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# Abstract

Give Good UX create the UX Audit Cheat Sheet as a checklist for user experience (UX) professionals and quality assurance (QA) teams to do UX audits. This checklist is an optional resource that may be integrated into the summative assessment of projects. Legacy technical systems can be inundated with limitations and sometimes lack systems integration documentation, user experience testing, accessibility testing and implementation, as well as the ability to track changes.

The UX Audit Cheat Sheet is an evaluation tool that can be used as a summative assessment once a project is completed or as a formative assessment to informally assess the progress of a project or need for modifications and improvements.
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## Objective

The objective of this evaluation is to improve and modernize core UX processes, provide a streamlined UX process to support project plans, facilitate coordination to allow reviewers, analysts, and designers to efficiently make design decisions based on global standards and relay those standards to quality assurances testers, project managers, and developers. UX validation checks and auditing documentation implemented early in a project all the UX process to be understood and integrated into project planning so that UX testing and UI design decisions can be managed effectively through a prescribed workflow. This allows reviewers and designers to make timely decisions and will eliminate the need for quality assurance and reviewers to perform additional non-routine analysis. Automation of the review process will ensure consistency, transparency, efficiency, and quality of UX testing. The UX Audit Cheat Sheet may also have practical applications in reviewing other documentation for accuracy and completeness including use cases, test cases, design artifacts, test cases, requirements, implementation documentation, and user guides.

## Task Work Description

Provide design and review activities for UI/UX designers and QA testers that describe tasks, content of projects, and analysis of applicable implementation impacts. The functional components of the UX Audit Cheat Sheet are often vague and may need revision for specificity to detail industry best practices as they relate to the Software Development Lifecycle Cycle (SDLC), 508 Compliance, Web Aim Accessibility Guidelines, web standards, and other known standards related to government projects.

## Summary of Key Points of Research

(avoid words like develop, design, optimize, control, or manage).

questions, participants, methods, results, data analysis, and conclusions.

## Possible Implications of Research and Future Work Potentially Connected To Findings
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# Requirements

1. Use [APA style](https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/) (<https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>) for other format requirements such as margins, headings, citations, footnotes/endnotes, and references. Leave one line space between sections.
   1. Double-spaced
   2. standard-sized paper (8.5" x 11") with 1" margins on all sides
   3. Sample APA Paper: http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/18/
   4. Individual Resources Example:  
      Contributors' names (Last edited date). Title of resource. Retrieved from http://Web address for OWL resource
2. Example introductory abstract sentence, (Pei, 2007), (The OWL, 2016):
   1. The research objective of this proposal is to test the hypothesis H.
   2. The research objective of this proposal is to measure parameter P with accuracy A.
   3. The research objective of this proposal is to prove the conjecture C.

|  |
| --- |
| Fitzpatrick, J., Sanders, J. & Worthen (2011): “the identification, clarification, and application of defensible criteria to determine the evaluation object’s value (worth or merit) in relation to those criteria.” (p.7) |

# Purpose

1. To assist decision makers
   1. Example: to establish the impact of a tobacco cessation program in Iowa
2. To assist program improvement
   1. Example: to determine the value of a job training program at ISU
3. To assist organizations with ongoing progress, adaptation and learning
   1. Example: to instill new ways of thinking by participating in an evaluation project
4. To determine which programs are working well
5. To determine which programs are failing
6. To determine what are programs’ relative costs and benefits
7. To determine what can be done to improve a program, process, product
8. To determine who are the stakeholders, who is impacted?
9. Encourage the use of evaluation results to reflect positive change or mitigate risk
10. Stimulate dialogue
11. Make an informed judgment regarding the appropriateness of a person, program, process, or product for a specific purpose
    1. Examples: Health program evaluation, course evaluation, web interface usability testing

# Elements of a Program

## Defining Criteria

Defining criteria is a key component of any evaluation. The measurements and methods used to develop an evaluation closely relate to research. Research and evaluation methodology may also differ in critical ways like how an evaluator or researcher determines if their outcome is successful, who determines criteria, and which criteria are targeted.

## Planned/Implemented Activities

## Managed Resources

## Specific Goals and Purposes

## Target Participants

## Documentable Outputs, Outcomes, and Impacts

## Investigable Costs and Benefits

# Stakeholders

1. People who have authority over the program (funders, policy makers, advisory boards)
2. People who have direct responsibility for the program (program developers, administrators, managers, and staff)
3. People who lose funding or are not served because of a program termination
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