**Medium-Fidelity Prototype – Evaluation Protocol and User Testing Plan**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluation ID | MFP |
| Aims | Primary aims:   1. Determine if users consider the fridge and other household’s stats a necessary feature and if they would use this feature 2. Determine if the system would integrate easily within their lifestyle (identify the value FridgePrint provides) 3. Evaluate how can better employ social and mobile features, issues and technologies to concept. 4. Evaluate how FridgePrint effectively considers changes in the social and physical context of the kitchen 5. See how well FridgePrint enables users to be social  * See what housemates own. * Get involved with what housemates are using, planning   Secondary aims:   1. Evaluate the conceptual design. 2. Identify user’s expectations in terms of experience – desired and actual 3. Identify user’s thoughts of interaction and user interface 4. Learn more about the user and their needs |
| Dates | 13/10/20-18/10/20 |
| Creators | Anisa Rowhani |

**Preparation before the participant arrives**

Materials needed:

1. Zoom or any other video sharing platform (for remote – if applicable)
2. Observation sheets
3. Testing personnel
4. Task List
5. Prototype
6. Way to record data for observation and evaluation (voice recorder, screen recorder, phone, laptop, notebook, etc)

Users:

* University students living in share houses, with housemates

**Introduction**

The facilitator is required to thank the user for their participation in the evaluation of the design. They then introduce the design project and the aims of the session and how it will unfold.

*Script*:

As part of the DECO3800 course we thank you for agreeing to participate. Today we are going to get your feedback on your experience of using our application. We are looking at how well you understand the process of interaction, whether there are any problems with the interface and overall testing the idea. This is a voluntary task and if you feel uncomfortable please feel free to stop the testing session. Through this process, we are not evaluating you in any way, we are evaluating the application and its effectiveness of the design. The prototype is digital but has limitations in its interaction.

**Consent**

The user is informed of the purpose of the evaluation and any potential recordings of the session and must provide verbal consent before undertaking the evaluation.

**Tasks**

The user will be given the tasks to complete – either on a piece of paper or tasks verbally read out to them. The facilitator will encourage the participant to speak out loud what they are thinking as they interact (Think Aloud) and any thoughts that arise and comments about whether the feature they are interacting with currently would integrate well into their lifestyle and adds value.

1. Add pears, cucumber, beef mince, yoghurt, leftover chicken noodles and tomato sauce to fridge
2. Add a note to the note board
3. Respond to housemate Jane’s comment on cream
4. Remove spinach from the fridge
5. Add ownership status to apples
6. View and compare this week with last week’s foodprint

**Observations**

The facilitator will make observations and record data as the user completes the tasks. The facilitator will not talk or prompt the user in any way during the testing period in order to prevent inaccurate results and bias.

* Issues or confusions with task, hesitations
* Body language
* Questions asked
* Impact of social/mobile features on experience (reactions, next actions, behaviours, reflections)
  + E.g. Next Steps – to what extent does seeing a comment/notification/ownership tag enhance/alter their experience?

Questions to ask at end of task to assist in gathering insight:

The facilitator can use the list of questions below as a guide to ask the user questions if the opportunity arises after completing a task.

* Was the pathway you took expected, if not what did you expect?
* On a scale of 1 to 5 (most difficult) rate your difficulty in performing this task?
* What was your first impression of the layout? Was anything out of place/confusing?
* Question them on any of their actions that were unusual, or they were uncertain about.

**Evaluations:**

The evaluation methods utilised consist of elements of the following:

* Think Aloud
* Interview
* Observation
* Probes

In this way I could holistically evaluate FridgePrint’s social features by directly engaging with users on elements that are not just directly concerned with usability.

Questions to encourage users to think aloud:

* How would you use this feature in your daily life?
* Would this help with opening the fridge for a snack?
* What type of reminders are useful to you?
* How are you feeling while doing this task?
* What features caught your eye first?
* Do you know where you are in the app?
* Why did you do that interaction?
* What do you think these features do?
* What do you find confusing while doing the task?

**Post-Testing Interview**

After the users has completed the tasks, they will be asked personalised questions based on their actions through the testing period in order to gather in-depth insights. This part allows to evaluate the social elements through engaging with users.

The facilitator can use the list of questions below as a guide.

* Can you imagine and describe circumstances in which you would not want to use this application and the features? Why?
* Can you imagine circumstances the app would make it more difficult for users?
* Can you anticipate problems that would make the app unusable?
* In what situations would the system be useful? How would it integrate into your lifestyle? Would you have to make changes to your lifestyle for it to work or would it be seamless?
* How effective was it to enable awareness and coordination of food items hidden in the fridge?
* Is there anything you would change?
* Do you have any suggestions for improvements on how the application can better coordination and awareness of fridge items among housemates?
* How do you understand this app? What does app do?
* Thoughts on navigation, organisation, layout, structure, features?
* Difficulty out of 5 of completing tasks
* Anything unclear, what parts confusing?
* What changes would you make to improve the application’s ability to improve coordination in household?
* What features would see as useful to include?
* What do you think about the overall idea of having a application to track items in the fridge in a household collectively?
* Do you think we a missing any important features in the design?

**Closing**

Once the testing session is over, the facilitator thanks the participant for their time and effort.