Heuristic Evaluation of PlannR By Group 6

1. Problem

PlannR is a platform meant to help students have a better learning experience by steaming off the pressure from meeting coursework deadlines and allocating enough revision time.

2. Violations Found

1. H3 – User control and freedom |Severity 2| Found by group 6
After pinning the feedback, it is found that user doesn't have back button.

Fix: add the option to go back.

2. H3 – User control and freedom |Severity 2| Found by group 6
The program doesn't show if the user will be able to be logging in the system or not. This means user won't be able to track their personal data.

Fix: add user login menu so user will be able to store their personal details of meeting coursework deadlines.

3. H1 – Visibility of system status |Severity 1| Found by group 1 and 6
It doesn't show in detail what the reward section denotes. Does this mean your app shows I will get reward when I earn certain points? But how do I know what reward I will earn and what happens if click the reward section (button, txt?).

Fix: add more detail on reward section.

4. H7 – Flexibility and efficiency of use |Severity 2| Found by group 4 and 6
Program doesn't mentions about having any progress tracking.

Fix: Add an option to allow for progress tracking

5. H9 – Help user recognize, diagnose, and recover from errors |Severity 2| Found by group 6
It doesn't mention of displaying any error messages indicating a problem. For example, if a user input any un existing date while adding deadline then there isn't any mention if it will show any error message.

Fix: Add pop up error messages after errors occur.

6. H5 – Error prevention |Severity 3| Found by group 1 and 6
The design on PlannR doesn't mention of eliminating any error –prone conditions or check them and present users with a confirmation option before they commit to finalizing the action.

Fix: A suggestion text on the side/below of the date displaying actual format for inputting date would help users to make themselves stop from entering invalid dates and preventing errors on the system.

7. H2 – Match between system and world | Severity 2| Found by group 6
Comparing to the real-world systems, PlannR only has date for the coursework deadline without mention of times.

Fix: Include time along with the date so the user would be able to see the exact due time and date for deadline.

8. H7 – Flexibility and efficiency of use |Severity 1| Found by group 6
The current system needs user to input the deadlines by itself however it would be more user friendly if the system could be connected to the associated school/colleges/university and the deadlines could be added automatically.

Fix: Introduce "Connectivity" functionality which helps to connect the student with his/her affiliated educational institute.

9. H8 - Aesthetic and minimalist design | Severity 1| Found by group 6
The design on a whole needs to be more aesthetically pleasing and simple as now the aesthetics makes the user interface cluttered.
Fix: Introduce a more minimalist design flow

10. H4: Consistency & Standards, | Severity 1 | Found by group 6

The spacing for each button is not consistent some are closer and some are further apart. This might be because of the ratio of the ratio of each button being different.

Fix: Keep the spacing and the ratio of each button consistent.

11. H5 – Error prevention |Severity 2| Found by group 1 and 6
I found that I was able to add more than one deadline with the same attributes, which overlapped in the calendar and I was only able to view the one I added at last.

Fix: Add a constraint to not let user add duplicate deadlines.

12. H3: User Control & Freedom | Severity 2 | Found by group 6

Not sure if the deadlines can be deleted by the user that once it has been added, as there are times where deadlines extend, and we might no longer want to record the previous deadline date.

Fix: Add a "delete deadline" button.

3. Summary of Violation

Category	# Viol. (sev 0)	# Viol.2 (sev 1)	# Viol.3 (sev 2)	# Viol.4 (sev 3)	# Viol.5 (sev 4)	# Viol.6 (total)
H1: Visibility of System Status		1				1
H2: Match Sys & World			1			1
H3: User Control & Freedom		2	1			3
H4: Consistency & Standards		1				1
H5: Error Prevention			1	1		2
H6: Recognition not Recall						0
H7: Flexibility and Efficiency of Use		1	1			2
H8: Aesthetic Minimalist Design		1				1
H9: Help Users with Errors			1			1
H10: Documentation						
Total Violations by Severity						12

4. Summary Recommendation

We were very pleased and content as we got the opportunity to evaluate the system "PlannR". The system was very interactive yet simple and easy to use. We found the design aspect of the overall system to be unmistakably remarkable. However, there are few improvements that could be made to the system, none of them groundbreaking. We've listed some of fundamental changes that could be made to the system below.

We came to find that there were not many conditional statements put in places in order to prevent errors such as Adding duplicate deadlines, entering a date that is already past etc. As mentioned above "displaying actual format for inputting date" might prevent users from inputting the same date or a date that's already past. However, their needs to be list of conditions put in place that checks for errors like this before the form is submitted.
This is more of a user control and usability issue. As there are numerous amounts of deadlines, we find it in-efficient to manually input each deadline in, as this can be very time consuming and is liable for human errors like the ones mentioned above.

Finally, whiling demoing the system we felt very restricted and the system didn't stand out as much as there are countless existing timetable managing system , hence why we suggest for "PlannR" to implement more features that collaborates with adding deadlines, such as being able to add notes to the deadline, add a to do list that opens when the deadline is selected etc.
To conclude the design aspect of the system is outstanding but usability and freedom of the user was slightly lacking. It might be beneficial to brainstorms and create a mind map of the existing functions of the system, which might help point to functions that need some enhancement. Lastly, never stop testing, even if the design, usability, interactions etc. are perfect, continues testing of a system might prevent the use of outdated information being used in the website and in some cases it might just require little tweak here and there, however every step is a step towards bettering the system.

Conclusion

To conclude, we successfully generated six user needs through interview and survey data that was then integrated on to an empathy map. We then used this information to paper prototype our ideas and eventually come up with a concept video. Our ideas were then evaluated heuristically by another group, giving us a detailed list of implementation improvements.