# Feedback Plan

This documentation is designed to detail and document the process for gaining feedback from both a technical and non-technical external audience. This will encompass a range of observational techniques from users who have not seen the requirements or prototype before.

Additionally, I will detail the resources that I have used to gain feedback on the prototype and perform an analysis on the feedback I obtain.

# Plan for Gathering Feedback

## Non-Technical Users

For the non-technical users, I will provide a structured observation which will include screenshots and snippets of the prototype. The recipients of the form will then be asked questions regarding the user experience, layout, and simplicity of the website. This will be implemented in Microsoft forms.

This feedback will be black box, meaning that the users are unlikely to know the inner workings of the system or systems designed using similar technologies. Whilst this may mean that the user’s technical knowledge is limited, this will be an accurate representation of most of the system’s users, hence it is important we get feedback from users with similar technical abilities.

To simplify the collection and analysis of this data, most questions will ask the user to provide a rating between 1 and 5. This will allow us to perform statistical calculations such as the mean, medium, and mode ratings for a feature.

However, to ensure that users still can give personalised feedback or opinions, there will be a comment box at the end of every section which allows users to provide written feedback about any feature or improvements. This will allow us to get a mixture of both qualitative and quantitative feedback.

The full observation we have used to gain feedback from this audience may be found later in this document, under the observation listing section.

## Technical Users

For the technical users, I will provide an observation. The technical user will see and be able to interact with a working version of the prototype. They will be asked to perform multiple actions, they will be shown the code, and will be asked to provide thoughts, comments, or improvements.

This feedback will be white box, meaning that users come from a technical background and will be likely to know how the system works and the code behind it. This may allow us to get more detailed feedback about more specific parts of the system or features, such as memory leaks or cybersecurity risks. It also means that they may have more insightful feedback for user experience and user interface features.

This will be less structured than the non-technical observations and it will not be using any numerical ranking systems. Each observation will be recorded in the observation listing, and I will aim to get between 3-5 observations recorded.

# Observation Listing

## Non-Technical Audience

Due to security measures, I cannot send a link to the observation itself as it is likely that it will be inaccessible. However, I can take screenshots and include snippets of the form which will show the questions which a recipient of the survey will receive.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Assets | Section |
| Q1. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: It is easy to register for an account and log in with the respective account using the register and log in pages? (Note that these are 2 separate pages, a vertical white line has been used to indicate this). |  | 1 – Shared Features |
| Q2. Attached to this question is a screenshot of the navigation bar, which is loaded at the top of every page on the solution. To what extent do you agree with this statement: The navigation bar provides quick and constant access to relevant features and information? |  | 1 – Shared Features |
| Q3. Attached to this question is a screenshot of the website using the "light" and "dark" themes from an implemented accessibility feature. To what extent do you agree with this statement: both the website's light and dark theme use a suitable range of colours? (Note these are 2 different screenshots dependent on what theme is selected). |  | 1 – Shared Features |
| Q4. Do you have any comments regarding this section or the features in it? |  | 1 – Shared Features |
| Q5. Attached below is the landing page that users can access upon signing in and having the "user" role. To what extent do you agree with this statement: The user dashboard provides easy access to features and it is easy to know which feature to select? |  | 2 – User Features |
| Q6. Attached below is the weather forecast page. This details the current weather at the user's location using real and up-to-date data. To what extent do you agree with this statement: The data broadcasted on this page is relevant and will allow the user to make decisions which are dependent on the weather? |  | 2 – User Features |
| Q7. Attached below is the air pollution dashboard page, This details the current concentration of pollutants in the air at the user's current location using real and up-to-date data. To what extent do you agree with this statement: The data broadcasted on this page is relevant and will allow the user to make decisions which are dependent on the air quality? |  | 2 – User Features |
| Q8. Attached below is the health tracker page. Users are able to submit daily "diary" entries, and this page shows today's entry. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: The health tracker displays relevant metrics and options for monitoring health and making related decisions? |  | 2 – User Features |
| Q9. Attached below is the my diary page. It will show every record which the user has submitted to the diary in a table format. To what extent do you agree with this statement: Previous diary entries are laid out in a concise and suitable format? |  | 2 – User Features |
| Q10. Attached below are the pages for editing / creating a diary entry (they are identical besides the title). To what extent do you agree with this statement: The forms on the page are straightforward and it is easy to create a diary entry from them? |  | 2 – User Features |
| Q11. Attached below is the "all advice" and "my advice" page. To what extent do you agree with this statement: It is easy to find / save advice and access the list of advice which has been saved? (Note these are 2 separate pages, which have been separated by a white line) |  | 2 – User Features |
| Q12. Do you have any comments regarding this section or the features in it? |  | 2 – User Features |
| Q13. Attached below is the landing page that users can access upon signing in and having the "management" role. To what extent do you agree with this statement: The management dashboard provides easy access to features and it is easy to know which feature to select? |  | 3 – Management Features |
| Q14. Attached below are the pages for editing / creating an advice article (they are identical besides the title). To what extent do you agree with this statement: The forms on the page are straightforward and it is easy to create an advice article from these forms? |  | 3 – Management Features |
| Q15. Attached below is the "manage advice" page. It is similar to the "all advice" page but comes with options to update advice articles. To what extent do you agree with this statement: It is easy to identify and update an article of advice on this page? |  | 3 – Management Features |
| Q16. Due to time constraints, an admin dashboard could not be implemented, hence a placeholder popup has been used should a user attempt to access this feature. To what extent do you agree with this statement: The user is sufficiently and appropriately warned that this feature is not available yet? |  | 3 – Management Features |
| Q17. Do you have any comments regarding this section or the features in it? |  | 3 – Management Features |

## Technical Audience

As this observation has more of a loose structure, I deemed a form format unnecessary.

# Feedback Analysis

Now that feedback has been given regarding the solution, I will display the results and common themes I have been given by the audience.

## Non-Technical Users

As stated before, the structured observation has been split into different sections dependent on whether the feature is intended for a standard user, management, or both / neither. For Health Advice Group’s convenience, I have mapped the mean rating of each question and grouped it accordingly dependent on what section it is. Each question is prefixed by Q (question number), the corresponding question can be viewed by its number in the non-technical observation listing.

In this visualisation, 1 reflects a response which strongly disagrees with the question or statement provided whereas 5 reflects a response which strongly agrees with the previously mentioned question or statement.

This visualisation can be viewed below:

As per the data, most features and snippets of the solution averaged between 4, which reflects the feature as “good” whereas 5 reflects the feature as “very good”. Whilst no questions got below “average” rating or a 3, the weakest rated features were the air quality and health tracker dashboards, both at 3.9. Should we have more time to develop this prototype, it is very likely that these will be the first features to receive an update.

However, some data we collected cannot simply be analysed by getting mean values. As they were optional in the observation, text responses somewhat scarcer than ratings, some users also opted to leave additional comments and suggestions for features and sections. The most common suggestions were as follows:

* Add searching to make it easier to find specific entries by criteria (i.e., name, date created).
* Make the website look more visually appealing.

These suggestions will be considered should the development window for the prototype be extended. However, as of right now, Health Advice Group has not shared any plans to further develop this solution. However, in the interest of conciseness, how I plan to implement these suggestions into the solution may be further elaborated on in the future developments section of the reflection.

## Technical Users

The video observation is split into different sections, dependent on the feature being broadcast. For Health Advice Group’s convenience, I have mapped the mean ratings for the security, functionality, ease of implementation, and code cleanliness for every feature. Attached below is the visualisation:

As per the data, most metrics for features were rated between 4 (good) and 5 (very good), which means drastic overhauls or alterations of code are very unlikely to be needed. The weakest rating was for air pollution’s efficiency at 3.8 – this is likely to be because we display a lot of raw data, including the concentration for every pollutant. Should we have more time to develop the solution, this is likely to be reviewed and altered.

Due to a lack of features which have been received poorly, it is very likely that our next steps will be to improve user experience to those who are unlikely to have a similar level of experience to that of the technical audience. This is because it is likely to improve user retention and make the application seem like more of a seamless and “polished” experience.

As some inputs allow users to write comments and more detailed feedback, it would be impractical to attempt to visualise this. Instead, some of the most common / important comments will be summarised here:

* Reformat the air quality page or add something to make it easier to gain insights from the data provided.
* Add more colour to the pages – there is very little contrast.
* Utilise more of the whitespace on the page as some of the pages are plain or do not use the full screen height / width.