CS4826

Week 9
Project Briefing
Cooperative Evaluation

Cooperative Evaluation Assignment

- Requirements: a report documenting the group work to be handed in by Week 12, Wednesday 14th of April, 5PM.
- You can hand in until 12PM on Friday the 16th of April, but you will lose 5% of the project mark by each day delay. No reports will be accepted after that date.
- The reports can be handed in at the Interaction Design Centre, 1st Floor of the Engineering Research Building (ER1007).

Project brief

- The overall Project is worth 40% of the final mark
- The 2nd Assignment is 25%
- The Project will be done in the SAME groups of 2-3 people you have formed for the 1st assignment
- The artefact you have selected for your 1st assignment stays the same

Cooperative Evaluation Project

- For the 2nd part of the project you will use the "Cooperative Evaluation Method" to evaluate an interactive artefact
- You will document the evaluation
- You will analyse findings
- You will suggest re-design recommendations

Goals of Project

- Using evaluation techniques
- Analysing data
- Proposing recommendations
- Following the process
- - Working in team
- Documenting your work

Resources

- the "Cooperative Evaluation Runtime Guide" by Monk, Wright, Haber and Davenport;
- http://www.lindamacaulay.com/pdf/ re_appendixC.pdf
- pp. 280-181 of "Designing Interactive Systems".
- Sample declaration of informed consent form will be made available on-line

What is Cooperative Evaluation?

Cooperative evaluation: involving end-users into the evaluation of a device/interface

A method that allows evaluators to hear users' comments as well as observing their activities

Empirical method of evaluation: not based on a model of the system but on an actual testing

Finding users willing to participate in the study

- Setting up a task list: people will be invited to perform these tasks
- Choosing significant tasks: tasks that are related to crucial features of the device/system (the work you have done using usability heuristics should help you)
- Preparing a clear task list: step by step
- Go from simple to advanced
- Cover the important aspects of the device/system

- Recruit participants: likely users of the device/system
- Participants will be asked to use the device/system performing the tasks on the list
- While doing this the users will be asked to comment on their actions (Thinking Aloud Technique)
- Prompting by the evaluators will ensure that their opinions are expressed

- -As well as users' comments, the evaluators also conduct observations of how the participants are dealing with the tasks
- -Important to combine observational data with users' comments

- De-briefing interview at the end of the session
- One the participants have gone through the task list, the evaluator(s) invite them to discuss what happened in a semi-structured interview
- Encourage further comments and reflections

- Data analysis: the evaluator(s) review the results from the sessions (which they have documented with notes and video/audio recordings)
- From the results, a list of re-design requirements is drawn

Dealing with Participants

- Ethics in user involvement
- Informing participants of what the study is about
- Reassuring them on how the data will be collected and used
- Stating that they will have access to data
- They can withdraw if they so wish
- They are not being evaluated, the system is.
 Their opinions are valuable contributions to the evaluation study

Report

- The Report should document all the steps (one per section) followed by the group in conducting this study:
- 1. Brief description of artefact
- 2. Cooperative evaluation of prototype: Setting up a task list
 - -- Recruiting a group of users for testing (declaration of informed consent)
 - -- Setting up the testing environment and the recording equipment
 - -- Performing the evaluation: the users go through the task list and they are encouraged to think aloud. The group will document the session though video or audio recordings and notes.
- 3. Results from evaluation,
- 4. Design recommendations
- 5. Conclusions and lessons learned