Heuristic Usability Evaluation

OOPP - Group 48

Andrei Petre, Jochem Pouwels, Olaf Herman, Jesse Klijnsma, Lovro Mlikotić, Vlad Graure

Introduction

The objective of this evaluation is to give a concrete and independent view on the heuristic usability of the OOPP group 48 design for the Talio application. Evaluation will be performed by a different group, and the results of said evaluation will be included in this report. After we, group 48, have received the results from our partner team, we will conclude what actions need to be taken in order to improve usability of our application.

The application has been designed similar to a SPA webapp (Single Page Application). By minimizing sudden scene change, the application not only prevents straining on the users eyes, but also makes for a smooth user experience. CRUD operations are covered by popups, allowing the user to still see what they were working on in the background while filling in relevant fields, not to break their train of thought. These were some of the most important reasons for settling on our design.

On the left hand side of the application is a collapsible board listing, allowing the user to connect to any server and manage boards on that server. To the right of the board listing is the viewport for the board the user is currently viewing / editing. Task lists on a board are represented by a horizontally scrollable list, with tasks within their task list container in vertical scrollable lists. Tasks can be dragged within lists to different locations or to any spot in a different list. Task lists can be dragged to the left and right to rearrange them relative to one another.

CRUD operations allow the user to create / edit boards, task lists, and tasks. They also allow for deletion of all of those objects by requiring confirmation. Tags can be added to tasks for easy filtering but these don't require any CRUD operations: they are "created" by adding an arbitrary tag to a task for the first time, and are "deleted" by removing it from the last.

A visual representation of the full application has been created in Figma and is available at the following URL: https://www.figma.com/file/rFnfWB7FADIjt05hyIi5Gx/Talio-prototype

Methods

Experts

We recruited 6 experts from a different OOPP group (group 60). They are computer science students, with no experience giving feedback on heuristic usability, but with a lot of experience in using applications and a clear picture of what works best in their respective workflow. Because of this, we consider them to be great judges of usability.

Procedure

We are asking our experts to review our design and give feedback on the User Experience. This includes screen layout, application flow, and general style. The experts will be looking at a Figma design file which includes all screens of the application, including arrows that show how user actions flow between them. Any CRUD operations are also included in the design. The experts are expected to first have a quick look at the design file, and then discuss among them what things they like or dislike based on the overview. After taking note of the points brought up during this discussion, they are expected to have a closer look at the design file and to try taking some actions such as creating or deleting a board, tasklist or task, and follow the paths in the design file for these actions. After that, they should discuss their experiences again, note down the pros and cons, and share their notes with us. In their discussions, the experts should try to focus on application consistency, flexibility, clarity of state, and aesthetic.

Measures (Data collection)

We are measuring the experts' "feelings". We do not have a working prototype yet, so we can only have the experts evaluate our design. We hope that with a large enough group (6 people) we'll be able to expect the most common different user preferences for any given application, and use the feedback we get on how our design fits (or does not fit) each of their preferences to modify said design accordingly. Obviously, all user preferences differ, but we'll be able to fix any problems experienced by multiple experts. The experts will share their experiences, their pros and cons, using a bullet-point list of what they like about our design and what they would like to have changed, focussing on the heuristics mentioned in Procedure.

Results

< TO BE FILLED AFTER RECEIVING RESULTS FROM OTHER GROUP >

What are your results? Report on your findings.

If you make any adjustments (averages, etc.) report what you have done! You will probably not be able to just show all your raw results, so let the reader know how you got from the raw results to what you are reporting.

If you prioritize the list of problems (for instance with the matrix used in the lecture), show how you have prioritized your problems.

Conclusions & Improvements

< TO BE FILLED AFTER RECEIVING RESULTS FROM OTHER GROUP >

What are your main conclusions from these results?

This section should lead from the Results into the Improvements.

Describe how you will improve our application based on your results. What changes will you make, and why? What would it look like before and after? Why is the improved version better? Motivate your choices using the heuristics and your results.

The conclusion of this section should show your final GUI design.

Note that this report is only about the design, so it is not necessary to already show the finished improved implementation.