

## Evaluation Document

Note: this section will be integrated into your final paper submission.

- 10 points: include at least 3 evaluators and justify why they are qualified to provide useful feedback on your prototypes
- 10 points: detail the evaluation process comprehensively. Instead of listing the names of your evaluators, describe their background and any relevant characteristics that might influence their feedback on your design (e.g., expertise level, familiarity with similar designs, etc.). Also, outline the specific methods and tools (peripherals) used during the evaluation to provide a clear context of how the feedback was gathered.
- 10 points: Summarize the critical insights from the evaluation, incorporating feedback directly from your evaluator and your own analysis. This summary should not be a mere list of comments but an organized discussion categorized by major themes. Reflect on these insights to propose actionable improvements for your design, demonstrating a thoughtful consideration of the feedback in the context of your project's objectives.

### Answers:

1. The objective of our application is to improve the overall completion rates of MOOCs. To get the feedback for the wireframes, we distributed the designs among the course students and some of our friends to get wholesome feedback. We managed to get feedback from 4 people.
2. The evaluators comprise four individuals, three of whom are enrolled in the course. It's presumed that these three evaluators possess a solid understanding of web design principles, likely due to their participation in the course. The fourth evaluator, who is not a course participant, has been included to provide feedback from an external perspective. To gather feedback, we've implemented two distinct methods:
  - Heuristic Evaluation
  - Google Form [Link](#)
3. The evaluation feedback provided valuable insights into various aspects of our design, prompting us to make thoughtful improvements that align with our project objectives. One significant suggestion was **to incorporate open-ended questions in the feedback form** to capture users' general thoughts and ideas more effectively. This change allows us to gather qualitative insights beyond predefined response options, enabling a deeper understanding of user preferences and concerns.

Another key observation highlighted **the need for clearer distinctions between interactive mode ON and OFF**. To address this, we created separate wireframes for each mode, ensuring that users can easily understand and navigate between the two states. Additionally, we introduced options for video chunks within the interactive mode, enhancing user engagement and customization.

In the signup process, **we now prompt users to specify their preferences for video chunk durations and review processes**. This customization enables us to tailor the learning experience to individual preferences, enhancing user satisfaction and retention.

Despite these improvements, feedback also indicated that the **use of the interactive mode slider was unclear**. To address this, we provided clear distinction between the interactive mode ON and OFF.

Overall, evaluators expressed positive sentiments regarding the look and feel of the designs, indicating a strong likelihood of using the website for learning purposes. By incorporating their feedback and implementing actionable improvements, we aim to create a more user-centric and engaging learning platform that fulfills the diverse needs of our audience.