# Progress

More details at <http://www.expeditionmapper.com>

## Kickoff Meeting – April, 2013

* Discussed current process
* Discussed what the school researched
* Discussed what they wanted at a very high level

## Requirements Sprints

1. High level requirements (9/2/2013)
2. Defining Expeditions (10/10/2013)
3. FSW and Winter Terms (10/17/2013)
4. Non-Expedition Subject Areas (10/30/2013)
5. Data Elements Review and Reporting (11/6/2013)
6. Application Demo and Reporting Continued (12/19/2013)

## Prototypes

1. http://prototypes.expeditionmapper.com/em1
2. http://prototypes.expeditionmapper.com/em2
3. http://prototypes.expeditionmapper.com/em3
4. http://prototypes.expeditionmapper.com/em4
5. http://prototypes.expeditionmapper.com/em5
6. http://prototypes.expeditionmapper.com/em6

## Application for user testing

* http://deploy.expeditionmapper.com

## Usability Testing

1. Helen – Pilot at University of Baltimore (12/9/2013)
2. Beth – Remote (12/17/2013)
3. Rob – Remote (12/20/2013)
4. Kate – Remote (1/11/2014)
5. Lorie – Remote (1/11/2014)
6. Jeff – Remote (1/15/2014)
7. Megan – Remote (1/15/2014)
8. Mary – Remote TBD
9. Meg – Remote TBD
10. Romey – Remote TBD
11. Heather? – Remote TBD

## Observations

1. Second Grade Team (TBD), possibly Third Grade Team \*

# Dissertation Structure

## Research Questions:

* What precisely has the contribution of this project been?
* What were the results?
* What standards were used to evaluate the proposed solution?

## Chapters:

1. Introduction
2. Literature Review
3. Methodology
4. Results and Discussion
5. Recommendations (contribution)

## Structure:
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\* Standards used to evaluate based on user-centered research methods and leans on literature review for supporting research.

# Questions

1. Are the themes covered in my literature review relevant enough to my overall project? Do I need to incorporate more efficacy into why EL and CM are acceptable?
2. Are 10 usability tests enough?
3. Do I need to use any special form of data analysis for my results chapter? My findings have been either recorded or documented – is a narrative enough to highlight the major issues found? Should I follow an existing model?
4. I build much of the base application already due to limitations of Axure for user testing. Should I include system architecture information in my contributions chapter?
5. After analyzing everything and making recommendations – is there another phase I need to develop? A second set of testing? A second application / prototype… Have I brought this far enough along to propose my final design? (I feel like I could keep meeting and find more issues, but need to keep within scope).
6. Should my additional tools such as the online expeditionmapper.com blog, Kanban, etc. be documented in the methods chapter?
7. Should my appendices include scanned copies of consent forms, complete submission to IRB, complete set of screenshots from each prototype, etc?
8. Also for the appendices, how do I reference videos, or other media – or should these all be transcribed?
9. After going through this process, I keep thinking of other areas I may not have discussed enough: mobile, responsive design, cognitive psychology, etc. I am trying to stay focused, however should I reflect on some of these areas in my recommendations and results chapters even though they aren’t explicitly mentioned earlier in the lit review?
10. My plan is to fix the literature review based on our discussion today and then submit chapters 1-3 to you by Monday (20th) for you to review. Does this leave enough time for me to work on the remaining chapters to have them to you by the end of February for defending this spring?

23rd – chapters 1-3

18th – 1:00pm next meeting