SOFTENG 350: Lab #10

June 11, 2020

Aiden Burgess

abur970 - 600280511

Reviews

Yujia Wu - Group 11

Strength

The user needs section is excellent. The user needs that are identified are interesting and clearly relevant for university students working in a group. Also, the explanations of what the user needs represent are clear. I found the section on "intelligence need" to be very informing. Furthermore, there are examples given of possible solutions and what currently exists in other systems. It was also clear that the user needs directly influenced the teams design decisions, as images of how these user needs were implemented were shown alongside the explanations.

Improvement

Usage testing results are a bit lacking in terms of discussion and implications. There are two areas that are identified as problematic, and they are described properly and given reasonable solutions. However, these changes are both based on quantitative observations. This is due to there being no qualitative results, so problems with how the UI is used can't be discovered. When taking into account these observations, more discussion can occur and greater changes can be made to improve the application.

Joel Shin - Group 12

Strength

The usage testing results section was clearly laid out and followed a logical structure. It was pleasing to see both quantitative and qualitative results being examined and discussed. There were many solutions proposed for future iterations, and these solutions were derived from clear analysis and reasoning as to why the previous implementation was not ideal. One particular part of this section that was outstanding was the use of Likert Scales and the clear presentation of the information gathered using this system.

Improvement

The prototype description section does specify the user needs, however I feel they were not explained or described in enough detail. Some reasoning as to why these user needs are related to university students would be helpful. It would also be good to see a greater variety of user needs, as the four chosen relate to functionality. Some ecological or emotional user needs would strengthen this section of the report. However, it was commendable to discern the components of the application those particular user needs were associated with.

Comparison

The amount of modal functionality implemented by Group 12 is impressive. There are five different modals possible, and the modal that is tied to the share functionality is customised to include the file name in the input field prefilled. There was also actual functionality to add a new project. Group 11 had one modal which was for sharing, however their application had impressive functionality in terms of navigation. It is possible to navigate through the different projects and view the files in each one. They also implemented a history feature which was quite innovative and useful.