Aim of feedback:

To assess the effectiveness of the solution’s prototype provided and, moreover, whether it satisifes the client’s expectations. I’ll be making a questionnaire for both technical and non-technical users in this feedback. Instead of asking general questions, I’ll include ones that address every distinctive aspect of the website.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Audience | Prototype option | Prototype you will produce | Questions to ask about the prototype | Method of gathering feedback | Who to get feedback from and why |
| Non-Technical and technical | Due to my limitations with this private localhost environment, I am forced to adopt a strategic approach to seeking feedback based on the technical skills of my audience. For technical peers, the optimal approach is to give them the freedom to interact directly with the website. My final selection for this sort is to record the process of developing a local host environment, bundling all the code and related files, and then disseminating these step-by-step guidelines. Along with this, I will provide particular tasks or user situations for them to experiment with. While this will require some technical understanding on their part, I anticipate the feedback to be most detailed and informative because they will be actually manipulating the working prototype and can identify usability flaws, bugs, or areas of enhancement based on their own experience. For my less technicalcolleagues, enabling direct access isn't an option.  Therefore, I will have to choose a method that demonstrates the website's functionality in a clear way without making them work with code. My main options are creating a recording of a walkthrough of a website or presenting a live demonstration of its features. My final choice will likely be creating a well-structured and concise video demonstrating the prototype's primary features and user flows. This has the benefit of being easily accessible and for them to review it in their own time. But to compensate for the lack of face-to-face contact, I could also organize an extra, live talk and Q&A. This would allow me to guide them through the prototype, point out specific things, and answer any questions they might have in real-time, making the feedback exchange more dynamic despite the constraint of not being able to share a live link. This two-step process is designed to make giving feedback as easy and interactive as possible for people who are uncomfortable with the technicalities involved in running a local host. | Building on that, the nature of the prototype naturally limits my ability to get input from a broad spectrum of people, so choosing proper testing methodologies becomes even more principal. Not being able to easily share a public link requires more customised strategies. But the good news is the availability of technically skilled coworkers within the same network. My last step of giving them the necessary files and installation instructions directly addresses this limitation by making them active participants in the testing process. This interactive approach enables them to navigate the site at will, interact with every facet of it, like completing forms and triggering dynamic functionalities, something that is simply not feasible using a static video demonstration. 1 Thus, the data received through this group will be more detailed, richer, and precisely in accordance with their experience as end-users of a live prototype version, though within a controlled, local setting. This direct testing bypasses the inherent awkwardness and reduced interactivity of a video, in which testers would be stuck sitting back and passively viewing, which could reduce their capacity to fully grasp the user flow and pick up on subtle usability issues. | Please enter your name  Please enter your skill level  Based on the first impression what would you rate the website?  Does the website give a clear understanding of its purpose?  Describe the website design. Is the website visually appealing?  Is the interface. Intuitive, clear and easy to navigate?  What are your thoughts on the terms and conditions? Do you think I placed it in the appropriate place?  Is the navigation bar easy to find and easy to read?  What are your opinions of the logo? Do you think it repersents a green tech company?  What would you rate the navigation bar and the logo?  This is the colour palette for the solution. Do you think it resembles green tech?  Can you hover over the blue buttons? Does the colour darken?  Do the buttons direct you to the correct page?  What would you rate the homepage?  From only seeing the homepage, Is the vision / goal clear?  Does the navigation bar link direct you to the correct place?  Please rate the homepage  Did you find that the images illustrated the correct quotations?  Did it capture your attention?  Did you find that the ‘Learn more’ buttons direct you to the correct page?  What did you think of my ‘About us’ page? How was the information displayed?  Please rate the log in/ Sign up page  Once logged in, what was your first impression of the dashboard? (Please note that there will be empty spaces as you have not calculated your energy consumption or have scheduled a consultation)  Please rate the schedule page Did you see the message “Please log in or sign up before booking”?  Did you see the social media icons or google as another option to log in. However, do note that this cannot be done and it will be fixed in further development.  Did the carbon calculator give accurate results?  In the energy page, did it track your energy usage correctly and did it display the results  Please rate the energy page  What is your overall impression of the website?  Please look at the database naming conventions. Do you think I chose the appropriate names? (Questions further are for technical users)  Take a look at the folder structure. If a technical user tried to add on to this website, do you think it would be easy? | In order to receive end-to-end feedback on my prototype, I'm using Microsoft Forms with strategic branching to engage my technical and non-technical testers effectively. Following the purpose of their technical proficiency, users will be directed to relevant sets of questions. Technical testers will evaluate aspects like ease of setup, performance on their local machines, and technical problems encountered, providing valuable insight into the prototype's resilience and implementation. Simultaneously, non-technical users will receive a separate branch based on their engagement with the video walkthrough, assessing usability, interface readability, and overall understanding of the target user flows. The split setup allows for feedback that is meaningful to each group's interaction and perception, generating the most actionable data I can gather. The sequential and analytical capability of Microsoft Forms will then ensure an easy-to-follow and coherent examination of the separate streams of feedback, allowing for a well-rounded view regarding the technical adequacy and user experience of the prototype. | For this project, majority of the testers will be my groupmates as they are technical users as I can gather feedback efficiently. My non-technical testers would be my family or friends because they do not contain those technical skills therefore allowing me to gather feedback effectively. |

Feedback Summary

Synopsis of who was asked for feedback



Find other ways to collect data e.g interviews

Synopsis of who responded and provided feedback

Everyone that has received the form has responded to the questionnaire.