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# Part 1 – Introduction to System (1K words)

## 1.0 Introduction

The context of this paper will be to analyse the Solent Alumni website concerning the user experience of the Future Solent post-graduate students. This case study will be crucial since it will give students chances for post-graduation jobs and networking and highlight the university in house competence.

The SU students and the university should benefit from these possibilities because the university should have a platform capable of supporting students by encouraging them with their future careers. A comparison between the Solent alumni website and the Manchester alumni website noted the features between both universities and seeing if any of the other universities possess a feature that would be a good idea to be implemented on the prototype. (See appendix 1).

## Current SUAA UX Design and Business Model

The Alumni has a Website with a lack of proper UX practice offering to the visitor a negative experience upon landing on the Page. In terms of usability , Efficiency, when the user enters the website there is no good navigation principle by not highlighting the current page as well not have adopted the concept of a functionality called sticky navigation bar, according to (DUXU, 2014) states "A good user experience is when a user does not have to spend a significant amount of time locating, evaluating and using the navigation." so a good practice of website navigation is important to have less chances of letting the user confused.

In terms of Effectivity, pertaining the similar subject discussed above, the navigation bar is tough to understand, the alternatives offered on the middle on the website are not market on the navigation bar, causing the user to scroll.

The business model used on the Solent Alumni page is the community model as mentioned by Mohammed (2021) it is a model that in base on user loyalty, users have a high investment in value and time. The users could get in touch with the university by mentoring or sharing their story, in this situation the way that be website may generate revenue is using a system that the alumni students can donate to support the university.

## Academic and Market Research

In terms of academic research, the Solent Alumni website was compared with the accessibility standards (w3) because the website must be accessible to anyone. Some aspects are not included.

It is possible to understand easily through an illustration offered by the UK home office (ukhomeoffice, indef) what a website should have by default. A list was created to explain what alumni accessibility possesses and do not (see appendix 2).

In terms of Market research, the Solent Alumni website and the Manchester alumni website were evaluated, and the Solent is a group whose focus is to let the students maintain contact with the university. However, they do not offer the opportunity to contact their old classmates, an option that the Manchester alumni offer.

Over the past years, the website has used different methods to make it more accessible to anyone because they do not want to let the student who had their journey on the Solent university.

They use several ways to let the students decide if they want to contribute to university growth, such as participating in events, mentoring, and donating. The target market is the previous students that went to Solent University and such future alumni postgraduate students.

## Analysis

"Understandable means content needs to be understandable both by the users and any assistive technologies they might use" (boia, n.d). The research made it possible to compare with different alumni websites and some academic papers and understand the significant usability problems found on the Solent Alumni website, and consider which changes should be made to make it accessible to anyone.

Since 2000, The accessibility guidelines Working Group (AGWG) focus on the Web Content Accessibility Group (WCAG) has been releasing a version of new guidelines to explain to the developers what makes a good website accessible.

This guideline has the objective of reducing the number of websites that can be found on the internet that not following the guidelines because according to the 2020 Web Accessibility Annual report (abilitynet.org.uk, n.d.) and a Report made by Webaim() states that around 98% of the websites failed to meet the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines. Their focus is to explain what lousy accessibility is found on the websites and what guidelines should be taken to be accessed by anyone.

## Summary

In summary, the first part was to study the user experience principles, check if the Solent alumni website meets the accessibility standards to be used by anyone, and study which business model the alumni uses. Academic research was made to evaluate the accessibility features gaps existing on the website, and it was possible to gather some aspects that need to be improved.

On the Market research, it was made a comparison between several alumni websites to understand how they manage and collect some information to improve the Solent alumni. The author's previous actions have the objective to give some knowledge that can be used on the prototype development.

The user is a scanner by nature, so it is essential to develop a website that is easy to interact with, avoiding a phenomenon called "scrolling fatigue" explained by (SMITH, indef) by studying the (NIELSEN, 1997) can be translated in "zombie scrolling" when having a long page. Not having the focus points defined, the user tends to pay attention to the content they find interesting, and then they scroll the more fatigued they get.
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# Appendixes

Appendix 1:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Solent University | Manchester University |
| What is Alumni video | opening statment |
| Social Media platforms | sharing experiences |
| Donation Page | alumni-exclusive offers |
| Alumni News | events |
| Post Graduation video | networking |
| Events opportunities page | volunteering opportunities |
| Free Library access and gym discounts | Donate to manchester |
| Careers support | Contacts page |
| Discount on postgraduate study |  |

Appendix 2:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **What the alumni have implemented** | **What the alumni doesn’t have implemented** |
| In terms of autistic spectrum | - the writing in plain language | -the website uses bright contrasting colours  -the usage of wall of text  - the complex building and cluttered layout |
| In terms of screen readers | * The website follows a linear logical layout * Structured content using HTML * Write descriptive links and headings | * Only show information in an image or video * Force mouse or screen use |
| In terms of low vision | * use good colour contrasts and a readable font size * use a combination of colour, shapes and text * put buttons and notifications in context * publish all information on web pages * follow a linear, logical layout |  |
| In terms of dyslexia | * consider producing materials in other formats (for example audio or video)   - | * use large blocks of heavy text * force users to remember things from previous pages - give reminders and prompts * put too much information in one place * underline words, use italics or write in capitals |
| In terms of physical or motor disabilities | * make large clickable actions * design for keyboard or speech only use * design with mobile and touchscreen * in mind * provide shortcuts | * bunch interactions together |
| In term of deaf or hard of hearing | * Write in plain text * Let users ask for their preferred communication support when booking appointments | * Put content in audio or video only * -make complex layouts and menus |
| In terms of anxiety | * Give users enough time to complete an action * Explain what will happen after completing a service * Make important information clear | * Leave users questioning what answers they gave |

# Assessment Appendix

**Assessment Details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Module Title: | **UX Strategies** |
| Module Code: | **COM621** |
| Module Leader: | Dr. Anthony Basiel |
| Level: | 6 |
| Assessment Title: | **Solent Alumni Programme System** |
| Assessment Number: | AE1 |
| Assessment Type: | Report + Prototype |
| Restrictions on Time/Word Count: | 3000 words |
| Consequence of not meeting time/word count limit: | It is essential that assignments keep within the time/word count limit stated above. Any work beyond the maximum time/word length permitted will be disregarded and not accounted for in the final grade. \* |
| Individual/Group: | Individual |
| Assessment Weighting: | 100% |
| Issue Date: | 30 Sept. 2021 |
| Hand In Date: | 21/1/2022 |
| Planned Feedback Date: | 04/02/2022 |
| Mode of Submission: | on-line via SOL |
| Number of copies to be submitted: | **1 Copy per student including all parts of assignment** |
| Anonymous Marking | This assessment is exempt from anonymous marking. |

**Assessment Task**

**DESIGN BRIEF AND TERMS OF REFERENCE**

This project aims to research and analyse the UX Strategy for the Solent University Alumni Association (SUAA). A project Gantt chart will be needed to produce a work plan for the 3 K word final report. Weekly progress will be shared in each class session and online. Students will do a case study analysis of the Solent University Alumni Association current website <https://www.solent.ac.uk/alumni> and related services / resources. The main university contacts are Mike Toy (SUAA manager) and Mark Humphrys (Marketing Manager). Please coordinate your communication with these staff members so we don’t send too many individual emails. Their support time is limited as our ‘clients’.

This is a summary of the overall assessment tasks:

1. A market research study will be done with at least 1 other university similar to SU.

1. Conduct a review of the Solent University mission, vision, value etc.

statements in light of corporate social responsibility to identify any gaps.

2. Critically compare this to at least 1 comparable UK university.

3. Critically compare this website to at least 1 other UK university alumni

website. NOTE: figures and tables can be put in the report appendix to save

on word count.

2. Review the SUAA website (<https://www.solent.ac.uk/alumni> ) for UX strategy

including the services and resources offered.

3. The data collected and analysed will help inform some recommended changes to

the resources e.g. UX designs.

4. All ethical guidelines for research and NDA (non-disclosure agreements) or data

protection policies will be followed. e.g. consent forms for current Computing

students will be used to get primary data on the current website and resources,

compared to the student's recommendations.

5. COM621 students will compile short interview questions for Mike and Mark as part of the business and website review process to submit as a group (not individuals).

6. Any surveys or interviews will done with current students (prospective alumni), not

with SO graduates due to data privacy regulations.

7. A 3K word summary report will be provided based on last year's assessment to

provide consistency as detailed below.

NB: Recommendations will not be implemented. A summary presentation video will

be made from student submissions.

The project will be broken into four distinctive parts, which are explained below.

The project will be broken into four distinctive parts, which are explained below.

**Part 1 – Introduction to System**

Deliverable 1000 Words

Part 1 will be the assimilation of relevant information about the functionality of the system and requirements for the interface based on the type of user and frequency of use and clearly defined business goals. This section aims at what stockholders/shareholders want? An introduction should be provided to introduce your team idea, what solution it solves using context analysis or based on gain and pain model.

Introduction should provide answers to the following questions:

What is the context?

Who are the users?

What is the system?

What is the problem?

Why is it important?

Who should benefit from it?

What impact does technology have on that context?

What is the feature list comparison of existing systems?

**Part 2 – User Research Analysis**

Deliverable 1000 Words

In UX, it is important to understand who the users are and what are their needs. In order to do that you should utilise a variety of UX methods, minimum required:

1. Contextual Interviews - Enable you to observe users in their natural environment, giving you a better understanding of the way users work.
2. Surveys - A series of questions asked to multiple users of your idea.

You should produce a valid list of user groups (Demographics, Geographic, Psychographic and behavioural) attributes table. You must also produce a list of user needs in a form of a table.

**Part 3 – User Journey**

Deliverable Poster /Video

At this point, as per part 1 and part 2, you should have two essential UX outcomes available, User Research findings in a form user needs and objectives and a clearly defined business goal. In this section, you are required to produce a fully detailed **user journey** including all the following elements:

1. User Persona (Minimum 2 persona representing two typical user groups)
2. User Scenario (Minimum 2)
3. User Goals
4. Flow of Tasks/Information/Screens/IXDs/Contents/Information Architecture
5. Empathy Mapping
6. Usability Metrics

**Part 4 – Prototype**

Deliverable prototype

Part 4 will be the production of a prototype. You are required to produce the prototype interface using an appropriate prototyping tool. Each team member is responsible for ensuring that their design area is prototyped. Populate your interface prototype with example data sufficient to demonstrate the prototypes functionality.

1. [https://gomockingbird.com/home.htm](https://gomockingbird.com/home)
2. <https://www.fluidui.com/>
3. <http://www.foreui.com/>
4. <https://www.uxpin.com/>
5. <http://www.hotgloo.com/>
6. <https://moqups.com/>
7. <http://www.justinmind.com/>

You will be required to demonstrate your software prototype in your normal Tutorial, times to be advised during class by the unit tutor. Please make sure that your prototype is accessible online. Make sure that when you chose the prototyping tool to consider whether it could be exported and extracted for SOL submission. Alternatively, a web link of the prototype needs to be valid for at least 90 days.

**Part 5 – Usability Testing**

Deliverable 1000 Words

Part five will be the usability testing. As part of your interface implementation process, you will have to test your interface. Your will be responsible for what UX or Usability testing you carrying out, and accordingly, design the test and have it approved by your tutor. You should recruit participants to test the project, with predefined demographical criteria, you will be responsible to bring them to the lab and test your interface. Data analysis of this part should inform the final design, and this should be documented in 1000 words report supported with heat maps and gaze plots.

Usability testing metrics:

* Layout: Inability to detect something users need to find; Aesthetic problems; Unnecessary Information.
* Terminology: Unable to understand the terminology.
* Feedback: User does not receive relevant feedback or it is inconsistent with what the user expects.
* Comprehension: Inability to understand the instructions given to users on the site.
* Data Entry: Problems with entering information.
* Navigation: Problems with finding users way around the test site/system/software.

**Assessment criteria**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | **B** |  | **C** | | **D** | **F** |
|  |
| **Analysis of User experience requirements, usability planning & design (ref L.O. K1,C1,P1)** | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Able to critically analyse UX |  |  |  |  |  | Identification, |
| problem and conduct a thorough | Good understanding of UX | Able to recognise a UX | | | Can identify some key | analysis, planning of |
| analysis, plan & design of a | analysis techniques and | research issues and apply a | | | elements of the HCI | a poor standard |
| development problem, select | methodologies evidenced | series of steps | | | problem and plan a set of | which does not meet |
| effectively between different | by set of UX analytical | in providing a solution to a | | | actions to achieve that task | or address problem |
| alternatives and provide | artefacts. Able to apply a | usability & interaction | | | based upon a given method. | area. Does not reach |
| justification in the context of | suitable, | development problem. | | | Although sufficient has flaws | required threshold. |
| problem and in the light of | logical series of steps | However, analysis or | | | in elements and/or actions, | Doesn’t include UX |
| existing HCI theory. | effectively and | design may be weak in | | | and/or method. Analysis has | artefact. |
| To include: User analysis, task | consistently in providing | parts or use of the | | | the minimum required |  |
| analysis, screen | a solution to a usability | methodology inconsistent. | | | elements that exceed the |  |
| designs, windows hierarchy | & interaction/software | To include: User analysis, | | | threshold. |  |
| diagrams etc. More | development problem. To | task analysis, screen | | |  |  |
| complete designs will include | include: User analysis, task | designs, windows hierarchy | | |  |  |
| establishment of | analysis, screen | diagrams. | | |  |  |
| usability requirements for | designs, windows hierarchy |  |  |  |  |  |
| subsequent evaluation. | diagrams. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | |  |  |  |
| **Implementation of Design and Evaluation (ref L.O. K1,C1)** | | |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| Able to produce a usable and | Can implement a design | Can implement an HCI | | | Can apply visual | Does not reach |
| robust interface with fully | spec. in full, within a | problem solution from a | | | environment design tools | required threshold. |
| functional components from a | visual environment | design specification | | | and techniques in solving a | Implementation & |
| given specification fully | well-informed by | informed by evaluation. | | | structured and/or user | evaluation |
| informed by evaluation. | evaluation while | The specification may not | | | related problem informed by | inadequate. |
| Demonstrates exceptional skill | respecting good | be implemented in full | | | evaluation. However, the |  |
| in the use of the visual | professional HCI | and/or the system may not | | | solution may be partial or |  |
| development environment. | principles and practice. | be sufficiently robust. | | | may employ only a subset of |  |
| Comprehensive and thorough | Some robust usability | Some evaluation / testing | | | the appropriate techniques. |  |
| evaluation and usability testing. | evaluation / testing. | will have been carried out. | | | Evaluation superficial, |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | marginal testing. |  |
| **Identification and appraisal of key areas of work (ref L.O. C1,P1)** | | | | |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| Able to define and conduct a | Able to define and | Able to define and reflect | | | Able to describe and partly | Does not reach |
| rigorous critique of key areas in | reflect upon key areas in | on key areas in the context | | | reflect on some key | required threshold. |
| the context of very clearly | the context of well- | of recognized HCI issues. | | | elements within the HCI | Identification & |
| defined HCI issues and to | defined HCI issues and | Some solid critical | | | area. Definition and critical | appraisal of a poor |
| evaluate the solution and the | provide a critical | evaluation against original | | | evaluation is superficial. | standard which fails |
| solution strategy with reference | assessment of actions | requirements though this | | |  | to reach required |
| to existing theory. Able to | taken. Able to identify | could be extended. | | |  | threshold. |
| assess the implications of | alternative solution |  |  |  |  |  |
| adopting alternative solution | strategies. |  |  |  |  |  |
| strategies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| **Knowledge and Understanding & Contribution (ref L.O. C1,T1)** | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  | | |  |  |
| Demonstrates a detailed | Comprehensive overall | Demonstrates familiarity | | | Satisfactory understanding | Does not reach |
| recognition and knowledge of | understanding of issues | with issues and practice in | | | and identification of HCI | required threshold. |
| theory & practice in the context | & practice in the context | the context of human- | | | issues, design capabilities , | Inaccuracies / |
| of human digital interaction and | of human digital | digital interaction with a | | | evaluation issues and | omissions in areas of |
| an in-depth identification and | interaction with a | software model. | | | functionally of the interface | theory & practice may |
| understanding of concepts. | software model. Has | Reasonable familiarity with | | | and software model but | be substantial with |
| Has the ability to synthesize | read around the subject | recommended reading. | | | lacking in depth and | irrelevancies. |
| and apply information in the | and is able to integrate | Some gaps in significant | | | breadth. Minor contribution | Struggles or fails to |
| solution of a problem in | and organise | areas. Contribution to | | | to group. Poor written | engage with |
| conjunction with team. Makes a | information. Has clearly | group is acceptably | | | reflection on work | concepts, issues |
| full well managed & positive | worked with the team | managed with some gaps | | | contributed to group with | within HCI. Very |
| contribution to work produced | and made a significant | in depth and breadth. | | | little or no example | little or no reflection |
| by group. Is able to reflect fully | contribution to | Written reflection of | | | artefacts, poor referencing. | on contribution with |
| on how contribution is made | group/team work. Able | contribution is constructed | | |  | no example artefacts. |
| with fully referenced clear | to reflect on how | clearly with some gaps and | | |  |  |
| example artefacts. | contribution is made with | few example artefacts | | |  |  |
|  | referenced examples. | which may not be clearly | | |  |  |
|  |  | referenced. | | |  |  |
| **Presentation & planning (ref L.O. C1,P1,T1)** | |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comprehensive, detailed, | Provides a coherent | Provides a coherent style | | | Meets the basic guidelines | Does not reach |
| coherent, & consistent | clear well planned | and structure for the | | | for a given presentation and | required threshold. |
| throughout with no errors of | whole. Consistent in | subject in hand with some | | | presentational style. | Aspects substantially |
| rationale reasoning or fact, | rationale, reasoning, | structural and information | | | Evidence of planning. | unclear, incoherent or |
| Very well planned. | Planning. | defects. Well planned. | | |  | missing |

## Learning Outcomes: Self-Assessment (LOs – mapped for each of the 3 sections. Evidence all 5 are addressed.)

What you will be able to do after the module: Use the key words of the LOs.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Module Learning Outcome** | **Evidence (pg #)**  **Notes** | **Personal Learning Outcome** |
| **1. Implement problem solving techniques into designing features and functionalities to produce industry level products.** |  |  |
| **2. Compare User Experience principles to accommodate different forms of interaction across multiple touchpoints (physical and/or digital), and to formulate and apply these principles in complex contexts.** |  |  |
| **3. Analyze proposed UX design solutions using a range of methodologies and techniques against goals, objectives and key performance indicators (KPIs).** |  |  |
| **4. Critically evaluate and validate solutions against goals, objectives and key performance indicators (KPIs) with a view to continuous improvement of the digital product or service.** |  |  |
| **5. Apply accessibility principles to digital product design.** |  |  |

## Ethics Policy

The work being carried out by students must be in compliance with the Ethics Policy. Where there is an ethical issue, as specified within the Ethics Policy, then students will need an ethics release or an ethical approval prior to the start of the project.

1. The Ethics Policy is contained within Section 2S of the Academic Handbook:

<https://staff.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/2s-solent-university-ethics-policy.pdf>

1. The **British Education Research Association (BERA)** research guidelines are useful for your surveys and interviews.
2. For commercial research, you may want to use a free online NDA (Non-disclosure agreement) such as: <https://legaltemplates.net/form/non-disclosure-agreement/>

I have read and applied the appropriate ethics guidelines for this assessment.

