**Stage 3 Report**

**A. Low-Fidelity Prototype & Walkthrough: 23%**

**• General usability / ability to interact w/ prototype**

**• Description of the prototype**

**• Key problem (can be summarized from Stage 2)**

**• Quality of task examples (revised if necessary)**

**• Walkthrough reports**

**Design approach? Ask to elaborate.**

After individually sketching out the design approach according to our team’s task examples, we did a quick demo and walkthrough on the different design. We kept in mind that Connect is confusing the user in a way that it provide too many functionalities in a single page so we try our best to make our UI as simple-looking as possible. As a group, we chose the rough design of the most intuitive and clean-looking UI that has vertical tabs to continue on to the low-fidelity prototype.

Since all three task examples from Stage 2 are supported by the interview results, we try to fulfill all three task example into our prototyping. We prioritize the three tasks to be test creation, inheritance of course, and then group creation and management. Group creation and management is the last because it is more abstract to start with and both test creation and inheritance use groups. Once we have test creation and inheritance done, we will have a better idea on how to do a good integration among our task examples.

The low-fidelity prototyping tool that we use is called myBalsamiq. myBalsamiq is great for building simple web interfaces and it is exactly what we look for.

[description of the prototype]

[State the prototype's purpose, in terms of Stage 2

requirements and the specific role it will play in your Stage 4 evaluation. Identify the

task examples you have chosen to support in your design (refer to relevant appendix

in this or a previous report). Justify the prototype’s scope. Provide any instructions

crucial to someone being able to explore it on their own.]

Goal:

1. Makes the tool simpler and more user-friendly -- Trying to make the tool focus on “Discoverability” that helps users to discover functionality as they use it

[walkthrough report ----- should contain a paragraph outlining what you found in your

walkthrough, good and bad. If you found nothing (i.e. your interface is perfect) then outline

the ways in which it was perfect (e.g. “Our cognitive walkthrough showed that users can do

X, Y, and Z without errors or confusion.")]

Walkthrough report:

Prototype 1: Exam creation integrated with inheritance

- the prototype only has two pages and, without animation, user is more or less overwhelmed

- Saving different version of the same exam can be a hard-to-get concept

- It is not obvious how changing question type really works with a 2 page only prototype

- Our cognitive walkthrough showed that users can do “selecting different exams, editing questions, saving questions, and customizing different final versions”

**B. Evaluation Plan: 17%**

**• Goals of evaluation**

**• Statement and justification of evaluation method**

**• Participant pool**

**• Overview of evaluation protocol**

Part B.

Goals of Evaluation:

- Evaluate whether or not the interface is simple and easy enough to understand by observing users walking through the low fidelity prototypes.

Statement and justification of evaluation method:

- See whether or not target users can figure out and walk through the prototype, given some tasks based on their questions regarding the interface. If so, it means the users can understand the prototype and discover functionalities on their own.

Participant pool:

- Novice users to UBC Connect

- (Professors are preferred)

Overview of evaluation protocol:

**C. Medium-Fidelity Prototyping: 27%**

**• General prototyping plan; consistency with evaluation plan**

**• Justification of choice of implemented Func/Appearance attributes**

**• Justification of prototyping tool, and appropriate choice**

**• Quality level of prototyping (appropriate for purpose – neither too high nor too low)**

**• Documentation of prototyping, including figures and tables as relevant**

**Part C:**

**General Prototyping plan:**

**\* Horizontal Prototype:**

- Simple HTML homepage of Connect with cleaner UI

- Change colours and Font Size to emphasize important information/ functionalities

**\* Vertical Prototype:**

1) Exam Creation integrated with inheritance - Sub component:

Tool: VB running on ASP.net site (created by Visual Studio 2010)

Justification of functionality:

It is an integration between two of the main focuses, exam creation and inheritance. Exam creation prototype can be wrapped around by the inheritance, providing more depth into both of them. Also, it supports our goals of evaluation that helps users to discover the features provided when a professor is trying to remake new exams from previous courses.

Justification of tool:

- It is faster to build an interactive tool using VB, and

- ASP.net is used for the look and feel of web interface.

2) Inheritance - Sub component

Tool: Advanced HTML

Justification of functionality:

Justification of tool:

- Connect is a website, using HTML to prototype fits the nature of this application

- HTML pages can be run and evaluated easily with cross platform compatibility

**D. Cumulative contribution record: 7%**

**E. Intangibles: 7%**

**• e.g. effort, maturity, presentation of appendices,**

**revisions to task examples, and overall depth.**

**Part A Appendix**

**Revised Task Example include summary of revisions**