

# Trick or Eat Paper Prototype Post

## Mortem

### Freedom Eaters

Marcel Amato

Dominic Gagne

Alexandre Gontcharov

Matthew Tersigni

Erik Zorn-Wallentin

# Table of Contents

## Table of contents for Trick or Eat Paper Prototype Post Mortem

<b>i</b>	<b>Team Details.....</b>	<b>1</b>
i.i	Marcel Amato.....	1
i.ii	Dominic Gagne.....	1
i.iii	Alexandre Gontcharov.....	2
i.iv	Matthew Tersigni.....	2
i.v	Erik Zorn-Wallentin.....	3
<b>ii</b>	<b>Client Details and Use Cases.....</b>	<b>4</b>
ii.i	Corey Alexander.....	4
ii.ii	Keisha Bartrem.....	4
ii.iii	Ross Kett.....	5
ii.iv	Use Cases.....	6
<b>iii</b>	<b>Things That Worked.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>iv</b>	<b>Things to Improve.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>v</b>	<b>Looking to the Future.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>vi</b>	<b>Individual Contribution.....</b>	<b>14</b>
vi.i	Marcel Amato.....	14
vi.ii	Dominic Gagne.....	14
vi.iii	Alexandre Gontcharov.....	15
vi.iv	Matthew Tersigni.....	16

vi.v	Erik Zorn-Wallentin.....	17
vii	<b>References</b> .....	18

## i Team Details

### i.i Marcel Amato

Marcel Amato is the designer for the team, and for our paper prototyping sessions was in charge of acting as the system, along with Erik Zorn-Wallentin. Marcel attempted to be as quick as possible when bringing the new pages or pop-ups to the client as those pages and pop-ups were needed. Marcel created rough drafts of the paper prototype, then discussed and implemented improvements with Erik as the rough copy was being made. Once the design was done Marcel was then tasked to draw the final version of the paper prototype. By taking the initial decisions made in the rough copy of the prototype and altering the system a final copy was produced, which better represented the proposed solution.

### i.ii Dominic Gagne

Dominic Gagne is the documentation lead for the team for our paper prototyping sessions. He was charged with the task of documenting how the client interacted with the system, along with Alexandre Gontcharov. Dominic paid attention to the details of the client whilst they attempted to navigate our prototype, being careful to document the issues and successes that the client experienced when completing the use cases. Dominic was involved with the design of the paper prototype, helping to make decisions and dutifully documenting the interactions of the team.

### i.iii Alexandre Gontcharov

Alexandre Gontcharov is the project manager of the team, and for our paper prototyping session was charged with the task of documenting how the client interacted with the system, alongside Dominic Gagne. This included paying attention to any positive or negative feedback from the client, such as any areas of struggle, as well as documenting anything important that happened throughout the use cases. In addition, he created the note taking rubric with Dominic for the paper prototype session, helped organize the meetings and made important decisions with the design of the paper prototype.

### i.iv Matthew Tersigni

Matthew Tersigni is the team leader for the team, and for our paper prototyping session was entrusted with facilitating the session. Matthew introduced the team, and promptly discussed Meal Exchange and Trick or Eat. Matthew discussed the goals of the Trick or Eat campaign with the client, and how Meal Exchange planned to meet those goals.

Matthew continued into a preamble about what a paper prototyping session entails, explaining the client's responsibilities along with the responsibilities of the team.

Matthew then went on to lead the client through the use cases, prompting often for feedback. A polite stance was taken when faced with feedback, whether it be positive or negative.

## i.v Erik Zorn-Wallentin

Erik Zorn-Wallentin encompasses quality assurance, and for our paper prototyping sessions was charged with the task of acting as the system, alongside Marcel Amato. Erik was charged with the task of creating the rough draft of the entire paper prototype for the paper prototyping sessions. Erik paid attention to the client when they were using the paper prototype during the paper prototype session. Performing according to the scenario, Erik actively changed the paper prototype as the client reacted.

## ii Client Details and Use Cases

### ii.i Corey Alexander

Corey was our first client who worked through the prototyping session with us. He is a teaching assistant in our class, has a Degree in Computer Science, and is currently enrolled in Graduate School. However, for the purpose of the paper prototype session he acted as if he had a very basic knowledge of computing. In addition, due to the time constraint Corey only did half of the use cases (five out of ten). One of the main struggles that Corey had was that he regularly forgot the lists of tasks in the use case. Another issue was that Corey did not understand the difference between a participant and a team captain. As a result of this he went off use case 1 as displayed in section ii.iv and created a team captain account instead of a participant account. Furthermore, during use case 4 in section ii.iv Corey struggled with the account settings dialog. The small screen made it harder for him to read the options so he suggested having a separate page for it. Lastly, for use case 5 in section iv.ii Corey emphasized that a lot of things were happening on this page and that he did not see a join button to join a team.

### ii.ii Keisha Bartrem

Keisha Bartrem is a Meal Exchange employee who participated in Freedom Eater's second paper prototyping session. She provided valuable feedback on the usability of the system, along with sharing some useful insights as to how Meal Exchange currently uses their more conventional systems. She identified several components of the

prototype that performed exactly as she had expected while also giving us advice on how to improve our implementation of some concepts. This way, they could fall more in line with Meal Exchange's standards.

Keisha was also able to give us some more general feedback on the layout of the system. More specifically, she indicated to us that our primary splash page contained too much information and had a 'cluttered' feel to it. Most of the members of Freedom Eaters agreed with Keisha on this point. Any future prototypes will focus on having a more intuitive and easy to understand visual layout.

### ii.iii Ross Kett

Ross Kett is a Graduate Student with the Department of Mathematics and Statistics. He has a strong background in Computer Science and is currently developing Statistical Modelling Systems for the School of Computer Science. Ross was able to provide Freedom Eaters with a plethora of valuable feedback during the second paper prototyping session. Ross was the third and final user to test our paper prototype, and his feedback reflected the criticism we received from our previous users. For the most part, Ross enjoyed using the prototype and found interactions to be very intuitive. His primary criticism was almost identical to that which we received from Keisha. Ross found the splash screen to be slightly overwhelming and flooded with information. Based on the fact that we independently received the same criticism from two users during our paper prototyping sessions, Freedom Eaters will be addressing this concern as soon as possible. Alternate layouts for the splash page have already been proposed by a few members of Freedom Eaters.



## ii.iv Use Cases

1. **Use Case:** A participant must be able to create a participant account.

**Brief Description:** The user accesses the system and attempts to create an account. The system responds with a dialog allowing the user to choose either a participant account or a team captain account. The user selects a participant account. The system responds with the respective prompt allowing the user to input their participant information. The user fills out the form and clicks submit. The system stores the information and logs the user into the system as a participant.

2. **Use Case:** A participant must be able to sign up as a team captain when creating a participant account.

**Brief Description:** The user accesses the system and attempts to create an account. The system responds with a dialog allowing the user to choose either a participant account or a team captain account. The user selects a team captain account. The system responds with the respective prompt allowing the user to input their information. The user fills out the form and clicks submit. The system stores the information and logs the user into the system as a team captain.

3. **Use Case:** A participant must be able to log in to their participant account.

**Brief Description:** The user accesses the system and attempts to log in. The system responds with the log in prompt. The user inputs their username and password. The system validates the users credentials. The system forwards the user to the Trick or Eat page. The system populates the page with information relevant to that user.

4. **Use Case:** A participant must be able to indicate whether they are a university student.

**Brief Description:** The participant clicks the account settings button. The system prompts the user with their account settings. The user edits their university student status. The system updates the information for that user.

5. **Use Case:** A participant must be able to accept an invitation to join a team.

**Brief Description:** The participant clicks their notification stating that they have been invited to join a team. The system displays the notification stating that the user has been invited to join a team. The user accepts the invite to join a team. The system associates that user with their team.

6. **Use Case:** A team captain must be able to choose the route(s) their team will canvas.

**Brief Description:** A team captain who is logged into their team captain account clicks the button to select a route. The system displays the list of existing routes. The user selects a route. The system displays the detailed information about that route. The user confirms their selection. The system assigns the team captain and their team to the selected route.

7. **Use Case:** A participant must be able to see which route(s) their team is assigned.

**Brief Description:** A participant has logged into their account and clicks the button to “view route”. The system displays the route that participants team is assigned to.

8. **Use Case:** A participant must be able to view the participants on their team.

**Brief Description:** A participant has logged into their account and clicks the team info button. The system displays their respective team info.

9. **Use Case:** A participant must be able to sign a participation waiver.

**Brief Description:** The participant declined the participation waiver when signing up. The system set the participation waiver status to reflect this. The participant

logs into their account and clicks the waiver status button. The system displays the participation waiver. The participant accepts the participation waiver. The system updates the participant's waiver status.

10. **Use Case:** A participant selecting a bus route must be provided with a bus waiver to be signed.

**Brief Description:** A participant who is logged into their participant account clicks on the view routes button. The system displays the routes. The participant selects a bus route. The system displays the detailed information for that route. The participant confirms their selection. The system prompts the team captain of the team the participant selected to join that a participant wants to join their team. The team captain accepts the new participant to their team. The system inserts the participant to the team. The system alerts the participant that they have been accepted to the team. The system prompts the participant to accept or decline the bus waiver. The participant accepts the bus waiver. The system updates the participant's waiver status.

### iii Things That Worked

Although all the paper prototype participants did not understand the difference between team captains and participants, they agreed that the sign up portion for the participant was pretty straightforward and fairly easy. Furthermore, all the clients found the login and register button where they expected it to be and the process to logging in on the portal was also simple and intuitive. In addition, the forget password button and the dialog screen that follows was simple and intuitive. Users unanimously agreed that resetting their credentials was easily accomplished, as it was a common function used by other popular websites. Another thing that all the clients agreed upon was that the language used was intuitive and self explanatory.

## iv Things to Improve

The most common thing the clients thought that did not work was our interface on our “Trick or Eat” page. This interface showed every possible detail to the client on one page, which included the map interface, route details, drop off location details, team details, and details on the user (account info, team info, route info, etc). Even though everything worked well together on the page, there was little room left for the details of the user. These details include the user’s account information, team information, route information, waiver status, and much more. Since there was little room left for the details on the user, the client enacting the paper prototyping session felt that it was a “clunky mess” that needed to be opened up more. The client suggested some improvements, such as moving details including the team information on the bottom right side of the screen to a more meaningful location or another page. The next implementation of the interface on the “Trick or Eat” page will be a more “open” page where all the information of the event will be spread out more across the page, or to be relocated to other pages, enabling the data to not exclusively be located on the left side of the page. This will allow us to have a “less clunky” interface, and this will improve the overall usability of the system.

The next, most common issue the clients explicitly stated that they believed did not work as well as it could have, was flushed out during a use case in which we allowed them to create an account, wherein an option of two buttons would appear that enable them choose to create a normal participant account, or a team captain account. The client felt this interface needed to be altered to only include one option when they click on the

account creation button that automatically allows them to start creating their account.

The client further informed us that there should be a “drop down” option for the user to be able to select if they are a team captain or a normal participant. The next implementation will follow their request to alter the account creation to one with a “drop down” menu, this will help simplify our interface for the clients to more easily understand, and, with any luck, to help improve our overall design.

## v Looking to the Future

Looking to the future our team is tasked with improving the system based on the feedback that the client provided during the paper prototyping session. The overarching theme that was encountered during the paper prototyping session was that our interface was too cluttered. It was suggested that some aspects of our design were made more modular or moved to other locations. The smaller tweaks are related to the things that were overlooked when designing the system, such as alternates. Corey brought to fruition the fact that a request to join a team could be declined and lost forever in our implementation. This could be circumvented by having a section where the user could check their notifications, and view their past, swiftly dismissed, irrational declination of invitations. Another issue that was brought to our attention included the fact that we do not have stars next to required fields on our input regions. Keisha and Ross both commented that they would have liked to be able to see all the possible routes accompanying the map of those routes.

The system could also be improved for extendability by allowing users to set their location. If the user were in the United States of America, they definitely would want that to be reflected in their account somehow. Overall our design received positive feedback from the clients who participated in the paper prototyping sessions, as such it is our inclination that we should continue with the design, making slight changes based on the negative feedback received.



## vi Individual Contribution

### vi.i Marcel Amato

I agree with Don and his theory of designing first before doing research and working on user observations. Studying about the client is very important and can help with creating ideas for the design, but it is not always necessary to start researching as the first step. As Don mentioned in his article sometimes development groups would start a project already with knowledge of their customer, in this case I definitely feel that starting the design first is a huge time saver. On the other hand, if the designers and coders have minimal knowledge about their client then I feel that it would be more beneficial for them to research briefly before designing to get some knowledge and ideas about the client's persona. The biggest advantage to designing first would be the huge amount of time gained by jumping right into planning and prototypes. This would help testing tremendously and would be able to provide the developers with more opportunities to show the client what they have designed. The studying of the client could start during the finishing phases of designing and would help polish off any rough edges of the design created.

### vi.ii Dominic Gagne

I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Norman's view. Gathering feedback from users after having some sort of design implemented was extremely useful. Through the use of paper prototyping, Team Freedom Eaters was able to gain several valuable insights into

how members of Meal Exchange wanted to use the system. The acquisition of these insights would simply not have been possible without already having a design.

With the exception of a few small details, the prototype that Freedom Eaters created was exactly the product that members of Meal Exchange had expected. Designing the interface and considering the user experience first resulted in a system that was close to what the client had expected. With a design implemented, Team Freedom Eaters was able to gather concrete, practical criticisms from our users that simply would not have been possible without having already implemented a design in the form of a paper prototype. While I believe that implementing the entire system before getting any user feedback would have been a mistake, I certainly think it was wise to have a early-stage design that could be used as a tool to gather feedback from our client.

#### vi.iii Alexandre Gontcharov

I agree and disagree with Don Norman's view that user observation first is wrong. When a project is announced it is without a doubt in my opinion too late to study the project. The whole process of doing user observation just takes too long - it should be done before the project announced and be expanded on throughout the adaption period. Most of the time should be spent on creating a design, reviewing it, testing it and finally redesigning it. As a result of this you also get to interact with the client more and do observational studies as they interact with the system to describe any requirement they missed or they were not aware themselves. At the same time, if you don't have a say in the project and you were just given it to do then at this point you're forced to do user observation so that you can understand the project, the client and his needs.

However, despite user observation taking a long time they tend to produce good designs and I have a huge respect for well thought and written designs. From my experience with a good design there is less changes to make to the document or redesign it and everything eventually falls together smoothly which as a result saves you some time.

#### vi.iv Matthew Tersigni

I agree with Don in some respects, but it is my opinion that he is wrong in many other respects. Doing user observations first is definitely not wrong in many cases, for example if a user interacting with some system or completing some task is observed by a designer, that designer can determine the latent needs of that user. Latent needs are those that a user does not know how to express, or, moreover can be described as something the user never knew that they needed. This latent need might be something that is impossible to implement without a redesign had the system been designed first and studied later.

That having been said, I agree with Don that the system still should be studied after it has been designed and implemented. Quality assurance is an extremely important part of the life cycle of a system. If the system when implement does not adequately solve the problem it was intended to solve then it needs to be fixed. Furthermore, if the system developed creates new problems, whether it be usability problems, control flow problems, or any other issue with the system, these can only be found by studying the system after it has been designed.

## vi.v Erik Zorn-Wallentin

I agree with Don in his article about “Why doing user observations first is wrong”, he talks about the order should be “design, then study” and I fully agree with this statement. Projects should be started first with “design” as he mentions that “Most projects are enhancements of already existing projects”, so there is no reason to have to study all over again when you already have learned what the company needed to learn. If you start with design first this allow you to test it quicker by after studying how the client’s feel about your design. This step of design first is very important because it allows you to better understand what your client’s actually want and get them the product they are “looking for”. When studying is done second, this allows you to learn from your current product and given time to polish it up depending on the client’s feedback.

When the project is underway, Don says that “it is going to be severely constrained by time and resources” and I agree that design needs to start on day one. This allows for more time to create a better product for the clients, and get actual feedback properly by allowing them to test it. Without doing design first, you are losing this opportunity of valuable feedback with potential clients, and are only studying for something that you currently don’t have to test with the clients.

## vii References

Don Norman. 2006. Why doing user observations first is wrong. Interactions. © CACM, 2006.

Accessed at: <[http://www.jnd.org/dn.mss/why\\_doing\\_user\\_obser.html](http://www.jnd.org/dn.mss/why_doing_user_obser.html)>