**Summary of findings:**

- the main purpose of the application was understood correctly by all

testers: schedule employees’ time, manage employees’ shifts.

Thisindicates that the application elements layout and its overall

organization is self-descriptive enough to be understood easily during

first 25-30 seconds.

- all testers positively admitted the duplicate textual navigation on the

bottom. All testers said this is very helpful and supports intuitive,

simple navigation. - all testers could understand and liked what the

“Google”, “Twitter”, and “Facebook” links are for. Those social

platforms are really helpful while managing people’s time.

- all 5 testers finished the main practical task of the testing – creating

a schedule draft – in less than a minute. An average time for completion

is 39.33sec. In real working environment this time will be greater and

approximately equal to 2 minutes at least per each employee. Considering

the fact that an average coffee shop team consists of 13 employees, the

overall time for schedule draft completion will be 13 x 2 = 26 minutes

at least. Consequently, the main testing goal is achieved

– to find out if the “timeApplicator” helps users to reduce the process of

preparing a schedule draft from several hours to less than half an hour.

- the rest 4 testing practical tasks were executed almost without

incidents and in less than 20sec. However, the “Day Off Requests” page

was really confusing for 2 testers. They didn’t understand how to select

day offs and how to save/submit them. Also, one tester didn’t understand

how to save/download schedule draft to the local machine. The tester

indicated there was no call to action button.

- all the testers could easily understand how many pages/tabs the

application prototype consists of. They indicated there are 5-7

pages/tabs while in fact there are 4 main tabs and 3 not yet implemented

tabs. Consequently, the whole application prototype structure was easily

understood by all testers.

- the application navigation is simple, clear, well organized and provides

the good contrast among all other elements. However, the navigation

transition between pages/tabs might be confusing because 2 out of 5

testers were slightly lost while browsing the application prototype.

Also, all 5 testers stated the relation between buttons and

corresponding pages/tabs is not clear (awful) and buttons’ text is not

self-describing enough to be understood in the first 5-10 seconds.

- the application home page doesn’t look attractive enough to fully

encourage / welcome users to work with it. An average score for the home

page attractiveness is 3.2 out of 5, where 1 means not attractive at all

and 5 stands for very attractive.

- addition links such as “Home”, “Help”, “FAQ” acquired much testers’

attention instead of being simply noticed. This indicates the home page

is kind of cluttered because the testers paid more attention to minor

functionality instead of noticing the main navigation buttons and

functionality first.

- the purpose of the calendar tool on the home page was not understood

correctly. Most testers thought this is simple day selection tool for

any kind of reference. The desired purpose of the calendar is to select

schedule drafts based on the calendar days. None among the testers

noticed the text explaining the purpose of the calendar – “The schedule

draft for the week of:”.

- the “Home” link on the top of the initial screen / tab confused the

testers. They didn’t understand if the link is there so what the page

they are currently at then. This indicates the confusion between the

application initial screen and the desired but not implemented home

page.

- the “Employee” button was confusing since 4 out of 5 testers thought

this will redirect them to the list of employees. Consequently, the

button text is not sufficiently self-describing. The revision has to be

considered.

- the “Day Off Requests” button was slightly confusing because 2 out of 5

testers thought this will redirect them to the list of the employees’

day offs. Those 2 testers stated the button indicates like employees

submit their day offs which are stored under the “Day Offs Requests”

button later. The desired functionality is to manually assign day offs

for employees based on their requests which are out of scope of this

application.

- the “Availability” button was confusing since 3 out of 5 testers thought

this will redirect them to the list of employees’ availability which

they submitted before. However, the desired functionality is to manually

enter employees’ day offs based on their requests which are out of scope

of this application.

- 3 out of 5 testers didn’t understand what the “Save as:” text line and

the drop down list are for. After the provided explanation, the testers

pointed to the absence of the call to action elements there. They

mentioned that would be better to have a button instead of a textual

line.

- the color schema of the schedule draft (the actual table) is too

aggressive and disturbing. The testers indicated this should be changed

since this causes too much distortion. Consequently, the actual schedule

draft table has to be redesigned.

- the 24 analog watch on the top left corner of the application might be

slightly confusing since the time shown in the schedule draft table is

digital. There is no “recognize rather than recall” mechanism here.

- the logic of the application prototype data flow is low and unclear for

the first sight. All testers experienced difficulties understanding what

to do next, where to click next.

- the testers indicated the application prototype is simple, neat, old-

school, clear, almost uncluttered, and efficient. However, the data

flow, logic, buttons’ text, and pages/tabs component layout strongly

needs improvements.

**Summary of findings for the redesign component:**

- 4 out of the 5 testers indicated the redesign navigation layout and,

consequently, the home/initial page is approximately 70% less

uncluttered than the initial version

- the redesign version is more logical and clearly shows the sequence of

steps comparing to the original version. However, the navigation still

looks slightly complicated for the first sight

- the redesign version is easy to grasp and understand

- the redesign version is clean, neat, simple, and well-structured - this

is clearer how to browse between different schedule drafts and how to

save a draft to your local machine

- the calendar on the left side can be reduced to one month instead of two

- buttons' text plus steps sequence numbers really helps to understand the

data flow, however more work in this direction should be considered.