# UI Design Audit

A Design Audit assesses a user interface for compliance to an allocation Style Guide or a UI design guidelines (such as the iOS Human Interface Standards for mobile devices). The report provides a list of instances where the user interface design violates the target standard.

Operating system developers, device makers, and application development environment providers often provide guidelines for using the UI components that their systems provide to the developer to insure consistency across their platform, and provide the best user experience. The government may also provide guidelines to insure a minimum level of functionality or usability across the products of many providers within a domain. Insuring that these standards are met can significantly reduce the time and effort required to learn to use an application, and may tend to reduce errors.

## Benefits

* An experienced evaluator can quickly spot deviations from a standard that they work inside frequently.
* Improves consistency between applications.
* Improved consistency allows novice users to apply their experience in other application to learning to use a new application.
* Some guidelines providers will not allow non-compliant applications to be distributed, and a systematic evaluation can avoid this issue.

## Limitations

* Guideline documents can be very large and complex, or written in a way that is needlessly constraining Microsoft (2013).
* Guidelines may not reflect the most current UI strategies that they are using themselves.
* If an evaluator is not immersed in the system that the guidelines cover they may take a significant amount of time to familiarize themselves enough to perform an audit.

## Study Execution

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **​Milestone** | **​Owner** |
| Request Certification | Business Office (Or Developers) |
| ​Provide system access | ​                                                Business Office​ |
| ​Conduct certification | ​HFE​ |
| Deliver completed checklist | HFE |

## Outcomes

• Completed checklist and pass/fail results. Issues are reported by their impact and priority.

Impact is divided into three levels:

**High Impact**: Expected to negatively impact use, possibly leading to dissatisfaction of a level such that users might opt to discontinue use.  
**Medium Impact**: Expected to impact use in the field, for example by leading to user confusion or frustration.  
**Low Impact**: Potential to impact use in the field; user might be frustrated but can still succeed at tasks.

Priority is expressed as critical or non-critical.  There are 3 forms of criticality:

**User Experience Impact**: The user is prevented from effectively and efficiently completing vital tasks. Vital tasks are those that users would likely deem essential to meet fundamental needs.  
**Organizational Impact**:  Potential to cause a negative impact and diminish the credibility and reputation of the VA to provide excellent services to Veterans.  
**Life Safety Impact**:  Potential to cause fatality or significant harm to human life.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Phase of Development​** | |
| ​ | ​Planning, Scoping & Definition |
| ​ | ​Requirements Gathering |
|  | ​Early Design |
| **✔** | **​Detailed Design & Development** |
| ​​ | ​Field Testing |
| **✔** | **​Certification Process** |
| ​ | ​Deployment |
| ​ | ​Post-Deployment |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **​Study Characteristics ​** | |
| ​**Timeframe** | 1-2 days |
| **​Level of Effort** | Low |
| ​**Data Collection** | N/A |
| ​**Data Reporting** | Qualitative |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **​Related Methods ​** | |
| **Derived from** | ​N/A |
| **​Complimentary Methods** | All |
| **​Similar Methods** | N/A |
| **​Follow-Up** | ​TBD |