self evaluate whether they have accomplished the design task, this will go to fill in the conclusions of the report

V.      <u>Report writing.</u> The group will produce a 20 pages (max) report of the evaluation. Report writing is both an individual and a group activity. All members are expected to contribute to it and the report will be marked as a group deliverable not as a collection of chapters authored by different people. The report will be composed of the following steps for each of the presented phases (acting, writing and prototyping):

- o Executive summary (1 page stating the main findings and recommendation form your study )

- o Related work (literature review on similar systems)

- o Objectives (stating and justifying the objectives of the design exercise)

- o Methodology (clear description of the design procedures)

- o Results (design artifacts produced and their evaluation results)

- o Conclusion (recommendations, suggestion for further research)

- • Deliverables: a paper copy of the report and a CD rom including, Interviews transcripts, and an electronic copy of the report

<u>Help and contact information</u>

The work will be carried out independently by the students under the supervision of Dr. Silvia Torsi Silvia Torsi <u>torsi@disi.unitn.it</u>, who will organise and participate in group meetings.  It is of utmost importance to the success of the project that each member of the group contributes to the work. In case of problems and conflicts which students are unable to deal with independently, they are invited to e-mail Prof. De Angeli (deangeli@disi.unitn.it), copying **<u>each group</u>** member in the e-mail. People who did <u>NOT</u> contribute to the group work will receive a lower mark (up to 0 in case of no contribution at all).

A reading list will be distributed separately with clearer design spec.


Marking scheme


Presentation (10%);

Background research (20)%

v Validity and reliability of methodologies and procedures applied for design (30%);

v Critical analysis of evaluation results (20%);

v Quality of design suggestions (10%);

v Reflections and suggestions for further research and new design spaces (10%).