**Interview Questions after Observation**

**1. How did you find your overall experience with the interface?**

It was very usable although not very visually appealing.

It was pretty easy to use. I was able to navigate to everything pretty well.

It was really good. I actually like the UI a lot, it was easy to find stuff and it was easy to find things, and it also looks very nice. I’m not a professor at this stage so I’m not sure how Connect would work. But this is certainly a very user-friendly interface.

For the inheritance, not sure if original owner will want to be removed completely from all the work

For test creation: expect to be more straightforward, not sure what next is about and the placement of edit is better to be more clear (besides question number) - better to have more text information users what the layout is about

Inheritance:

1. Everything was clearly laid out and easy to use. The workflow as fluid and given my objectives, I was easily able to figure out how to execute it without any supervision.

2. Personally thought it was bit of a messy UI, but that just may be because of the prototype nature of it. On a purely functional standpoint, it succeeded in enabling me to complete the listed objectives easily and concisely.

3. The change in the sidebar after clicking on CPSC344 for the first time was really unnoticed to me... It took me a really long time to even notice that the list had changed to a list of suboptions. Other than that, everything worked great.

4. Seemed simple and easy to use. I didn't feel blown away with too many features and extra information which was really nice.

Test Creation:

1. Pretty good, However I felt that feedback from the system and built in instructions were somewhat lacking. The overall workflow felt like it should have been explained better. Things such as "Add to Template", I had no idea what it did.

2. I felt somewhat lost as to what I was actually supposed to do. Even with the my objectives, it felt as if the layout didn't really match the exact workflow it my head. I also felt the terminology used was somewhat confusing.

3. Should add some indentation or bolding of fonts bring out what should be most eye catching. Because in terms of workflow, the only thing I could rely on was going top-down, and not be able to simply look at the screen and detect where the different option where by objections or bolded/different text.

4. Easy to use and I was able to accomplish the task really easily.

Grouping:

1. Very clear and easy to use. Layout made sense and seemed made sense and there was very little confusion as to where things were located... Might want to change 'Content' to 'Files' or something like that though.

2. Bit of a bland color palette, but functionality wise, it works great and matched what I was expecting out of such a tool.

3. The homepage 'online/offline' lists were confusing and seemed to lack any sort of true reason to exist. Really liked the file manager. cool stuff.

4. Didn't really feel ubc themed, but other that that; worked great.

**2. Would you be interested in using (or more willing to use) the functionalities if they were implemented in Connect?**

Yes

The functionalities we test was the one where we were able to add extra people, and go to the History...

That would be a lot easier because what they are doing now is they are putting everything onto the server and you have to use terminals and everything and it’s a big pain. So if you have

something like this it would be a lot better for interface.

Of course.

Horizontal prototype layout for title page is nice

Inheritance is not going to be used too much (can be hidden away for the most of the time)

Test creation should be built for more intuitive usability (layout and transfer effect from connect and maybe vista)

Inheritence:

1. Definitely, in the math department, we currently just hand of websites to one another while at the same time having to record marks in connect or vista. Having centralized means of transferring courses to one another would be great and this solution seems to be something really good. I hope you run with it and make this a real thing lol

2. Very much so, I find always having to recreate a website for every term to be rather annoying. Being able to automate the knowledge base transfer would be very useful.

3. Since I don't teach a course, I don't really think I would use this.

4. I don't teach, so I would probably never use this thing.

Test Creation:

1. Not really sure; webwork currently supports automated latex exporting as well as programmatic question creation, if your tool did begin to implement such features, yes I could see me using it, however if it doesn't, it is somewhat of a deal breaker.

2. Webwork is currently the standard for my department, so I don't really think your tool can compare to something which allows programming based question/answer creation.

3. I think I could use this for my undergrad lab groups for review quizzes; which is something which I strictly avoid because of the current quizzing system.

4. I can't really see myself ever needing to create a test.

Grouping:

1. Since I teach math classes, I don't really need my students to be in groups. However i'm sure my students would enjoy such a feature to share notes or have group study chats.

2. I can't really see a benefit to this feature for someone in my department, however it would probably be very useful for students.

3. I would really like this feature for group management in my labs. I could also see my lab students liking this for creating study group and sharing notes and probably answers for assignments lol

4. This would be really cool for creating study groups and sharing files between them.

**3. How did you find each particular feature (interviewer: please go over EACH feature)?**

**- left sidebar**

it was pretty easy to use, but could use polish. In this prototype it only has the features that you guys implemented. How would it organize a full feature set?

it was pretty easy to use

It was good. Except that if I use the “back” button, will it also bring me back? (Yes) Ok, then it was great!

Easy to use

**- vertical tabs**

pretty good

it’s straightforward

That was also good

Easy

What is this? @$%@$#

**- deleting links in previous course year**

easy to use and straightforward

what would probably be useful is that if I pretty the “x”, it would say “Are you sure you want to delete something?” so it would be a bit less scary.

I really like this one, it was so easy.

Smooth

**- adding/ deleting ownership**

Easy to use. Have to know other person's ID though

very straightforward. Would appreciate if there was a confirmation sign. But other than that everything is fine.

This was also very easy especially with that “X” and adding was also quite easy.

(Would you like to have a pop up confirming your deletion?) Yes, I would like that.

clear how to add and delete them. the layout is nice and obvious

**- modifying a question (in test)**

Alright. Nothing unexpected

It was also very easy to do

Easy to recognize where to modify it

**- adding question templates**

A bit of a learning curve for first time users

Yes just one click, that’s good. First I was thinking about maybe drag-and-drop, but then I saw the checkbox.

Fast because the task wording is hinting what to do

**- saving a version of the test**

Straightforward

I was confused a bit. I didn’t know that after clicking “next” I would go to a summary page.

No problem with saving it but the layout is not very clear how the exam looks like. Better have a preview

~\_~\_~\_~\_~\_~\_~

- left sidebar (easier to navigate?)

- vertical tabs

- deleting links in previous course year

- adding/ deleting ownership

- modifying a question (in test)

- adding question templates

- saving a version of the test

- Adding Groups

- Adding members

- Adding Files

Inheritence

1. Left sidebar seemed simple enough, I would recommend changing the fonts or something for the sub course menus... What vertical tabs?.... Simple Enough... Easy.

2. Clean, simple, good... what tabs... easy... easy

3. Please change display for sub menu options... didn't see any... simple and easy, maybe cleanup the UI?.... Same with the last one.

4. Everything was where I naturally thought i would be.. there were tabs?....

Test Creation

1. Confusing, didn't flow nicely... I had no idea what this actually did... I did it, but I'm not sure how lol

2. Easy, maybe move the edit button closer to the question.... had no idea how I did that... The whole adding to template thing seemed convoluted to me.

3. Well i need your help for the entire process... so I'm assuming I found each feature difficult to use lol

4. Bleh, was confuzzled...

Grouping

1. Easy... Simple... Nice UI, would use if implmented.

2. Very simple and easy... Simple, seemed modeled after things used in existing systems... Easy to use.

3. ALL GOOD

4. All very easy.

**4. Are these features useful in moving you towards the context of Connect?**

Yes, it's a good start.

I use Connect to grab the file from previous courses. I think that’s very useful and it’s not currently supported by Vista or Connect. And I would use that a lot. But other than that, I wouldn’t use those existing functionality of Connect. They use forums and everything but I don’t really use that.

All I use Connect for is to grab files and checking grades, but other than that, that’s all I use Connect for. So I would use the functionality of grabbing the files (from previous courses or from my own courses). I would definitely use the function if it was implemented.

Yes of course!

Simple layout is good

Inheritance can be useful for a closed system

Version" I guess

Inheritence:

1. Very much, I would really like to inherit course material.

2. I think so, inheritence is very useful to me.

3. Not really seeing as how I dont teach classes.

4. Not at all... I'm a student lol

Test Creation:

1. Not really, webwork is the standard for math classes.

2. Math dept recommends webwork, so we stick with it.

3. Would be cool for my lab students.

4. I dont think I woud ever need to create a quiz.

Grouping:

1. Defineatley not for me personally, but I do think that my students would really like it for sharing notes

2. Not for me; but probably my students?

3. I think I would definately use such functionality for creating lab groups in the labs I use, and my students would probably really like it for unified document sharing instead of having to create separate google groups for such functionality.

4. I really liked this. For any project based or lab based course, this would be of great help for sharing files and organization.

**5. If not then why are you reluctant? What particularly is the issue with connect and it's features?**

Confusing interface. Steep learning Curve but feature packed. I don't think anything bothers to become an expert since it's a HELPER to the course

For most courses, they’ve got Piazza and they’ve got Connect discussion. Nobody goes on Connect discussion and everybody goes on Piazza, that’s why I go to Piazza for the chat and the posts. For any given course, the only thing I would do is to check grades and grab files. I use Connect to grab the files from and Piazza for the forum.

If people started to use Connect for discussion I would probably use Connect too. I only used the discussion forum of Connect once because I had to post some link because there’s nowhere else to post it. As a student, I would always use the network that’s bigger.

I mean for the “next” button in test, maybe you could change it to something like “view summary”.

Current system need work on:

- For test creation, more text to explain the steps and layout ( maybe progress bar)

- versioning is a nice-to-have feature but the current one is too primitive

- changing name of exam

Inheritence:

1. N/A

2. N/A

3. Not a teacher

4. Not a teacher

Test Creation:

1. Uses webwork.

2. Uses webwork.

3. N/A

4. Not a teache.

Grouping:

1. Class doesn't work in groups.

2. Class doens't work in groups.

3. N/A

4. N/A

**6. What other improvements would you like?**

While your revision has made it easier to use, it could still be taken a bit further.

What I would think would be useful is to have a “download all” button so I something to go recursively to download all files to my local disk. I like to keep all the files to my local disk. Say I want to download all files and exams for CPSC 344 W Term 1, it would be great to have a download all button in the subdirectory.

[in summary page] If I were a test creator, I would like to see a preview of the entire test. Instead of labels and stuff, I want to see the actual question. When I add the third choice, was it really added?

Test Creation:

1. Allow you to code answer detection with matlab or another math based programming language.

2. Needs programming based question/answer creation, easier workflow and make the UI easier for users to find the 'summary' and 'add to template' functions

3. Hard to say... workflow seemed natural, I just couldn't find how to actualy follow it. So general fixes to the UI for easier button finding?

4. I don't know where to start... I was just really confuzzled.

Grouping:

1. Clearer emphasis on what the online/offline lists on the main page is for. You should indicate what the "Danger Zone" actually is or means, cause the only reason I knew what it was cause its like GitHub.

2. Perhabs change the way you list the groups to more of a tree based directory style instead of a huge list. I think that the gorup would get quite large for TAs or Profs who need to be a member of all sub groups.

3. Group Chats!

4. group wikis maybe, annoucments section on homepage?

**7. What do you think are the most important features for such a system? What do you expect to do with Connect?**

Collaboration and Course Organization is what connect should be all about and nothing more.

ie Discussion, chats, Grades, Notes, etc...

1. Grab files

2. Post questions

3. See my grade

I think any other feature would be feature creep, too much feature. In my opinion, Connect should focus on that three things and get rid of everything else.

For me it would be putting the marks online. I can remember with Vista it was a pain, it took me hours to put maybe... 20 marks online. What I would like with Connect would be making the process of posting marks easier.

most important feature

- Get it to support basic works (quiz creation) -> preview and deadline does not work

- simple ( fewer pages to gt to what is desired)

1. Ease of use, I want Connect to be a one stop location for all school related work.

2. Strong functionality hidden behind a simple UI, I want connect to be extremely easy to use without having to look at a single manual or help guide.

3. Clean UI, and strong functionality.

4. The ability to manage all my school work in a efficient manner without having to depend on outside software solutions

======================================

Appendix

1 = Math Professor A

2 = Math Professor B

3 = Human Kinetics TA / Grad Student / Researcher

4 = English Major / Undergrad Student

========================================

Other comments of Observation:

- Change on screen became unnoticeable when subjects have to read the required tasks at the same time

Deliverables

====================================

**1. Goals, approach and rationale:**

In the stage 4 evaluation, the main difference will be the overall type of information we wish to discover during the interviews. Because of a lack of an operating prototype in Stage 3, the main goal was discovery, while in stage 4, it is refinement. We wish to discover and get a more refined idea of the workflow which users most naturally want to follow in order to refine our UI; While in stage 3, it was more so about discovery of wanted functionality.

Their our minor implications for interviewing a different user pool than in Stage 3; this new set of users may not have the same values in functionality which the previous did which could muddy our qualitative data. However, because the functionality is set and the purpose of this stage is refinement, the impact is minimal and should not impact our data to a significant degree.

**2. Execution details (e.g. actual Participant pool, etc)**

Representative Users: 2 Professors, 5 TAs, 1 Student

Observational Walkthroughs with a post task semi-structured interview. This will allow us to gather a high amount of qualitative data on how users find the prototypes as well as get a better indepth look at how users interact with them via observation.

**3. Divergence from Stage 3 evaluation plan, if any, and justification**

Although not directly referenced in the stage 3 report (was more so implied), post task semi-structured interviews to gather qualitative information on user experience. We originally planned to conduct observations with professors only. However, due to the fact that we might not be able to get as many professors in such a short time, we decided to expand our user group to include professors, TAs, and students. Moreover, we are not doing a comparative observation of current Connect and our prototype because most users are unfamiliar with Connect.

**4. Summary of data (from Step 2). Include key figures.**

For inheritance, we received positive responses about navigation, layout, and finding things. Participants find this feature particularly useful and hoping to have it implemented to replace the current way of sharing of course materials. We also found that one participant commented on not knowing whether the original owner can be completely removed from the course. 2 participants would like to have a pop-up asking for confirmation before the system delete data in course material and ownership.

In Test Creation, out of the 7 participants who we conducted the observations, all of them commented about that the layout and workflow were unintuitive. Lacking feedback and instructions are other key feedbacks they identified. 5 out of 7 participants had a hard time figuring out that the Next button would provide them with a summary view of the quiz. 6 out of 7 participants did not understand what “Add to template” means and what it does. We interview two professors from the Math department and both of them stated that they are currently using webwork (another software to create exams) and would only migrate if Connect test creation supports programmatic question creation and features like exporting data.

As for Grouping, we interviewed 4 participants and all of them liked the layout and the idea of grouping. The 2 Math professors did not think they would use grouping due to the nature of the Math courses (no groups), but they all think that students would like to have this feature. However, the 2 students really liked the idea and thought that for any project based or lab based course, Grouping would be of great help for sharing files and organization. 2 out of 4 participants thought that homepage ‘online/offline’ lists were confusing and seemed to lack any sort of reason to exist. They were looking for clearer explanation of what ‘online/offline’ lists were for but could not find any clear instructions in our current prototype.

For quantitative data, out of the 8 interviews conducted, the most used words/phrases show what users place most importance in:

* functionality
* usability
* ease of use
* workflow
* UI

**5. Conclusions (from Step 3)**

In summary, our findings indicate that the overall functionality which would be added to Connect via the prototypes is very much wanted by users and would act as a draw for users to implement Connect in a fuller manner. However, there are still some issues with our prototypes such as what we assumed would be the most natural workflow being conflicting with what the actual users felt. As well as many users feeling that some wording and layout issues still exist to maximize ease of use.

The overall evaluation process went smoothly with no hiccups. Although there is an inherent limitation of how much quantitative data we are capable of gathering from such a limited number of interview, the depth and quality of our data collected makes up for any such shortcoming.

The prototypes matched exactly what we needed for our evaluations; as we were doing observational walkthroughs, the level of functionality needed was already predefined as such making the possibility of accidentally under developing our prototypes impossible.

-Bias:

> Participants are distracted with screen update when they are asked to read the required tasks at the same time. (Change blindness)

> Limited number of exam and questions to inherit old exams to make a new one is not a clear concept

> Since we are only providing the user with a small subset of Connect functionalities and are not capturing the entire component of Connect, the user might falsely think that our version of Connect is very clean and intuitive to use.

**Part B Deliverables**

**B1: Final design rationale and discussion of the state of your design**

**Provide a report with conclusions and recommendations as described in Step 4 (1 page).**

Inheritance:

-Pop up confirmation before actually deleting the data. We thought this is a good idea because it does not clutter the current UI and it is a good error prevention method.

-Left sidebar currently changes text when user click on the course. We want to better notify the user by adding an arrow in front of the text that got changed.

- For the concern of not knowing whether the original owner can be removed from the course or not, since we think more data has to be provided before we make this decision we are not going to make that change at this stage.

- One user suggest “Export All” button to export all course material files into local drive at once but we still think that we would like to see more users making the same suggestion before we add that feature into the prototype (to prevent feature creep if the feature is not actually needed).

Test Creation:

-more straightforward layout

(Master Layout - visible throughout the entire exam creation process)

> Add progress bar (To show which step the user is currently on and the previous/future steps)

> Make the progress bar available for navigation around the process steps

(Exam Creation Page)

> move the Edit button to be besides the Question number

> make the “Add more choice” or “+” should be only visible after the “Edit” button is clicked

> Moving the “add to template” check box to the beginning of each question and change the wording to “Use this question?”

> Create 1~2 more questions

> Create another exam for comparison

> Change the wording of Next button to “Next step to Preview Student View”

> Add more separation / bouandries to separate up different questions, “to-be-used” questions and “other exams”

> Hide advanced options (exam deadline)

(Summary Page)

> move this page to be shown after the Preview Page

> Remove most statistical data

> move all the summary data to exam creation and hide them under some “historical/statistical data tab” of each question”

e a quiz preview page. (2 people mentioned it)

> additional question type: programmatic question creation and exporting functionality (2 out of 2 math professors mentioned it)

Grouping:

- Clarify naming of ‘contents’ to something more suitable such as ‘Files’

- Clarify the reason for online/offline lists to indicate that they are implementing chat functionality.

- Clarify the wording of “Danger Zone” in settings page to represent actual reason for being; ie “Admin Settings”.

**B2: Reflection on your design process**

**Discuss your responses to the issues raised in Step 5. (1 page)**

**Did you see your design change under the influence of user feedback? What were the**

**biggest surprises for you – the things you learned from or about users that you would not have predicted based on your own experience and intuition?**

For this stage, our design did change under the influence of user feedback. We are very grateful to have users suggesting improvements to us. Some suggestions are made by multiple users and that is where we confirm that a change is needed. Our biggest surprises was that we thought our UI was intuitive enough to have the users do their tasks without any guidance. However, it appeared to us that not enough instructions were provided by our prototype and the users were not able to complete certain tasks right away.

**Did the methods you chose for your evaluation and prototyping get at what you were**

**looking for? In hindsight, would a different design process approach have been better?**

- Our evaluation for Stage 2 was a little biased. Our problem was that we had an idea of what WE thought was wrong with connect before we even began asking users (i.e. We asked a question about test creation). It may have been better if we had gone into the interview without having these ideas in advance and conducted completely open ended interviews rather than semi-structured interviews. This way we will know what the USER’s problem with Connect is rather than what users think of OUR problems with Connect.

- Our evaluation process for Stage 4 was very effective. Our interviews/observations allowed our users to elaborate on their personal problems with Connect. The sample size was also very ideal in that we had enough data to find similarities amongst what people think about our prototype. We would not have chosen any different evaluation approach.

- Our Prototyping process was quite difficult. Advanced HTML5 is not as easy and rapid as some other prototyping techniques. In addition, our feature set within Connect is very diverse. Therefore we ended up essentially having 3 different prototypes. The work required was much higher than some other groups and it was extremely rushed since the time frame for the prototype stage was not particularly long. Because of the diversity of the prototypes, we should probably have chosen a faster/easier prototyping approach. In the end, however, we were still able to make decent functional prototypes.

**What seemed the most, and least, valuable among the activities we’ve asked you to try,**

**either generally or specifically for your project?**

- The interview and evaluation tutorials were really helpful in giving us an idea of what kind of information we need to get out of the subjects.

- Although we did not directly use it, Heuristic Evaluations were very important in giving us an idea of what makes up a good user interface. (Specifically the Heuristics)

**Having gone through this course, how might you approach your next interface design**

**project (whether for fun/personal or work, large or small) differently?**

- One of the biggest issue that our group had was having an idea of what we wanted before doing evaluations. This caused us to not be as open minded as we otherwise could have been during our first evaluations (stage 2). Our interviews were conducted in such a way that tried to guide the results to what we wanted to see. It is very important that the evaluation comes first. Next time, we would not come up with any ideas in advance and try to be more open minded during the evaluations.

- Our task examples were too diverse. In a large software system like Connect, we chose 3 functions that didn’t have a lot to do with each other. This resulted in us basically having to make 3 different prototypes. In a limited timeframe this was very difficult to accomplish.

Tool Used:

- Dragon Naturally Speaking 12

- Photoshop