

Usability Testing & Heuristic Evaluation

Links to Figma Prototypes

Prototype A:

<https://www.figma.com/file/ftXFDom1lQyuY8ITfro7qNyS/Prototype-A?node-id=0%3A1>

Prototype B:

<https://www.figma.com/file/Ng2MPMgsDUbZEwoh9VwflfE7/Prototype-B?node-id=0%3A1>

Usability study notes #1

- Study Session #, date, time, location
 - **Session 3, Dec/1/2018, 2:30pm, UMC**
- Study participant info: give them a pseudonym, and note their occupation (often we would record their age, gender, etc., but in this case those aren't very relevant to the usability test)
 - **Sarah Cordell, Student at CU, 26, female**
- Who conducted the study (and who else from your group helped)
 - **Nimra Sharnez**
- Observations from **Prototype A**: What happened when testing prototype A? Did you notice anything surprising? Any confusion or mistakes?
 - What did you like about Prototype A?
 - **The simplicity and the colors**
 - What did you dislike about Prototype A?
 - **The font, prefer, bigger simpler fonts**
 - What was confusing about these prototypes?
 - **No, it was very user friendly**
 - Do you have any suggestions for improving these prototypes?
 - **A simpler way of displaying the tasks, use icons exclusively**
- Observations from **Prototype B**: What happened when testing prototype A? Did you notice anything surprising? Any confusion or mistakes?
 - What did you like about Prototype B?

Usability Testing & Heuristic Evaluation

- **Love the layout, looks like a planner, very realistic. Like the hourly part.**
 - What did you dislike about Prototype B?
 - **Fuller calendar, with a list in each box, monthly layout**
 - What was confusing about these prototypes?
 - **The “edit” list was confusing, maybe add more instructions for new users**
 - Do you have any suggestions for improving these prototypes?
 - **N/A**
-

Usability study notes #2

- Study Session #, date, time, location
 - **2, Dec/1/2018, 12:00pm, Norlin Library**
- Study participant info: give them a pseudonym, and note their occupation (often we would record their age, gender, etc., but in this case those aren't very relevant to the usability test)
 - **Cole Eckert, Whole Foods employee, 21, male**
- Who conducted the study (and who else from your group helped)
 - **Nimra Sharnez**
- Observations from **Prototype A**: What happened when testing prototype A? Did you notice anything surprising? Any confusion or mistakes?
 - What did you like about Prototype A?
 - **I liked the colors and the simplicity of the application**
 - What did you dislike about Prototype A?
 - **I did not like how the application was formatted for the calendar**
 - What was confusing about these prototypes?
 - **No confusion really**
 - Do you have any suggestions for improving these prototypes?
 - **I would suggest re-formatting the calendar to larger or with words**
- Observations from **Prototype B**: What happened when testing prototype A? Did you notice anything surprising? Any confusion or mistakes?
 - What did you like about Prototype B?
 - **I liked the layout of this application a lot.**

Usability Testing & Heuristic Evaluation

- What did you dislike about Prototype B?
 - The small font size
 - What was confusing about these prototypes?
 - The customization was a little confusing
 - Do you have any suggestions for improving these prototypes?
 - I would suggest to increase the font size and also to give instructions as to how to customize
-

Usability study notes #3

- Study Session #, date, time, location
 - **3, Dec/2/2018, 4:15pm, Engineering Center**
- Study participant info: give them a pseudonym, and note their occupation (often we would record their age, gender, etc., but in this case those aren't very relevant to the usability test)
 - **Jason Lubrano, Student at CU & Best Buy employee, 25, male**
- Who conducted the study (and who else from your group helped)
 - **Erika Bailon**
- Observations from **Prototype A**: What happened when testing prototype A? Did you notice anything surprising? Any confusion or mistakes?
 - What did you like about Prototype A?
 - I liked the simplicity of the application and the concept overall
 - What did you dislike about Prototype A?
 - I don't like the layout particularly, I feel like the space could be better utilized
 - What was confusing about these prototypes?
 - Maybe the customization was a little confusing
 - Do you have any suggestions for improving these prototypes?
 - I would suggest maybe just utilizing the space of the application a bit more rather than having the logs be so large
- Observations from **Prototype B**: What happened when testing prototype A? Did you notice anything surprising? Any confusion or mistakes?
 - What did you like about Prototype B?

Usability Testing & Heuristic Evaluation

- I like the real life agenda look of this one, I also liked all the little widgets and details on the side of the application, I also liked the mascot and color scheme a lot
- What did you dislike about Prototype B?
 - There was no notification setting
- What was confusing about these prototypes?
 - Nothing was too confusing about it
- Do you have any suggestions for improving these prototypes?
 - Maybe incorporate a notification aspect so we can be reminded about our plans and events

Heuristic Evaluation Tables

Prototype	Heuristic	Tester
A	1 Match between system and real world	Erika
B	1 Match between system and real world	Nimra
A	2 User control & freedom	Erika
B	2 User control & freedom	Nimra
A	3 Consistency & standards	Erika
B	3 Consistency & standards	Nimra
A	4 Flexibility & efficiency of use	Erika
B	4 Flexibility & efficiency of use	Nimra
A	5 Aesthetic & minimalistic design	Erika
B	5 Aesthetic & minimalistic design	Nimra

Usability Testing & Heuristic Evaluation

UARs

UAR #: 1A	Problem/Good: Good match between system and real world	Date: 12/03/18
Name: Erika Bailon		
Relevant heuristic: Match between system and real world		
Steps to reproduce: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Used appropriate wording. 2. Used familiar concepts. 3. Organized the information. 		
Detailed explanation: We used appropriate working in every text we created in the application so the user could understand what each step meant and what each button was going to do. In addition we used familiar concepts so the user did not get confused with words that meant something additional or had double meaning or could be interpreted in some other way. The information was organized in a logical order to not confuse the user and have them go back and forth between actions.		
Possible solution: The matching was good, therefore, we do not have to find a solution since there is not a problem, however we could improve it by making the font different so the user can get a feeling of more of a serious app.		
Severity (low, medium, high, critical): Low	Relationships: Related to UAR#: 5A Because of aesthetics, the layout of the application and organization.	

Usability Testing & Heuristic Evaluation

UAR #: 1B	Problem/Good: Good match between system & real world	Date: 12/03/18
Name: Nimra Sharnez		
Relevant heuristic: Match between system and real world		
Steps to reproduce: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Used appropriate wording2. Used familiar concepts3. Organizing the information		
Detailed explanation: <p>Match between system and real world is successfully met through the appropriate wording, familiar concepts and organized information. Appropriate wordings helped to allow user to properly understand guidance of the application. Familiar concepts allowed for users to more easily use the application. Organizing the information in a user friendly format gives user a better and simple experience.</p>		
Possible solution: <p>The match between system and real world was efficient so there were no noticeable problems.</p>		
Severity (low, medium, high, critical): low	Relationships: <p>This is related to 5B, through organization and the layout of the application.</p>	

Usability Testing & Heuristic Evaluation

UAR #: 2A	Problem/Good: User had a good control and freedom in the application.	Date: 12/03/18
Name: Erika Bailon		
Relevant heuristic: User control & freedom		
Steps to reproduce: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allowed the user to decide which step to take which each task. 2. Gave the user the option of jumping from screen to screen. 3. Allowed user to personalized the design of their tasks. 		
Detailed explanation: The user has pretty good control and freedom with the type A prototype. We gave the user the freedom of adding as many things as they want and modify each task by adding an icon or picture or whatever they want to make the visuals better in their own app. In addition, they can manage the calendar also with the images they want so they can remember more and make it fun so they don't have a problem navigating the application. They have extra features also that they can manage, like alarms and reminders. So the user can do whatever they want as in how much interaction they want with the application.		
Possible solution: There is not a problem so we do not need a solution.		
Severity (low, medium, high, critical): Low	Relationships: UAR# 4A- Flexibility & efficiency of use	

Usability Testing & Heuristic Evaluation

UAR #: 2B	Problem/Good: Good user control & freedom	Date: 12/03/18
Name: Nimra Sharnez		
Relevant heuristic: User control & freedom		
Steps to reproduce: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clear user navigation2. Include obvious back arrows		
Detailed explanation: <p>With obvious step by step customization, users know how to properly use the application. With back arrows after screen pop-ups, users can go back to previous page. Big buttons indicating what tasks are to be done next allow for users goals to be met easily.</p>		
Possible solution: <p>Possible solution to any confusions would involve the incorporation of more obvious buttons on how to go back and such.</p>		
Severity (low, medium, high, critical): medium	Relationships: 4B Flexibility & efficiency of use through users usage	

Usability Testing & Heuristic Evaluation

UAR #: 3A	Problem/Good: Good consistency and standards	Date:12/03/18
Name: Erika Bailon		
Relevant heuristic: Consistency & standards		
Steps to reproduce: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Be consistent in the wording and flow of the application.2. Not have many ways of getting to the same action.		
Detailed explanation: Even though we give freedom to the user, the prototype has a one way of doing things so the user is not having more than one way to create an action or use the application and make it inconsistent. Also, each step is clear about what to expect so the results of each actions are really consistent.		
Possible solution: We can improve the design by asking more people about the standards and what they expected that didn't meet. But so far, everyone has liked it.		
Severity (low, medium, high, critical): Low	Relationships: UAR# 2A. It relates to the control and freedom provided to the user because of how clear and intuitive are the actions.	

Usability Testing & Heuristic Evaluation

UAR #: 3B	Problem/Good: Good consistency & standards	Date: 12/03/18
Name: Nimra Sharnez		
Relevant heuristic: Consistency & standards		
Steps to reproduce: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Diverse button options2. Uniqueness to each step3. Clear and consistent options presented		
Detailed explanation: <p>With the large differences of activities in the application, users will not be confused and properly understand the steps to actions in the application. The uniqueness of each step will let users understand what their actions will result in. The clear consistency further improves the user experience allowing for the heuristic to be properly met.</p>		
Possible solution: <p>Adding a larger diversification of actions.</p>		
Severity (low, medium, high, critical): low	Relationships: 2B User control & freedom	

Usability Testing & Heuristic Evaluation

UAR #: 4B	Problem/Good: Good efficiency and flexibility	Date: 12/03/18
Name: Erika Bailon		
Relevant heuristic: Flexibility & efficiency of use		
<p>Steps to reproduce:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Make sure the application is friendly to new user and expert users.2. Keep consistency and easy wording.3. Indicate each action and step needed.		
<p>Detailed explanation:</p> <p>The application has really good guidance on what to do and where to go for each action, this makes it easy for new users. Everything is worded out without many words to make it tedious, but with enough words to make it intuitive. The application has icons that take you directly to the action you want so it accelerates the learning curve on how to manage the application. This also makes easier to get to frequent actions.</p>		
<p>Possible solution: The calendar is probably the less intuitive thing and we could modify it to make it more guided and more words to indicate people what to do, not just icons that are easy for expert users.</p>		
Severity (low, medium, high, critical): Medium	Relationships: It relates to 2A because the control we give to the user has to do with how they can manage to use the app.	

Usability Testing & Heuristic Evaluation

UAR #: 4B	Problem/Good: Good	Date: 12/03/18
Name: Nimra Sharnez		
Relevant heuristic: Flexibility & efficiency of use		
Steps to reproduce: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recognize new users 2. Recognize expert users 3. Cater to both 		
Detailed explanation: Through addressing the fact we will have both users experienced and new, using modern and obvious design will allow for both groups to understand and appreciate the application. Our approach for Prototype B gave both a “paper-like” feel and virtual aspects to the application welcoming both groups, new and experienced.		
Possible solution: Adding more aspects that can appeal to new users could be beneficial to those who struggle with applications. As shown in our study, the use of instructions when a user logs in at first can help the user’s experience.		
Severity (low, medium, high, critical): medium	Relationships: 3B Good consistency & standards	

Usability Testing & Heuristic Evaluation

UAR #: 5A	Problem/Good: Pretty good minimalistic design and aesthetics	Date: 12/03/18
Name: Erika Bailon		
Relevant heuristic: Aesthetic & minimalistic design		
Steps to reproduce: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Keeping meaningful/understandable words.2. Avoiding irrelevant and ambiguity actions, wording or steps.3. Condensed the application to relevant units of information.4. Clear and simple visibility.		
Detailed explanation: After sketching and going over the application many times and the flow, we were able to condensed the steps, actions, and flow on the application to make it minimalistic and not confusing. We also made a very good job of keeping a good scale of colors to not saturate the visual to the user and make obvious each element in the application.		
Possible solution: Some buttons do not look like button and look like links, we could improve the design of those to also give feedback when they click on it, like a vibration.		
Severity (low, medium, high, critical): Low	Relationships: This relates to UAR#4A because efficiency depends on how clear and to the point the information and design is.	

Usability Testing & Heuristic Evaluation

UAR #: 5B	Problem/Good: Alright aesthetic & minimalistic design	Date: 12/03/18
Name: Nimra Sharnez		
Relevant heuristic: Aesthetic & minimalistic design		
<p>Steps to reproduce:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Reducing the number of ideas2. Maintaining only the ones crucial to application3. Consistent color scheme4. Simplistic designs and options5. Clear usage		
<p>Detailed explanation:</p> <p>Through only keep what was absolutely essential in the application, we were able to keep our application minimalistic and have a very modern aesthetic. The color scheme held consistent allowed for the aesthetic of the application to be visually pleasing and user friendly. This was aided by the simplistic design and button usage. With the lack of overwhelming buttons, user can properly use this application which maintaining and staying true to the heuristic.</p>		
<p>Possible solution:</p> <p>Incorporate more clear buttons that have been overly simplified for the sake of aesthetic. Emphasize the fact that things are clickable.</p>		
Severity (low, medium, high, critical): low	Relationships: 4B Flexibility & efficiency of use through the modern and efficient design	