**CS 192 Alpha Testing Analysis with Description**

Developer Name: NSE

Software Name: Mi-Band-Reminder

No. of Respondents (CS 192 Classmates): 10

FUNCTIONAL GOALS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **User Acceptance Criteria** | **Compliance** | | **Conclusion** |
| **Yes** | **No** |
| The user can create a reminder. | 10 | 0 | All comply. Function is accepted. |
| The user can set the label, time and date of the reminder. | 10 | 0 | All comply. Function is accepted. |
| The user can edit an existing reminder. | 1 | 9 | Majority do not comply. Function is not accepted.  Remarks: Crashes on submit/save. Does not work. |
| The user can delete an existing reminder. | 9 | 1 | Majority comply. Function needs minor fixes.  Remarks: No “delete” button. No confirmation. User not aware that the reminder is deleted. |
| The user is notified on the specified time and date of an active reminder. | 2 | 8 | Majority do not comply. Function is not accepted.  Remarks: No notifications. Nothing happens. Not working. |
| The user can mark a reminder as done. | 8 | 2 | Majority comply. Function needs minor fixes.  Remarks: No button. Deletes reminder automatically. No warning. |
| The user can connect to a Mi Band through the app. | 0 | 10 | None comply. Function is not accepted.  Remarks: Tested without Mi Band. Cannot test function properly. |
| When a Mi Band is connected, it will also notify the user on the specified time and date of an active reminder. | 0 | 10 | None comply. Function is not accepted.  Remarks: Tested without Mi Band. Cannot test function properly. |

DISCUSSION

We conclude that our software is not ready for beta release yet as many functions do not comply with user acceptance. The working/functional parts of our application are only reminder creation and deletion. Missing/broken functionalities are reminder editing, notification, and Mi Band connection. According to remarks by the respondents, the application’s UI also needs fixes (confirmation messages, help messages, warnings).

USABILITY GOALS

1-Strongly Disagree, 5-Strongly Agree

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SUS** | **R1** | **R2** | **R3** | **R4** | **R5** | **R6** | **R7** | **R8** | **R9** | **R10** | **Ave.** |
| **1.** | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3.3 |
| **2.** | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1.7 |
| **3.** | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4.1 |
| **4.** | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1.9 |
| **5.** | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2.9 |
| **6.** | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2.4 |
| **7.** | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4.2 |
| **8.** | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2.1 |
| **9.** | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3.7 |
| **10.** | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1.9 |
| **Score** | 72.5 | 92.5 | 65 | 70 | 77.5 | 92.5 | 52.5 | 80 | 60 | 42.5 | 70.5 |

DISCUSSION

1. I think that I would like to use this system. Respondents are mostly undecided but slightly leaning towards agree.
2. I found the system unnecessarily complex. Respondents mostly disagree.
3. I thought the system was easy to use. Respondents average at slightly agree.
4. I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system. Respondents average at slightly disagree.
5. I found the various functions in the system were well integrated. Respondents mostly undecided but slightly leaning towards disagree.
6. I thought there was too much inconsistency in this system. Respondents average at slightly disagree.
7. I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly. Respondents mostly agree.
8. I found the system very cumbersome to use. Respondents average at slightly disagree.
9. I felt very confident using the system. Respondents average at slightly agree, but somewhat undecided.
10. I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with this system. Respondents mostly disagree.

Based on the SUS Score, our software’s system usability is not terrible but also not good. Our group mostly needs to improve on function integration, consistency, messages and documentation, but we can also improve on the other points mentioned above.