Team FitFinder - CIS*3750 Paper Prototype Post Mortem

Part 1: Details

Our Use Cases

1. Open event details on the map
2. Search for an event in the event list
3. Create an account
4. Log off of the newly created account
5. Log back onto the system with the account you created in use case number three
6. Create an event

Members, Roles and Explanations

Role #1: Note Takers
Contributing Members:

- Arezza, Alessandro
- Bhatty, Harshdeep
- Desai, Neh

Description: Members who were assigned this role took notes based on how the user interacted with our paper prototype. We paid attention to certain words they said or actions they took to answer questions regarding the usability of our proposed model, its function, and its ease of navigation as well as any points where they may have gotten stuck. It also helped us to identify aspects of our project that we should start doing, continue doing, or stop doing, which we discuss in the second part of this document.

Role #2: Human-Computer Actor
Contributing Member: Fish, Michael
Description: This role involved interacting with the paper prototype based on the user's actions. When the user interacted with an element on our prototype the human-computer actor was responsible for responding to their actions by displaying the appropriate page aspects on the paper prototype, along with any errors that were present based on their interactions or input.

Role #3: Facilitator
Contributing Member: Gara, Madison
Description: This role involved interacting with the user to inform them about the project, our prototype, and the use cases they were to perform with it. This member also introduced our team, asked questions to obtain information about the user's experiences, described what the paper prototyping session was for, and addressed any questions or doubts the user had while performing the use cases without telling them what to do.

Information Learned about our Volunteers

Note: Our group decided not to ask the age of any of our volunteers, as we felt that it was impolite towards the volunteers and irrelevant to our project since people of all ages can be involved in physical activity.

Volunteer #1

Name: Eric

Information: Our first volunteer was an enthusiastic individual with a background in Psychology. They had no relevant technical experience or background; as they said to us, they could "barely use Overleaf". Despite this, they are still representative of a user of our system, as they were excited about the physical activities we had showcased, and were apt in using the standardized website aspects we included in our prototype.

Volunteer #2

Name: Jeremy

Information: Our second volunteer had a lot of experience in technology-related fields. They informed us that they had previously taken CIS * 3750 and were now a graduate student in the School of Computer Science at UofG. Due to their experience, they tested our system extensively and tried to break it with various inappropriate or unintended inputs and actions. Jeremy is representative of a user of our system because they knew how to interact with the webpage we prototyped and had ideas for how to improve it. He also mentioned that he enjoyed Muay Thai, so the different physical fitness events posted on our webpage would feasibly be of interest to him.

Volunteer #3

Name: Mohammed

Information: Our last volunteer was similar to our first in that they said they had no background or experience in computer science. Despite this, they could still be a user of our system, as our prototype was standardized enough to common website formatting familiar to most users, regardless of technology experience. Additionally, physical activity is important to the health of all people, regardless of background. We also provide detailed error messages and constraints to help people figure out how to use the website as described in the previous volunteer information.

Part 2: Summary

Things to **stop** doing or things that did not work out well:

One aspect that we should reconfigure is the input fields we have in our sixth use case (create an event). On our paper prototype, when the user wanted to create an event, they were given several input fields so that they could customize it to their liking by adding a title, thumbnail image, location, date, price, and description. All of these input fields were placed one below another, which overwhelmed some of the users. Moving forward, we should redesign the format of these fields to make it less stressful for the user, perhaps by adding an advanced details dropdown for non-required event details. We should group common items on one line, and have a drop-down box with standard options for certain fields (such as price and date) so that the user can more easily decide what they want to input.

Apart from the above, the volunteers did not give us other recommendations of things to stop doing, as most people generally liked our prototype and its functionality.

Things that should be added to the design and things that we should **start** doing:

At the end of the paper prototype session, a few of our volunteers asked us questions regarding accessibility and how a blind person would interact with the system. Although one of our requirements was to make our website AODA compliant, this is something we should start putting more thought into as it is an important factor for user accessibility. We should research third-party applications or APIs we can use to add text-to-speech functionality. We should also think about creating keyboard shortcuts for our website so that the user can navigate to different pages and execute common commands without having to locate and click buttons on the screen.

On the Create Event page, once the user has filled in the information they want and customized it to their liking, a confirmation with a preview of the event details should be shown before the event is created. This will provide them with an idea of what their post will look like instead of having a pop-up that simply asks them to confirm their event posting or not. Jeremy suggested we add this feature, and our group agrees that a preview allows the user to confirm that their event details are as they should be before they are posted to the webpage. Having a preview also allows users to fix any mistakes they find right away instead of having to edit posted events, which can be a bit of a hassle and may cause user confusion if they see the posting before it is edited. This will help our Event Creation page be more user-friendly.

While performing the first use case of displaying event details on the map, two out of three of our volunteers went to the wrong pages multiple times before completing the task. The

volunteers kept on going to the Events List page and displaying the map for a singular event rather than all of the events that were displayed on the home screen. To make it more apparent that the home screen map displays all of the events, we should change its layout. We could make it a bit bigger so that it is more obvious to the user and they can see all of the pins that indicate an event more easily. We should also add a title indicating that it is a summary map of all the listed events. Lastly, we could also add a description somewhere near the map that clarifies what will happen if they click on the map itself.

Most of our volunteers struggled with starting our sixth use case of creating their event. Once they found out where to go to start creating the event the process was smooth, but getting to that point was difficult for most of our volunteers. They kept going to the Events List page, which intuitively makes sense as one would expect anything to do with an event to be on that page, but the event creation button was in fact under the hamburger menu. To decrease the time it takes to start this process, we should put a button or a link on the event list that takes the user to the Create Event page in addition to including this button in the hamburger menu. This redundancy will make the event creation page easier to get to, and the user can save time by not going to the wrong pages multiple times.

When users were interacting with our paper prototype during use case number six, some of our volunteers put in unrealistic values for some of the inputs. For example, a volunteer put 1 million dollars as the price for an event when in reality, it is unreasonable that an event would cost that much. To prevent this, we should put in clearer instructions on reasonable price ranges so that exorbitant pricing is not added to our website. The location input was another section where the volunteers would often include invalid information. We advised the volunteers that our project was concerned with well-being opportunities in Guelph only, but they attempted to include locations outside the city. We should put a description near the location input that reminds the user that the location needs to be in the City of Guelph so that they are not frustrated by continuous errors that pop up if they input invalid details.

Things that worked well with our design and things that we should **continue**:

All three volunteers commented on and liked the constraints and errors that we took into account in our paper prototype. For example, Jeremy enjoyed that we had a relevant dialogue box (a piece of paper) error show up when the user tries to include a curse word in their username. The thought we put into detecting errors and handling them is something we should continue doing, as user behaviour can be unpredictable. Taking into account everything they can do to break the system is good to have for our system to run as smoothly as possible and allow users to quickly recover from mistakes.

The hamburger menu worked well with our design and is something we should replicate in our wireframe. All of our volunteers said that it was very intuitive to use and navigate through. Regardless of their level of technical experience, the users all thought to click it, knowing that they could find more detailed options that were not shown directly on the main page under this hamburger menu. Several of the volunteers also commented that they liked that the hamburger menu helped reduce clutter on the main page's display.

Our easy-to-follow layout on the multiple screens we had on our paper prototype is something we should continue to maintain and develop. When users were performing use cases three and four, they said that the buttons to create an account and to log off once the account was created were clearly visible. They also liked that you could navigate to other pages via hyperlinks. For example, if a user clicked the Create Account button by mistake instead of the sign-in button, they would be redirected to the Create Account page, where there is a hyperlink that takes you to the sign-in page if you already have an account. This allows users to gracefully recover from mistakes, which is something a few volunteers commented on and appreciated since the user does not have to go back in their path to sign back in.

Any other trends/outliers:

Trends:
One thing all of our volunteers liked was our UI design and the cleanness of it. The lack of clutter made our webpage very intuitive and easy to navigate. They also liked the hamburger menu in particular, as it simplified our layout by not requiring all options to be put directly on the home page. The menu also helped our users when performing use case number six, as they interacted with the menu bar to figure out how to execute the task.

Outliers:
Volunteer Three was the only person who mentioned that our error messages should be more specific compared to the others. We believe it would be useful to identify the input associated with the error in the error message to provide the extra detail he was looking for. He was also not as expressive compared to our other volunteers, so we had to interpret some of his actions to get feedback on what he was thinking in interacting with the prototype.