


CPUX-DS

Checklist Practical Test

Version 1.2 EN: 5 March 2021



Published by: UXQB e. V.
Contact: info@uxqb.org

www.uxqb.org

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Legend	3
3	General Information about Rating the Responses	3
4	Initial Check of the Delivered Responses	4
	Exercise 1: Create an Interaction Specification (35 Points).....	5
	Exercise 2: Identify and Enrich Task Objects (21 Points)	6
	Exercise 3: Create an Information Architecture (36 Points).....	8
	Exercise 4: Create a Low-Fidelity Prototype (70 Points)	10
	Exercise 5: Evaluate Card Sorting Results (16 Points)	13
5	Important Changes to this Document.....	15

1 Introduction

This document contains the evaluation criteria for the practical test for the Certified Professional for Usability and User Experience – Advanced Level "Designing Solutions" (CPUX-DS). The evaluation criteria are used by the examiner to assess the responses in the practical test taken by candidates who wish to receive CPUX-DS certification. This document can also be used to explain to parties with an interest in the exam how their CPUX-DS test responses are evaluated.

Further information about the testing procedure for CPUX-DS is available in the document "Test regulations CPUX-DS", see www.uxqb.org.

2 Legend

The tables on the following pages describe the evaluation criteria and the allocation of points for each assessment criterion for each of the five tasks and subtasks in the practical test. The examiner enters the candidate's score and, in case he wishes to do so, can enter a comment in the last column.

3 General Information about Rating the Responses

For each task there is a maximum number of achievable points. Points are subtracted from a total score per mistake. Generally, points are deducted for contravening quality criteria from the curriculum. In the case of follow-through errors, no further points are deducted beyond the initial mistake.

Example: If all dialogue steps are logical with no interruptions, the participant receives 15 points. Each interruption is scored with the deduction of one point.

There is a score to be achieved for each subtask if the examiner recognises sufficient quality. If deviations are found for a criterion, the examiner awards correspondingly fewer points. Each individual task cannot be rated with less than zero points.

The scoring procedure for each subtask is explained in more detail in the table of evaluation criteria.

4 Initial Check of the Delivered Responses

With the initial check, the examiner determines whether the candidate has provided all the necessary examination responses. The initial check does not include the making of an evaluation. If one of the following requirements for the examination responses is not met, the examiner should first decide whether a further evaluation of the test responses is actually meaningful.

ID	Response	Y/N	Examiner Comment
0a-1	Has the interaction specification been entered in answer sheet 1?		
0a-2	Have the task objects, attributes, executable functions and signposts been specified in answer sheet 2?		
0a-3	Has the information architecture documented on answer sheet 3a?		
0a-4	Has the structure of task objects been justified on answer sheet 3b?		
0a-5	Has a low-fidelity prototype (several sketches) been submitted on answer sheets 4a?		
0a-6	Has the interaction been annotated on answer sheet 4b?		
0a-7	Has been explained how two heuristics have been considered on answer sheet 4c?		
0a-8	Have the card sorting results been compared to the information architecture and assessed in answer sheet 5a?		

Exercise 1: Create an Interaction Specification (35 Points)

ID	Assessment Criterion	Allocation of Points	Comment/Result
----	----------------------	----------------------	----------------

Answer sheet 1: Interaction specification

1a-1	Logical dialog structure - Dialog steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the sequence of dialogue steps logical and consistent? Are the transitions between the user's action and the system's reaction, and between this and the user's next action, reasonable? Is the granularity of dialogue steps consistent? 	15 (Without deviation = 15 points; for each deviation = one-point deduction)	
1a-2	Formal dialogue structure – actions of the user / reactions of the system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the user's actions described in a differentiated way? Were the system's reactions described in a differentiated way? Are all user requirements represented and correctly assigned? Are the user's actions and the system's reactions described in a solution-free manner? 	15 (Without deviation = 15 points; for each deviation = one-point deduction)	
1a-3	Adjustment of the task model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the presented dialog requires an adjustment of the task model, is it coherent and correctly represented in the interaction specification? If changes have been made to tasks, were they sufficiently flagged/marked as such? 	5 (If changes have been marked or if no changes have been made = 5 points; if changes have not or incompletely been marked = 0 points)	

Exercise 2: Identify and Enrich Task Objects (21 Points)

ID	Assessment Criterion	Allocation of Points	Comment/Result
Answer sheet 2: Identified and enriched task objects			
2a-1	Have three task objects been derived plausibly?	3 (Three derived task objects = 3 points; for each missing or not plausible task object = one-point deduction. If more than three task objects were derived, only the first three task objects are evaluated.)	
2a-2	Per task object: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the perspective of the interaction specification, has an appropriate title been selected? Have all attributes from the interaction specification been named? Have all executable functions from the interaction specification been named? These can but don't have to be directly derived from the interaction specification 	12 (Per task object: 1 point for title, 1 point for attribute, 2 points for executable functions; i.e. for each missing task object = 4 points deduction.)	
2b-1	Per task object: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the perspective of the interaction specification, has at least one plausible trigger (word been named ? 	3 (Per task object: 1 point., No point, if the trigger is not plausible, if it's missing or if additional triggers aren't plausible)	

Checklist for the practical test CPUX-DS

ID	Assessment Criterion	Allocation of Points	Comment/Result
2b-2	Per task object: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the perspective of the interaction specification, has at least one plausible call to action been named? 	3 (Per task object: 1 point., No point, if the call to action is not plausible, if it's missing or if additional calls to action aren't plausible)	

Exercise 3: Create an Information Architecture (36 Points)

ID	Assessment Criterion	Allocation of Points	Comment/Result
----	----------------------	----------------------	----------------

Answer sheet 3a: Documentation of the information architecture

3a-1	Structure of task objects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the structure been documented as dictated in Figure 1? Has a legend been created for task objects, suborders and calls to action? 	4 (Without deviation = 4 points; for each deviation = one-point deduction)	
3a-2	Super- and subordination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are super- and subordinations of task objects resulting from the interaction specification and from the overview of task objects fully represented? If other super- and subordinations are shown, are these plausible? 	5 (Without deviation = 5 points; for each missing or not plausible super- and subordination = one-point deduction)	
3a-3	Connections <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are all connection paths resulting from the overview of task objects fully represented? If other connection paths are shown, are these plausible? 	5 (Without deviation = 5 points; for each missing or not plausible connection path = one-point deduction)	

Answer sheet 3b: Justification of the structure

3b-1	Comprehensibility and Plausibility of the justification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are super- and subordinations justified plausibly? Are connection paths justified plausibly? 	5 (Without deviation = 5 points; for each missing or not plausible justification = one-point deduction)	
------	---	--	--

Checklist for the practical test CPUX-DS

ID	Assessment Criterion	Allocation of Points	Comment/Result
3b-2	Are new super- and subordinations and connection paths which are not resulting from the overview of task object justified plausibly?	5 (If new super- and subordinations or connection paths are justified plausibly = 5 points; otherwise = one-point deduction)	

Calculation of the total score for task 3

3c-1	Have all task objects been included in the information architecture?	Calculate the proportion of included task objects in relation to the number of given task objects Score for tasks 3a and 3b (max. 24 points) x 1.5 x calculated proportion = total score (max. 36 points)	
------	--	--	--

Exercise 4: Create a Low-Fidelity Prototype (70 Points)

ID	Assessment Criterion	Allocation of Points	Comment/Result
Answer sheet 4a: Sketches			
4a-1	<p>Interaction across the subtasks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the perspective of the interaction specification, can the task be performed successfully with the prototype? Have the dialogue steps been implemented as described in the interaction specification? Can the task be performed efficiently (e.g. no unnecessary clicks/steps)? 	<p>15</p> <p>(Three criteria are fully met = 15 points; for each sub task that can't be fulfilled, for each missing dialogue step and each unnecessary interaction = one-point deduction)</p>	
4a-2	<p>Task objects and attributes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are task objects, that are relevant in the interaction specification, reflected in the sketches? For each task object: Are attributes resulting from the interaction specification and the overview of task objects reflected in the sketches? 	<p>10</p> <p>(Both criteria are fulfilled = 10 points; for each missing task object and each grossly incomplete set of attributes = one-point deduction)</p>	
4a-3	<p>User Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have all user requirements been considered in the prototype? 	<p>10</p> <p>(All user requirements have been considered = 10 points; for each not considered user requirement = one-point deduction)</p>	

ID	Assessment Criterion	Allocation of Points	Comment/Result
4a-4	Task objects and executable functions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it possible to access the required task objects, that are relevant in the interaction specification? Is it possible to access the required executable functions, that are relevant in the interaction specification? 	5 (All task objects and executable functions are accessible = 5 points; for each missing access = one-point deduction)	
4a-5	Triggers and calls to action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have appropriate trigger (words) and calls to action been used in the prototype that are required from the point of view of the user's mental model? 	5 (Suitable triggers and calls to actions are used = 5 points; for each unsuitable trigger or call to action = one-point deduction)	

Answer sheet 4b: Annotation

4b-1	Description of the interaction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the interaction described from the perspective of the user? Are all design decisions explained? 	5 (The interaction is described from the user's perspective = 3 points. Design decisions are explained = 2 points. For each mere description of the user interface = one-point deduction)	
4b-2	Subtasks/ dialogue steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the description cover the interaction across all subtasks and all dialogue steps? 	5 (The interaction can be completely reproduced on the prototype = 5 points; for each missing subtask or dialogue step = one-point deduction)	
4b-3	If deviations from the given information architecture and task objects have been made, were they described and justified in the annotation?	5 (All deviations are justified or no deviations are made = 5 points; otherwise = 0 points)	

Answer sheet 4c: Consideration of heuristics

Checklist for the practical test CPUX-DS

ID	Assessment Criterion	Allocation of Points	Comment/Result
4c-1	Have two heuristics (according to Nielsen) been named correctly?	2 (Two heuristics are correctly named = 2 points; for each deviation = one-point deduction. If more than two heuristics are named, only the first two heuristics are evaluated.)	
4c-2	Applying of heuristics Per heuristic: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the heuristics match the description? Has the application been described accurately? 	4 (Per heuristic: The heuristic matches the description = 1 point; the application is described accurately = 1 point; for each deviation = one-point deduction)	
4c-3	Per heuristic: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the fulfilled heuristics reflected in the prototype? 	4 (The two heuristics can be traced back in the sketches = 4 points; for each deviation = one-point deduction)	

Exercise 5: Evaluate Card Sorting Results (16 Points)

ID	Assessment Criterion	Allocation of Points	Comment/Result
Answer sheet 5a: Comparison of card sorting results and information architecture			
5a-1	Have 4 discrepancies been listed?	4 (four discrepancies have been identified = 4 points; for each missing discrepancy = one-point deduction. If more than four discrepancies are described, only the first four discrepancies are evaluated)	
5a-2	Per discrepancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the identified discrepancies been described comprehensibly and justified plausibly? 	4 (All discrepancies are described comprehensibly and plausibly = 4 points; for each incomprehensible or unjustified discrepancy = one-point deduction)	
5a-3	Per discrepancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the deviation been evaluated/assessed in a comprehensible way with regard to the further design process? 	4 (All discrepancies have been evaluated/assessed comprehensibly = 4 points; for each missing or not plausible evaluation/assessment = one-point deduction)	

Checklist for the practical test CPUX-DS

ID	Assessment Criterion	Allocation of Points	Comment/Result
5a-4	<p>Per discrepancy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a measure suitable for the discrepancy been described in a comprehensible way? 	<p>4</p> <p>(For each discrepancy, a suitable measure has been described plausibly = 4 points; for each missing, not suitable or not plausibly described measure = one-point deduction)</p> <p>Example for a specific measure: "A usability test should be carried out for checking if..."</p>	

5 Important Changes to this Document

Date, Version	Changes compared to version 1.0, 2 October 2020 and version 1.1, 31 January 2021
5 March 2021, Version 1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Based on the experience of the examiners from the evaluation of several examinations, the evaluation criteria, and the wording of the allocation of points were improved.