CS 194H Winter 2017: Assignment 7

Instructor: James Landay

Interactive (Hi-fi) Prototype #2 (Team)

Due: Thursday, February 9, 2017

Goals

The goals of this assignment are to learn how to incorporate feedback from a user interface usability test into the next iteration of a prototype.

Lab Usability Test Results

You should use the results and conclusions from your Lab Usability Test along with any feedback we (or your classmates) gave you on your last prototype. You should **fix as many of the problems found as you can**, prioritized by UI severity. You should also try to **implement as much missing functionality as you can** – time is short, so you may not be able to implement everything, but try to do what you can by priority of importance to your user experience.

The aesthetics of your design and meeting the standards of the platform are now becoming more important. Please make sure you have also fixed any of those design issues. The next assignment will be a field usability study, so make sure you have implemented what is necessary to pull that off.

Deliverables

1. Prototype

Your prototype must be runnable by the teaching staff and anyone else who would like to try it. A downloadable version (or link to downloadable version) must be put on your project web page along with instructions to make it run (for native Android or iOS native apps, think about using fabric.io. For iOS native apps you can also consider using TestFlight – make sure TA and faculty UDIDs are added). Make sure this works well in advance of the due date by testing on multiple devices.

2. Presentation

One member of your team will present your project during a **eight**-minute slide-based presentation in front of the other students and teaching staff. See the grading guidelines for information on how to structure your talk. You must **make the slides available for download on your web site**.

CS 194H Winter 2017: Assignment 7

Instructor: James Landay

Presentation Guidelines

You will have **8 minutes** for this presentation plus up to 5 minutes for questions. Please practice as we will grade you on how close you are to the time limit (under and over). All team members are expected to work collaboratively on the presentation, though only one team member will deliver the presentation.

Talk Outline (all points must be covered):

- 1. Project title & team (briefly introduce yourself, your idea, and the rest of your team)
- 2. Introduction
 - Introduce the problem you are attacking
 - Introduce the basic solution your application takes at solving this
- 3. Interface Changes
 - Show us the **major** changes (highlight old & new together on each slide)
 - Explain the **reasoning** for the change (come from test or other?)
- 4. Task Flows
 - Task Flows for 3 tasks
 - i. Slowly step through execution of each task with the new UI
- 5. Future Work
 - What was left *unimplemented*
 - i. What was left out and why
 - ii. Any wizard of oz techniques that are required to make it work
 - Plans moving forward
 - i. Which things do you still plan to implement / change?

CS 194H Winter 2017: Assignment 7

Instructor: James Landay

Grading Criteria

Your grade will be based on the thoroughness and design quality of your implementation, the reasoning you give for the changes you've made, and the quality of your presentation. The presentation grading will be broken into two components: the individual grade of the presenter and a group grade for the quality of the content itself. Each bullet/grading category below will be out of 4 points (4=+, 3=check+, 2=check, 1=check-, 0=missing).

Presenter's grad	des (NAME:)
 Organization 	
	ject & team introduction
o Intr	oduction to Problem & Solution
o Inte	erface Changes
o Tas	k Flows
o Fut	ure Work
 Presentation 	
	effective slides (easy to read, understand, good use of visuals/images)
	er required scope in 8 mins (+ 5 minutes Q&A). Practice in advance.
o Ens	sure the presenter makes eye contact and projects well. (:)
Group grade	(GROUP NAME:)
 Interface Change 	ges
Interface ChangeChange	ges anges from HiFi #1 to HiFi #2 clear?
Interface ChangeChangeChangeChange	ges anges from HiFi #1 to HiFi #2 clear? anges make the interface better?
 Interface Change Change Change Change Wei 	ges anges from HiFi #1 to HiFi #2 clear?
 Interface Change Change Change Change Well Good 	ges anges from HiFi #1 to HiFi #2 clear? anges make the interface better? re issues found in the usability study fixed?
 Interface Change Change Change Change Well Good Task Flows 	ges anges from HiFi #1 to HiFi #2 clear? anges make the interface better? re issues found in the usability study fixed?
 Interface Change Cha Cha Were Good Task Flows Cleate Is the 	ges Inges from HiFi #1 to HiFi #2 clear? Inges make the interface better? Ire issues found in the usability study fixed? Ire dod reasoning for the changes? Ire how each of the 3 tasks is carried out in the new UI? Ire prototype UI aesthetic & pleasing? Fit the platform UI style?
 Interface Change Cha Cha Wen Good Task Flows Cleater Is the Task 	ges anges from HiFi #1 to HiFi #2 clear? anges make the interface better? re issues found in the usability study fixed? od reasoning for the changes? ar how each of the 3 tasks is carried out in the new UI?
 Interface Change Change Change Change Well Good Task Flows Cleange Is the strength Task Future Work 	ges anges from HiFi #1 to HiFi #2 clear? anges make the interface better? re issues found in the usability study fixed? od reasoning for the changes? ar how each of the 3 tasks is carried out in the new UI? ne prototype UI aesthetic & pleasing? Fit the platform UI style? ks give appropriate range for this application?
 Interface Change Cha Cha Cha Wel Good Task Flows Clea Is the Task Future Work What 	ges anges from HiFi #1 to HiFi #2 clear? anges make the interface better? re issues found in the usability study fixed? od reasoning for the changes? ar how each of the 3 tasks is carried out in the new UI? ne prototype UI aesthetic & pleasing? Fit the platform UI style? ks give appropriate range for this application? at is left out and why?
 Interface Change Cha Cha Good Task Flows Clea Is th Tas Future Work What Under the content of the con	ges anges from HiFi #1 to HiFi #2 clear? anges make the interface better? re issues found in the usability study fixed? od reasoning for the changes? ar how each of the 3 tasks is carried out in the new UI? ne prototype UI aesthetic & pleasing? Fit the platform UI style? ks give appropriate range for this application?