

## Usability Tests & Paper Prototypes v2

Maleek Patterson

HCD-501

### **What I Did and Who I Tested With**

I conducted three usability tests on my initial paper prototype, which visualized four core steps: starting a session, viewing live HR/HRR data, generating an AI-drafted note, and editing the note in the “Note Editor” screen. Each test followed a think-aloud protocol where participants verbalized their expectations, confusion, and reasoning as they completed two required tasks: (1) start and stop a session, and (2) generate and review an AI note draft. I tested with three non-classmates. Participant 1 was a friend who is a nursing student and is familiar with patient documentation, Participant 2 was a friend with a fitness background who understood HR zones, and Participant 3 had no clinical experience, giving me a fresh, beginner perspective.

Before beginning, I explained the HEART Clinic scenario and told them nothing in the interface was “final.” Each participant interacted with the paper screens physically, tapping or pointing where they believed actions should occur. After each task sequence, I asked follow-up questions about clarity, layout, mental models, and what they expected to happen next. I captured photos of every iteration as the prototype evolved from the first rough sketch into a cleaner, more structured layout.

### **User Feedback in Detail**

Participants consistently identified the same friction points. The first was navigation clarity: users weren’t sure if “Today’s Session” was a button or just a label, and the device-connection illustration was interpreted differently by each person. All three expected some type of

confirmation before starting the session. In the Live Session screen, the HR and HRR numbers were clear, but Participant 1 said the “STOP” button felt too similar in style to the “START” button, raising concerns about accidental taps during clinical sessions.

The biggest confusion occurred in the “Generate Draft” screen. Having multiple “Generate Draft” buttons stacked on one page made users think they were selecting between different drafts rather than producing one. Participant 2 said, “Why are there three of them? Am I choosing an AI flavor pack?”

In the Note Editor, users wanted stronger separation between their own editable fields and the AI-generated text. The handwritten “AI Draft” box blended with the rest of the page, causing uncertainty about where they were allowed to edit.

Across all tests, users asked for clearer grouping, more labels, and stronger visual hierarchy. They wanted to know what mattered first, what they could ignore, and what actions were required to complete the workflow.

### **Changes Made After Each Test**

After Test 1, I redesigned the homepage by adding clearer button boundaries, separating the device-connection area, and labeling “Start Session” explicitly. After Test 2, I updated the Live Session screen with a larger STOP button, moved it farther from the HR display, and added a confirmation state. I also removed duplicate “Generate Draft” buttons and replaced them with one primary CTA. After Test 3, I restructured the Note Editor so AI-generated content appeared in a shaded box with a label, while editable fields had stronger borders. I also added section headers, spacing, and directional arrows to clarify task flow.

