Danielle Eisen, Emilee Fulton, Javin White

26 February 2020

Prototype Summary

The guiding question of our prototype design process was: "Is this design accessible and flexible to the needs of the school?" Each time we added a new element or page to the design of our prototype we would discuss as a group whether it would be compatible with a screen reader or Switch. To ensure that our design does not rely on color alone to convey information, we created a prototype that is almost exclusively black and white, except for clickable links, which appear by convention as blue underlined text. Additionally, we ensured our prototype has good structure, by placing elements such as breadcrumbs and "back" buttons in the same location on every page, and by presenting information in structured tables or columned lists with clear headers. Our intention was for the layout of each page to be predictable, so that voice over users can quickly become familiar with navigating the site. To make our system flexible to the needs of the school, we allow teachers to create new forms and edit the forms of specific students.

Another key requirement of our system was the security of our users. To address this requirement, we designed the system to only allow access to those who provide a username and password. After logging in, students only have access to information about the tools they use, while teachers have access to information about all of their students and the resources they need in each class as listed in each student's individual education plan (IEP). We based the abilities the student side and teacher side of the prototype should have on our user stories. We based the flow of accomplishing each task on our use cases. Other requirements, such as Switch and voiceover compatibility, cannot be explicitly included in the prototype because of Balsamiq's limitations. However, an implementation of our design should be compatible with accessibility tools because of our structured and basic layout.

While creating the wireframes, we followed the requirements we extracted from the contextual inquiry and analysis. Most of the requirements are fulfilled by the wireframes, but there are a few that we chose not to include in the design. One requirement that the design does not meet is: "Users should be able to access a list of tools available at the school for students to use." We discussed adding a "list of tools" view to the teacher version of the system, but ultimately decided not to because it was more important to focus on the tools in the context of a specific student. It is possible for the teachers to view the list of tools a student is using, just not a list of all tools available. The other requirements we changed were in regard to IEPs. Since the IEP documents for the students are hosted on an external website, we included the IEP among the student's forms along with a link to that website. The information from the IEPs would be accessible on our system, but the documents themselves are separate.

The student resource tracking system has a set of wireframes for students to access and a set of wireframes for teachers to access. For both, the interaction with this system begins at the

"login" wireframe. Selecting "Teacher Login" brings the user to the "TeacherLogin" wireframe, and selecting "Student Login" brings the user to the "home" wireframe. Both the teacher and student sides of the system can be navigated from there, with the icon for "Student Resource Tracking System" acting as a way to return to either the "TeacherLogin" or "home" wireframe, and the icon for "Log Out" acting as a way to return to the "login" wireframe. Teachers can view information about students and forms, and students can view information about their accessibility tools.