**PROJECT 1 : PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS**

### PICK A USER

My target user is a new mom. She gave birth last month. As a new mom, she does not have much time to use a system that can potentially waste her very limited time.

### PICK AN INTERFACE

For this project, I want to improve the design of the Eastern Idaho Public Health website.

A screenshot of a social media post
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I want to draw your attention to the right side of the screenshot. Yes, it was the designer’s poor choice to design an unresponsive webpage that only looks perfect on a very limited number of computer monitors. Because much of the valuable space is wasted, this website can be improved by applying modern website building techniques.

The reason why this interface is very important to the user (new mom) is because of the many resources and programs that Idaho Public Health offers. For example, many new moms, especially those who are also college students, enroll in the program called “WIC” Women, Infants, and Children. The website contains all the application information as well as additional guidelines and services offered through the website.

### INTERACTION FRAMEWORK

**Presentation** –This is where most of the problems of this website spring from. The website was designed a very long time ago and was not re-designed with the newest development technologies. The website lacks one of the most important features of modern websites – responsiveness. Responsiveness is when a website is able to adjust according to the size of the user’s screen. A user should be able to view the website on a mobile, tablet, laptop, and large TV screen. When responsiveness is omitted, users often struggle to navigate through the website and find the needed information because the website is either too big or too small.

**Perception:** This is where the website excels. Even users with disabilities are able to navigate through the website and find needed information by using text reading features.

**Interpretation:** This portion of the website does not have major problems. Users are able to interpret the presented information. The components of the website are easily identified: header, horizontal navigation, vertical left navigation, body, and footer.

**Evaluation:** Evaluation means that the user is able to relate the interpretations to his goals. This is a partial problem with the design because even though the website provides well-thought-through navigation, it does not provide a search bar where the user can easily find the needed information. In today’s world, users expect to see a search bar when visiting websites that offer much content.

**Goal:** This step is not broken. Users often visit the website to find more information on their topic of interest regarding health services offered through Public Health Idaho.

**Intention:** Different intentions can be used to express the same goal. In the world today, web users expect to see a search bar on websites that offer great amounts of content. The initial user’s intention might be to use a search bar to find what is needed. However, there is no search bar on the website. So, this step is partially broken because the user can use a different intention to find what’s needed.

**Specify Sequence:** This step is not broken. After the user comes up with the correct intention, then creating a mental picture of how to reach the goal becomes very easy.

**Execute Sequence:** This step is not broken. The user can execute the specify sequence and arrive to the desired page.

### VARIABLES OF USABILITY

**Efficiency (-1):** This aspect of the website has a problem. Since there is no way to quickly find what the user needs (no search bar), the user has to spend extra time and effort to get to the desired page.

**Learnability (2):** This step is not broken. The website does not require much time to become an expert.

**Familiarity (1):** This is not broken but could be improved. The website was most likely designed over a decade ago. It is possible that users have seen similar website layouts; however, modern website designs are built differently. Familiarity can be improved by modernizing the design.

**Simplicity (1):** The user does need to know the bare minimum in order to operate the design. In other words, the user needs to know the name of the service or program that he is looking for.

**Mapping (1):** The website does encourage the user to form a correct mental model by providing only one way of doing things. It also discourages users from having an inconsistent mental model by having a good page structure.

**Motivation (0):** The target user neutral about the interface because it is neither appealing nor highly useful. It falls right in the middle where the user is still comfortable enough to use it but would prefer to switch to something else.

**Trust (1):** Many users might understand that if the domain of a website is “.gov,” then it’s a trustworthy website. However, those who don’t know that might get a little suspicious because the website uses an older design, so users might think that the website is not up-to-date.

**Visibility (1):** The website has a great structure of the information. Users don’t have to dig in for hours to find what they need; however, a more convenient way to provide information to the could be used. A search bar would make the information offered through the website more easily available to the users.

### GRADING

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exceptional 100% | Good 90% | Acceptable 70% | Developing 50% | Missing 0% |
| Selection Criteria 20% | It is clear the interface is important to the user and the user could benefit from a better design | All the components are present and the project is doable | All the components (user, interface description, and picture) are present but the project might be very difficult to complete | Example missing description of user, description of the interface, or a picture of the interface | No item selected |
| Interaction Framework: Correctness 10% | It is "abundantly clear" that the interaction framework is fully understood | No errors in the listing nor defining the steps | One component of the interaction framework is incorrectly defined | Two components of the interaction framework are incorrectly defined | Three or more components of the interaction framework are incorrectly defined |
| Interaction Framework: Evaluation 20% | The interaction framework was used to correctly identify the core of the usability problem for the example | No mistakes were made in evaluating the example using the interaction framework | Analysis according to the interaction framework was inaccurate in one way | Analysis according to the interaction framework was inaccurate in two or more ways | The interface was not evaluated according to the interaction framework |
| Variables of Usability: Correctness 20% | It is "abundantly clear" that the variables of usability is fully understood | No errors in the listing or defining the variables | One variable is incorrectly defined | Two variables are incorrectly defined | Three or more variables are incorrectly defined |
| Variables of Usability: Evaluation 30% | The variables of usability were used to correctly identify the core of the usability problem for the example | No mistakes were made in evaluating the example using the variables of usability | Analysis according to the variables of usability was inaccurate in one way | Analysis according to the variables of usability was inaccurate in two or more ways | The interface was not evaluated according to the variables of usability |