CA357 Group 32 Report

**The following is James Fallon’s paragraph:**

We chose user evaluation as our method because it focuses on how well users can interact with our website and learn how to use it to achieve their goals. We wanted to understand the quality of the user’s experience when using our site. This feedback would help us gather ideas about our current design and we could therefore understand our user’s needs better. This method helps to evaluate the usability of the website and from there we could learn from and implement any changes that are deemed necessary. This evaluation would measure the ability of our site to be useful to those who will use it. It would allow us to learn how effective our site is and how satisfied our users are after using it. Most importantly, we wanted our users to:

- Judge the intuitiveness of the website

- See if it was easy to learn how to use

- Tell us about any errors that occurred.

- See the efficiency of the site

Another major reason for choosing user evaluation was because of how we designed our user requirements in our requirements report. For these requirements we gathered information from users who have no experience with open source, users who know what open source is but have not participated and users that have contributed to open source. It was important for us to therefore use user evaluation as we wanted the same user base to get the best results and stay consistent with our requirements report. As this was an original product, we also wanted to get feedback from our users as they would have never seen this type of product before.

There were twenty people involved in our user evaluation. These ranged from family members of the developers, friends, and classmates. This gave us a broad range of people to use our website and provide feedback. Some were not competent with technology while others were very competent. Having feedback from such a wide range of users allowed us to understand our user’s needs better as all users will have different needs and this is very important for us to remember when developing the site.

**The following is Cian’s paragraph:**

As a group, we decided our primary forms of user-based evaluation would be conducted via a survey/questionnaire in conjunction with users walking through and using the prototyped system for themselves.

As this prototype was developed in the constraints of an academic assignment/timeframe, we had to consider the aim of producing both a formative and summative evaluation output. This is because we obviously don’t have the opportunity to continue with any iterative development or refine and re-formulate entirely based on formative feedback, yet our goal is still to learn from our users.

As such, though this is a prototype it is still at its “final stage”, and therefore we wanted to make sure we gained an equally summative overview from our evaluation. Thus, allowing us to make a much more rounded and informed analysis of the evaluation overall, measuring the impact, usability, and overall effectiveness of the system/UI.

Therefore, we placed our primary focus on the empirical methodologies of the survey which would allow us to approach the gathering of information/feedback on both formative and summative fronts.

The goals of this evaluation were to create a series of questions that would facilitate the unbiased and reliable evaluation of our system. We did this by providing users with clear and direct questions with measurable responses, as well as including questions that would give our users a more liberal opportunity to provide other unique and more personal feedback.

We introduced some specific criteria that any given question had to meet in order to be included in the survey. Questions must perform at least one of the following tasks well;

* Help us to assess the extent of the functionality of our proposed system.
* Determine the effect of our prototyped UI on the user’s experience.
* Help review our overall design and identify any problems with decisions made there.

**The following is Stefan’s paragraph:**

The end product that we presented to our users for evaluation primarily focused on aesthetics and UI design. As such most of the practical features such as the search bar and create/edit pages do not receive or update any data. A number of users have reported these incomplete features as bugs or potential future features for us to consider. For the sake of this evaluation we have decided to analyse the critique given on the frontend implementation of our application.

Overall 73.6% of users agreed that our website is intuitive. Hyperlinks and navigation across the different pages is logical and can be inferred from the design (~84% of users found the webpage very easy to navigate). Additionally 84.2% believed our website fit the advertised purpose, that is, a more streamlined platform where one can find and get started with open source projects.

The colour scheme we chose was liked by ~73% of users. We wished to design something that was familiar to the user thus we opted for something reminiscent of dark themes present in many IDEs. Interestingly one of the suggestions we received was the implementation of a light theme mode. This was something we omitted. If we were to continue/redo this project this would be a feature we would definitely implement. The success of our colour scheme combined with our intentional spacing of repository tiles on the home page resulted in users (78.9%) claiming that the application is easy on the eye, something we believe to be crucial for good design, especially given that the possibility of using our website for long periods of time is high.

Overall from this evaluation we have learned that our website is a success from a design point of view and the improvements to be made are small/edge cases for particular users. (this of course ignores the lack of actual functionality to our webapp)

**The following is Maciej’s paragraph:**

While overall as a group, we are happy with the UI presented on our website, there are numerous changes we would like to make given more time, based on user feedback, and already planned features that we ran out of time making.

Some people have commented that they didn’t quite like our colour scheme, so we would like to implement an alternative colour scheme, in that colour scheme we could also appease another request found in our survey which was a request to have a light mode. Our alternative colour scheme should accommodate for people with colour blindness to be as accessible as we can. While on our main colour scheme we would like to give each major language a specific colour to make it more easily identifiable.

Another feature based on the feedback received from our user base is that the website can be a little confusing for a new user as to what the website actually is, granted we assumed our users would have an understanding of open source and git but to mitigate this we could implement a Call to Action (CTA) on the home page which would give an average user not familiar with the content of our website insight into what they are looking at. To continue on the navigation point, our users suggested a marker for which repos have previously been visited and we think this is a stellar idea as it would give you an idea of if you’ve previously seen a repo or not.

Another feature we would have liked to add and worked on but unfortunately ran out of time was a hamburger menu for mobile sized devices, this would have given our headers on mobile a much easier to navigate and less cluttered look.

Overall our surveyed users were largely satisfied with our UI choices. While there are things we would like to improve on given more time, we are happy with how our UI turned out.

**The following is Marius’ paragraph:**

We learnt a lot from this project and there are a few things that we would do differently if we were to do a project like this again. This was our first large scale project of this type, so we had a few growing pains, mainly with the use of git, which we now think we are more familiar with. The biggest issue we had with the prototype was the use of a common css stylesheet. This wreaked havoc on our webpages as some common tags such as h1 tags were set in the style by accident by a group member, which caused great confusion as to why some things would not line up. We should have made a base stylesheet before working on our separate pages. We also tried to make a responsive webpage, which we succeeded in some places, but partially failed in others. If we were to do a web project like this again, we would definitely look into using bootstrap to streamline responsiveness. Finally, we wish we had used a framework other than eleventy. We all have experience with python, and very little experience with html, css and javascript, so flask, django or some other python web frameworks would have been a better choice for our team.

In terms of the evaluation, we think that we should have described the purpose of the prototype more clearly to the survey takers, and conveyed the fact that the prototype was based on its UI’s design and layout, and not the actual functionality of the buttons and boxes. This would have avoided the confusion for the users, and decreased the amount of negative feedback in terms of, for example, the repo search box actually sorting the repo tiles.

Overall, we are proud of the work we have done and we are now more experienced in the creation of UIs.