C3 - Assessment of Supplier Demonstration

SENG 321 - Group 4
April 10, 2012

1.0 Reactions to Supplier Demo

We, as a customer group, noticed several notable discrepancies between the user interface presented in the demonstration and the screenshots in the user manual. This lead us to be confused when the supplier was navigating the website as we saw things we were not expecting. In general, though, the design and layout of the prototype made it difficult to focus on the functionality of the system; it was hard to visually interpret the data being displayed. This lead to a further confusion as to understanding what features we were actually seeing and how they worked. More development time will be necessary to do simple things such as structure the data responses and keep consistency between visual layouts.

We were unimpressed with the album management features in the user profile. The profile page was scattered and unorganized, and the images often returned back as blank, leaving the page looking like it was full of errors instead of just missing images. A default image should have been included so this did not happen. Also, when uploading an image to the photographer's album, it didn't show up as the thumbnail for that album - it still had the blank image. This was an important portion of the product and it was left unfinished.

Logging in as a customer and as a photographer seemed to work correctly. Creating accounts and jobs worked satisfactorily, including the ability for the customers to add comments to their job advertisements and for photographers to bid on these jobs with different dollar values.

Browsing photographers didn't work up to specifications. The demonstration showed that you were only able to filter by one of the categories: locations, specialty, availability, and cost. This was contrary to the specifications which outlined that users needed to be able to filter by any number of these things at once, and sort across a combination of them; that is, if the user filters by a specific location, the results should be sorted by a combination of availability and cost and specialty such that the list provides the most relevant results.

2.0 Relation to Acceptance Tests

Job Board (Customer)

The input variables title, type, date, location, and comments were all clearly present in job creation. After the job was posted, the user could clearly see it in the job list.

Browsing Photographers (Customer)

List of photographers was available showed any photographers who were not really available. Filtering capabilities were provided including a date range for availability, and specialty of photographer. The results appeared to be in order of relevance, though there was a very small sample for the prototype, making it difficult to verify.

Job Board (Photographers)

Filtering by date and location are provided, but the small sample size makes it difficult to verify that results are correctly sorted. Jobs do appear to be confined to the correct date range.

Photo Albums

Photo albums can be generated, but the user can only view one at a time and the thumbnails do not display any piece of the photo for the user. These problems can however be attributed to the early design stage of the prototype and can be fixed with time.

Account Creation (Photographers)

The photographer accounts were created with all the requested information and still required admin approval to complete the registration process. This meets all the requirements laid out by the team.

Account Creation (Customers)

The customer accounts could be added to the system automatically and required the information laid out in the previous documents. All test cases are met.