

Project Description:

SYNCO is a group collaboration app designed specifically for university students engaged in academic group work. It addresses common challenges in coordinating tasks, tracking progress, and managing communication among team members, especially in a busy post-pandemic academic environment. SYNCO will support tasks such as setting deadlines, sharing files, and maintaining focused group communication. The primary users of the app are college students involved in group assignments, research teams, thesis projects, and organization type academic events who need a centralized, student-friendly platform to work more efficiently and collaboratively.

Requirements Summary:

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS	Processor Cores	Dual Core
	OS	iOS 12
	RAM	2 GB
RECOMMENDED REQUIREMENTS	Processor Cores	Hexa Core
	OS	iOS 15
	RAM	4 GB
OTHER REQUIREMENTS	Permissions	Notifications, Photos, Files

Table 1. System Requirements

To cater to low-end apple models, the application will have at most a minimum of 2 Cores, 2 GB worth of RAM, and Android version iOS 12 as its OS. The app itself is not at all demanding, but we settled on these specs so that it will for sure run smoothly.

Overview

The team used Microsoft Teams, Discord and Messenger to send out the forms for our prototype evaluation. The Evaluation plan is split into three separate parts: Usability Specifications, Heuristics Evaluation, and Participant Survey and Feedback. Below is a table describing each technique.

Technique	Description
Usability Specifications	Usability Specifications is the technique used to evaluate the level of usability that the Prototype has. It consists of tasks that will be done by Participants. Furthermore, the Technique will contain timing the speed of the participants at a given task.
Heuristics Evaluation	Heuristics Evaluation will evaluate the UX design of the Prototype in an industrial-standard usability principle. This technique is chosen to provide a quick and approachable way to assess the validity of the Prototype's Design when time or resources are less.
Participant Survey and Feedback	A survey will be provided to participants after conducting the prototype. The survey will contain quantitative questions that are interpreted into a 5-point Likert Scale as well as Qualitative questions in the form of Feedbacks. This will ensure that no designer bias will be done to the result of this evaluation.

The tasks for this Prototype are:

- Create a Group
- Log out
- How easy will the user be able to navigate while using the Prototype.
- Sharing files and folders
- Setting deadlines

Data Presentation

Data Analysis

Usability Specifications

During the online testing session, Team SARANZA observed that participants interacted well with the prototype. Nearly all participants successfully completed the tasks assigned by the team members without any major issues. It was also noted that they quickly learned and remembered the steps and navigation of the prototype, allowing them to move through it with ease. However, a few buttons were unresponsive when clicked, likely due to overlooked constraint issues during the design phase.

Task	Mean	Interpretation	Classification
Creating a group	24 seconds	Highly Acceptable	Successful
Sharing Files	1 minute and 43 seconds	Highly Acceptable	Successful
Logging Out	26 seconds	Highly Acceptable	Successful
Setting deadlines	1 minute and 52 seconds	Highly Acceptable	Successful

Table 3. Task Time

Heuristic Evaluation

The SYNCO prototype will be evaluated within each type of Heuristic Evaluation.

Visibility of System Status

The prototype was able to inform the participants what was going on within the Prototype.

Match Between System and Real World

The prototype uses basic English which can easily be understood by all ages within our participants. Words and Phrases easily understood by the Participants.

User control and Freedom

The prototype possesses fail-safes such as "Cancel" and "X" whenever participants were mis-clicking or did not understand the instructions clearly. Back Buttons were also implemented as another form of Fail-safe.

Consistency and Standards

Consistency was followed with a bit of issues here and there. Issues such as inconsistency with the position of the Back buttons and location of where to tap.

Error Prevention

Error prevention was followed to some degree with a few mishaps in the prototype. Such errors were minor but still affected the participant's experience to some degree.

Recognition rather than recall

Options, objects, and actions were visible for the user to use during the Prototype.

Flexibility and Efficiency of Use

The prototype was easily understood and used proficiently by both the experienced and inexperienced of the FIGMA style prototype.

Aesthetic and Minimalist Design

The Prototype has a slick and simple that connects to the previous plan of Modern-Minimalistic feel. Furthermore, information that are of no necessities were not shown within the prototype.

Help Users Recognize, Diagnose, and Recover from Errors

Unfortunately, the prototype suffers from this Evaluation type. While the Prototype does indicate the user when they have clicked a part that has no interaction, the prototype was still unable to Help users with Plain Language, only indicators.

Help and Documentation

Users were able to access Help or Assistance through the form of the present team members.

Heuristics Conclusion

Overall, the Prototype was able to follow most of the Evaluations with some issues that still need to be properly addressed or fixed.

Participant Survey and Feedback

Results

SECTION 1			
Question	Mean	Interpretation	Classification
how would you rate your experience with the SYNCO Prototype	5	Highly Acceptable	Successful
On a scale of 1 to 5 how was the UI design of the prototype	4.54	Highly Acceptable	Successful
How easily were you able to follow the tasks provided	4.36	Acceptable	Successful
SECTION 2			
How was the Navigation Drawer	4.36	Acceptable	Successful
How was Accessing the Files	3.54	Acceptable	Successful
How was Importing PDF or IMG files	3.81	Moderately Acceptable	Neutral
How was Creating or Adding Groups, Members	4.54	Highly Acceptable	Successful
How was Setting deadlines	3.91	Acceptable	Successful

Table 3. Survey Data Interpretation

The table displays the results of the survey conducted after the online testing. It indicates that the prototype is currently at an acceptable quality level and is considered successful. However, the team still aims to further enhance the app's user interface. Based on the 10 Usability Heuristics Criteria, the data suggests that the prototype met user expectations and aligned well with key principles, particularly its minimalistic design and clear visibility.

Feedback

While most of the feedback were “n/a, na, N/A etc.” there was one that stated the app already looks and feels good, but we can still improve it further.

Design Implications:

- Does your prototype need to be altered in order to address the results of the analysis, or was it completely successful?
 - The results of the Prototype show it was very successful and is at an acceptable stage. However, the team still decided to improve parts of the UI since there are still parts that could be improved upon. Like the file sharing or where the files are stored.
- What improvements could be made to the design to address any shortcomings?
 - The team can make the Shared Files tab cleaner and more organized so that it doesn't look messy or disorganized. The team will also investigate improving the set deadlines tab as that's one of the areas where in the survey they had a lower mean.
- Did you discover any major flaws that would suggest a completely different type of design?
 - No major flaws but parts that can cause confusion, because some of the buttons in the prototype are not linked to anything, so that caused confusion to the testers.

Critique and Summary:

What were the advantages and disadvantages of your evaluation?

- One of the main benefits of conducting this evaluation was that the team was able to gather important information and data crucial to improving the prototype. Coordinating the online test was also more convenient, as participants were easy to reach and could be provided with the necessary links through social media. On the downside, while it's understood that a prototype is just a preview of the final product, the team felt that certain aspects of it were lacking.

What would you have done differently knowing what you know now (both design wise and evaluation-wise)? Given more resources, what could you have done that would have produced significantly more insightful evaluation results (again, whether this is an improved prototype or a different evaluation path).

- If more time had been available, the team would have considered conducting two separate evaluations: one for the initial prototype and another for the revised version. This approach could have provided more comprehensive feedback to help fully refine the prototype. Additionally, with greater resources, the team believed it would have been possible to incorporate back-end development, turning the prototype into a fully functional application. They also intended to enhance the prototype further by adding additional features such as notifications and online capabilities.

Summary of the Project

The team concluded from this study that designing a prototype is a challenging process. It requires not only sufficient knowledge and experience in interface design but also a clear understanding of the problem and the needs of the target users. Through this study, the team came to appreciate how familiar the participants were with iOS UI, even though it was their first time using the prototype. Overall, the team believes that the design of the prototype was acceptable and effective enough to be considered a success.