Heuristic Evaluation

Structure of the individual report

Part I: Your Name

Luca Scibetta, s303976

Part II: Project Description

The app aims at providing to students of Polythecnic University of Turin a mean to interact with university canteen, so they can better manage their time and improve the experience.

Part III: Evaluation Execution

I conducted the heuristic evaluation in-person, using the readme file related to the project I'm evaluating, the list of Nielsen's usability heuristics (from slides 09-heuristic-evaluation) and a OneNote page to take notes while applying the heuristics.
For the evaluation I started by exploring the mid-fi prototype to have a general overview of it and of the three tasks proposed. Then I repeatedly tried to execute the tasks and explored other possible actions not included in the tasks. Meanwhile I was taking notes on possible errors, imperfections and unclear elements and checking the list of heuristics to associate what I found to a specific one and to possibly find other possible errors.
I didn't have any interaction with the group that developed the project, but I interacted with professor Calò to ask about a doubt of mine regarding tasks.
In general, I think that tasks defined in the readme are not well defined since there is an overlap between the simple and the moderate ones, considering also the possibility to execute them in different orders without being clear whether information are being saved or not.

Part IV: List of Violations

[Issue #]. [Heuristic #] [Heuristic Title]
Where: [Where the issue occurred – task, step, page]
What: [Description of the problem]
Why: [Reason why it violates the heuristic]
Severity: [0-4, according to Nielsen's severity rating]

1. H4 Consistency and standards
   Where: Back button in many pages.
   What: The back button in some pages do not take back to previous page but to other pages.

Why: Users may be redirected to a page not consistent with what they are trying to do. (For example, if you click on the clock button in the down part of the screen you go to a page for selecting the timeslot, but if you click on the back button of this page you found yourself in the page for selecting your side dish).
Severity: 3

2. H3 User control and freedom
   Where: Last transaction page.
   What: A button for going back to previous page is missing.
   Why: User is not able to go back to the previous page if in some moment he wants to see the list of last transactions and he needs to redo everything to that point.
   Severity: 1

3. H5 Error prevention
   Where: In pages for selecting an option between possible ones (select dish, select timeslot, select payment method).
   What: Although the prototype does not underline any option as default, users can click on the next button (Next, Pay, Choose time, Confirm, Confirm and pay) and a default option is automatically chosen.
   Why: Users may not willingly click on the next button and give wrong inputs without noticing it.
   Severity: 4

4. H4 Consistency and standards
   Where: Next button in different pages.
   What: In different pages there are next buttons with different text.
   Why: Users may wonder what the difference is between clicking on next or choose time and may not notice the difference between going to next step (with the possibility of still going back and change) or to definitively confirm before a payment.
   Severity: 1

5. H1 Visibility of system status
   Where: Page for selection of timeslot after clicking on the clock button in the navbar (task 1).
   What: If users reserve a timeslot, they must proceed with completing the order (task 2).
   Why: It is not clear if timeslot is saved or not and why they should reserve a timeslot rather than doing a complete order.
   Severity: 2

6. H1 Visibility of system status
   Where: Order summary page
   What: Payment preview is missing
   Why: Users should know how much they will pay before confirming payment.
   Severity: 2

7. H1 Visibility of system status
   Where: Order summary page
   What: It is not clear if wallet balance represent method before or after payment and if cards need to be recharged for the current order.
   Why: Users may not understand if they have already paid and if they need to top-up their wallet.
   Severity: 1

8. H1 Visibility of system status
   Where: Order summary page
   What: Users have the possibility to select the dishes of their order.
   Why: It is not clear why users can or should select the dishes already present in their order.
   Severity: 2

9. H1 Visibility of system status
   Where: During payment transaction
   What: A loading page/bar during the transaction is missing.
   Why: Users May not understand what the system is doing during the transaction.
   Severity: 1

10. H1 Visibility of system status
    Where Payment method page
    What: System should ask for confirmation before payment.
    Why: Users may not want to confirm payment.
    Severity: 3

11. H8 Aesthetic and minimalist design
    Where: Calendar page
    What: It is not clear what page is useful for.
    Why: Users may go to this page and wonder what they should do.
    Severity: 2

12. H3 User control and freedom
    Where: Page for selecting a dish
    What: Users have not the possibility to choose to not have a particular dish or to modify a dish.
    Why: If users have food intolerance/allergy or dislike some ingredients they are unable to modify their meal.
    Severity: 2

13. H4 Consistency and standards
    Where: Navbar.

What: Label missing under icons.
Why: User may not understand how to properly navigate through the app.
Severity: 4

Part V: Summary and Recommendations

Report in the table below the total number of identified violations.

Heuristic	# violations
H1: Visibility of system status	6
H2: Match between system and the real world	0
H3: User control and freedom	2
H4: Consistency and standards	2
H5: Error prevention	1
H6: Recognition rather than recall	0
H7: Flexibility and efficiency of use	0
H8: Aesthetic and minimalist design	1
H9: Help users recognize, diagnose, and recover from errors	0
H10: Help and documentation	0
HN: Non-heuristic issue	0

The general impression transmitted by this prototype is quite good. Most functionality seems enough clear for a student with a background in using mobile apps, they also may be useful in a university context.
Some functionalities should be reviewed totally (like the calendar one) while others should be improved with more clarity. Also, the definition of tasks should be reviewed. With these improvements and some bug-fixing the app can be more useful and easier to use.