**Date**: March 27th

**Time**: 11 am

**Duration:** 20 minutes

**Research method used:** Interview & Cognitive Walkthrough & Usability Testing

**Group Name**: Linky

**Interviewers names**: Catherine Wang, Damla

**Details of Research**: Interviews are between 2 members of their group and 3 of us, we asked several questions of the functionalities and the facilitator walked us through their application, and we provided positive and negative suggestions about the design.

**Positive & Negative Impressions about**

* **chosen method of research**

**Positive:**

We conducted interviews and cognitive walkthroughs, they’re sufficient to explain their phone app thoroughly.

**Negative:**

Too many functionalities of their application which took a long time to walkthrough.

* **quality of research instruments**

**Positive:**

The interview went pretty well, we have discovered some design problems and they are immediately recorded as notes so they can improve their design.

**Negative:**

Some design details might be ignored because of the long walkthrough, so some functionalities were taken a long time to discuss where other functionalities were just quickly viewed.

* **choice & quality of questions/tasks**

**Postive:**

The questions that interviewer asked are very straightforward and the tasks we performed were easy to conduct because they used a very interactive prototype. We just need to click.

**Negative:**

The facilitator has missed some very important questions that their group haven’t considered yet.

* **delivery method**

**Positive:**

They chose a phone application to tighten up the family relationships which is good for young generations that use modern technology frequently.

**Negative:**

It might not be a good idea for elder people who don’t really use modern technology that much.

* **facilitator performance & attitude**

**Positive:**

Very good attitude, she patiently explained every question we asked.

**Negative:**

She’d not able to provide a perfect answer for some questions because their group hasn’t considered those questions.

* **quality of execution of design/prototype**

**Positive:**

The design is quite interactive, they have managed everything in place, different functionalities and features have distinctive colors, easy to identify.

**Negative:**

Too many features might require a long time for users to learn them all, and the layout is quite complicated.

* **overall research quality & applicability to the larger goal**

**Positive:**

They did a good job about conducting their design, and the prototype is indeed interactive, their prototype is currently designed for family members, and they can be extended to a larger user sample which include other relationships other than family relationships.

**Negative:**

To achieve a larger goal, they need to add more features, however, there have been already too many features, to do so might increase the complexity of their application which is not good.

**Date**: March 27th

**Time**: 11: 21 am

**Duration:** 15minutes

**Research method used:** Cognitive Walkthrough & Usability Testing

**Group Name**: Training Shell

**Interviewers names**: Ben Hu

**Details of Research**: The facilitator guided us how their terminal works by showing us step by step, which including how to start the terminal, then type the commands, and showed us the layout of the prototype.

**Positive & Negative Impressions about**

* **chosen method of research**

**Positive:**

We conducted a few iterations of cognitive walkthroughs with different functionalities, they’re quite intuitive designed to help user understand how their terminal/shell work

**Negative:**

It still needs some programming backgrounds to be able to do so, and the help command design is very good but it still needs to be fully implemented.

* **quality of research instruments**

**Positive:**

The walkthroughs consist of three main parts, two of them are ppt style introductions and the last one is the actual implemented terminal, they are sufficient to show how their project works.

**Negative:**

The walkthroughs need more details because after the walkthrough is finished, I just learn all the basic functionalities, but still no idea of how these commands work since they all look similar to the linux shell.

* **choice & quality of questions/tasks**

**Postive:**

It’s very easy to learn how to use the prototype because of the hints and guides provided, commands are simple and easy to understand, only thing user needs to do is to follow tutorial.

**Negative:**

More commands need to be tested, because the prototype only supports few commands, which is not enough to learn how to use terminal.

* **delivery method**

**Positive:**

It’s very intuitive and interactive because of the straight forward design, this shell is more newbie-friendly because it have detailed explains of each shell command.

**Negative:**

This shell operates only in linux-like systems.

* **facilitator performance & attitude**

**Positive:**

Very helpful about explaining the features.

**Negative:**

He didn’t try to explain unless I asked.

* **quality of execution of design/prototype**

**Positive:**

The execution went smoothly and very interactive too, I had a full understanding of their project after the demo.

**Negative:**

Some key features like “help” command is not fully functional which make the shell not that user friendly and needs the facilitator to explain.

* **overall research quality & applicability to the larger goal**

**Positive:**

Great idea about developing a starter shell/terminal, it’s designed to be more detailed than traditional one and their project fully revealed the design purpose, with fully implemented features, they can definitely achieve their goal, and it can even replace the current shell/terminal of linux, and the most important is that it’s learnability is great for newbie programmers.

**Negative:**

Their shell has a lot of features, it’s necessary but the compatibility is a future issue, it should be compatible with linux, however, it might be conflict with other operating systems.

**Date**: March 20th

**Time**: 11:11 am

**Duration:** 20 minutes

**Research method used:** Interview & Cognitive Walkthrough

**Group Name**: Danger Zone

**Interviewers names**: Svetlana Borodina

**Details of Research**: The facilitator explained me about how their prototype is doing, and showed me several examples about various functionalities, from a big menu to detailed features, and so I can figure out how the entire prototype is integrated.

**Positive & Negative Impressions about**

* **chosen method of research**

**Positive:**

We conducted a cognitive walkthrough, which explained what their application is doing and how it interacts with user.

**Negative:**

The walkthrough needs a lot of explanations from facilitator about how some features work.

* **quality of research instruments**

**Positive:**

A cognitive walkthrough is good enough to learn about the project, it showed most of the features and what they’re doing.

**Negative:**

Too many buttons that I didn’t know where they navigate to, the interface can have a better layout.

* **choice & quality of questions/tasks**

**Postive:**

Most of the basic functionalities are tested and working as intended.

**Negative:**

The features tested are not enough to explain every other functionalities, because they might function differently.

* **delivery method**

**Positive:**

The important information is showed by the UI, and they are adjustable in terms of size and fonts, it also supports multi-languages, the information is quite highly-integrated.

**Negative:**

The way that some of the information showed requires internet connections, so the device installed the application needs to connect to internet.

* **facilitator performance & attitude**

**Positive:**

Very good attitude, she’s helpful about explaining each of the feature.

**Negative:**

She should’ve explained better about the features, because some of them are still confusing even she explained.

* **quality of execution of design/prototype**

**Positive:**

The execution was quite straightforward, every step is clear and key features had been given a detailed walkthrough.

**Negative:**

Some of the buttons are not clickable, so the full features were not viewable.

* **overall research quality & applicability to the larger goal**

**Positive:**

This design has multiple functionalities, and features that can help with many things, the quality is not bad at all, with all features implemented, they can easily fulfill their goal, and to possibly increase their problem space too.

**Negative:**

The overall design is a little bit complicated, although a lot of features are necessary, they can be simplified by integrated together, and their UI navigation is not user friendly enough.