Validated Learning Report: LCR Tools Chrome Extension

Name: Seth Brock
Date: Oct 16, 2025

Part 1: The Hypothesis

1.1 Problem Statement

Clerks and leaders in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints spend significant manual effort on repetitive tasks within the Leader and Clerk Resources (LCR) website. Key administrative duties such as processing weekly attendance, exporting report data for analysis, identifying members needing photos, and finding members with multiple callings are time-consuming and prone to human error. This manual process often leads to frustration and administrative inefficiency. Furthermore, users desire features, such as member flashcards, that enhance their experience but are unlikely to be prioritized for official development.

1.2 Proposed Solution

The **LCR Tools Chrome Extension** is a high-fidelity, Chrome-browser reliant solution that directly integrates with the LCR website. It is designed to automate and streamline these key administrative tasks by providing context-aware actions, one-click data exports, a semi-automated attendance processing workflow, and other utilities that enhance the core functionality of LCR.

1.3 Core Hypothesis to Validate

By injecting user-friendly tools directly onto the LCR interface, the LCR Tools extension will:

1. **Significantly reduce the time** required for common administrative tasks.
2. **Decrease user frustration** by simplifying complex workflows.
3. **Improve data accuracy** by automating manual data entry and extraction.

Successful validation will be observed through faster task completion times, higher user satisfaction scores, and direct feedback confirming the tool's value.

Part 2: The Prototype

The prototype used for this validated learning cycle is a **live, published Google Chrome Extension (LCR Tools v1.2.1-beta)**. It is available on the Chrome Web Store, representing a high-fidelity and fully-functional product.

This approach was chosen over a mockup to gather the most realistic feedback on

functionality, usability, performance, and real-world bugs. It allows testers to use the tool in their natural environment with actual (though anonymized, if necessary) data and workflows. Setup for a localized mockup would be too technically difficult and timeconsuming.

Part 3: Testing Methodology & Key Metrics

3.1 Target Users (Customer Representation)

Testing was conducted with individuals who represent the primary user base for this extension. The ideal candidates are those who hold, or have recently held, callings that require frequent use of LCR for administrative tasks. Ideally, I would have been able to find people who use attendance frequently, but I also had to carefully select who I asked since there is sensitive information in LCR. Additionally, only YSA ward members were asked to participate—family ward members could be good for a second round of testing.

- **Tester 1:** Aaron Imlay, Assistant Executive Secretary (YSA)
- **Tester 2:** Kingsley Dickson, Executive Secretary (YSA)
- **Tester 3:** Chase Jenkins, Bishopric Second Counselor (YSA)

3.2 Key Metrics

A combination of quantitative and qualitative metrics was used to measure success and gather comprehensive feedback.

- **Quantitative Metrics:**
  - **Task Completion Time:** The time (in minutes/seconds) from starting a task to successfully completing it.
  - **Task Success Rate:** A binary metric (Yes/No) indicating whether the user could complete the task without assistance.
  - **Ease of Use Score:** A rating provided by the user on a scale of 1 (Very Difficult) to 5 (Very Easy) after completing each task.
- **Qualitative Metrics:**
  - **Direct Quotes & Feedback:** Verbatim comments, suggestions, and reactions from users.
  - **Observed Pain Points:** Notes on where users hesitated, seemed confused, or expressed frustration.
  - **Feature Value:** User comments on which features they found most and least valuable.

3.3 Test Scenarios

Each tester was asked to complete the following scenarios in a controlled environment. They were encouraged to "think aloud" as they worked through the tasks.

Scenario ID	Feature Tested	Task Description
S1	Advanced Attendance Processing	Use the extension to process attendance. Just use the sample CSV provided instead of real data (I flipped between these in actual testing—real data vs fake. Testers 1&3 used real data).
S2	Missing Photos Report	Navigate to the 'Photos to Approve' page. Using the extension, download a CSV list of all members who are missing a photo.
S3	Multiple Callings Finder	Your bishop has asked for a list of everyone in the ward who currently holds more than one calling. Use the extension to find this information.
S4	Member Flashcards	Go to the 'Photos to Approve' page. Open the Member Flashcards tool to help you learn names and faces. Try shuffling the cards and flipping a few over.
S5	Exporting Custom Report	Navigate to a Custom Report and export it to a CSV for distribution to Bishop.

Part 4: Documenting Learnings & Results

4.1 Tester 1: Assistant Executive Secretary

Quantitative Results

Scenario	Task Completion Time	Task Success? (Y/N)	Ease of Use (1-5)
S1	13min 05sec	Y	2
S2	50sec	Y	5
S3	36sec	Y	5
S4	29sec	Y	5
S5	14sec	Y	5

Qualitative Feedback & Observations

- **Quote:** "I like that you put the disclaimer at the top of the modal for members with multiple callings."
- **Observation:** LCR itself requires domain knowledge and potentially some technical familiarity. Users may not be familiar with CSV files to a large extent. Operating system-specific applications can make handling these hard (e.g. on Mac, you need to export as a CSV to upload attendance instead of just saving, which will save as a Numbers file).
- **Feedback:** Attendance marking was difficult if not already familiar with the process of marking attendance—would be a 4 ease of use if not. Flashcards were the thing they were excited about the most.

4.2 Tester 2: Executive Secretary

Quantitative Results

Scenario	Task Completion Time	Task Success? (Y/N)	Ease of Use (1-5)
S1	5min 22sec	Y	3
S2	43sec	Y	5
S3	49sec	Y	5
S4	29sec	Y	5
S5	23sec	Y	5

Qualitative Feedback & Observations

- **Quote:** "Piece of cake."
- **Observation:** Not intuitive of where to go to find certain actions. Could be good to have some kind of lookup directory.
- **Feedback:** Doesn't use attendance, figures it would be a 4 for someone who does. Videos could be good to train on how to use actions in some cases.

4.3 Tester 3: Bishopric Second Counselor

Quantitative Results

Scenario	Task Completion Time	Task Success? (Y/N)	Ease of Use (1-5)
S1	9min 0sec	Y	3
S2	1min 32sec	Y	5
S3	26sec	Y	5
S4	39sec	Y	5
S5	1min 29sec	Y	5

Qualitative Feedback & Observations

- **Quote:** "That's cool! It can do that?!"
- **Observation:** Could be good to do some kind of eyetracking tests for actions that use UI elements.
- **Feedback:** The extension helped make LCR more interesting for them to learn and in a lot of ways helped make it a bit more friendly to newbies.

4.4 Summary of Learnings & Hypothesis Validation

The test results confirm that the core hypothesis is **partially validated**. For the majority of features (Scenarios 2-5), the extension proved highly intuitive and effective. Once testers understood the basic interaction model, they successfully completed these tasks with high ease-of-use scores. Notably, user satisfaction was highest for features that added an element of novelty or engagement, such as the Member Flashcards, suggesting that enhancing the user experience beyond pure utility is a significant driver of the tool's perceived value.

The primary exception was the Attendance Processing feature (S1). While powerful, it presented a significant usability challenge due to the strict CSV formatting requirements, resulting in a low average ease-of-use score of 2.67/5. This friction indicates that the current workflow, while potentially saving time for advanced users, creates a new barrier for those less familiar with spreadsheet manipulation. Therefore, the hypothesis that the extension reduces time and frustration is **strongly validated** for most tasks, but the attendance feature requires further iteration before it fully meets that goal.

Part 5: Documenting Tweaks (Action Plan)

Based on the learnings documented above, the following tweaks and feature improvements will be made to the prototype to address user feedback and close the validated learning loop.

Learning / User Feedback	Proposed Tweak / Feature Change	Priority
Users found creating the attendance CSV manually to fit the directives of the action very specific and unintuitive.	Process dates/timestamps so you can have time in the entries (the program should discard them). Have a link to a quick YouTube walkthrough or better instructions on the UI popup.	**High**
Link to the Member Callings page from the popup for members with multiple callings when shown from Callings by Organization is to an old LCR page.	Fix the link.	**High**
Attendance follow-up page (after initial processing) is not very clear on what actions the user should take.	Redesign the guest UI to either be more self-explanatory, simpler, or have instructions.	**High**
Reports downloaded from the custom reports page had incorrect and distracting file names.	Add a specific case for custom reports.	**Medium**
More "fun" features in the app.	Have a popup screen after a file download to tell the user that the file was downloaded successfully.	**Low**
Users were not immediately familiar with CSVs.	Give the option to export tables as a CSV (for those who may want to edit things more granularly) or a PDF. This means table processing will need to be even more accurate.	**Low**

DISCLOSURE: This document was put together by Google Gemini based on the README document for the project. Adjustments were made to some parts that were inaccurate or needed tweaks and data/feedback was entered by hand.