# Executive Summary

Adrian, Dawson and team,

I’ve broken down my review into 2 parts:

* The first being my initial impressions of Looka and some feedback on the product design process. Although not explicitly requested, I have captured my thoughts as a part of my due diligence to understand the product as a whole.
* The second is a product audit of latest [General Purpose Editor prototype](https://projects.invisionapp.com/share/S4RIZGGVQB7) across the two broad dimensions of vision and execution.

## First Impressions

### Marketing Website

Since my introduction to Logojoy, it has rebranded to Looka. With the extended service offering, I find the experience has become disjointed. It is unclear who the primary target audiences are and what they get out of the platform.

I recommend (re)defining and validating those personas, and restructuring the information architecture to align with their needs. My hypotheses is that they are at least two distinct groups: those who want someone to execute their ideas, and those who want someone to offer their expertise. I’ve taken a stab at the two proto-personas in the appendix.

### Logged In Experience

The narrative from the marketing site seems to drop off significantly once the user is logged in. Arguably, this is where the most value is created because we could leverage the user’s profile. E.g. If a logo hasn’t been created, we can infer next steps with recent behaviour. If a logo has been created, this is an opportunity to surface the additional offerings or benchmarks.

### User Testing Best Practices It is unclear to me what the broader user testing strategy is. What I reviewed were usability tests; each group of users were asked to create a different asset (Facebook Ad, Business Card, etc), all using the same GPE. It’s generally difficult to test end-to-end experiences, especially early in the exploration process. The scope is too big to narrow down specific usability concerns to really polish a feature (e.g. creating the best backgrounds).

Strategically, the big questions I have remain unanswered. How does the GPE compare to other editors? Why would I use it instead? Where is the design expertise? Perhaps, this was done in a separate exercise. If not, a comparative user test might be more beneficial.

## GPE Prototype

### Vision

The GPE does not adhere to the “the goal of bringing the experience of sitting next to a designer online”. It’s situated within the mid-weight class of designer tools. It’s less advance than professional suites but more robust than the average mobile apps.

The onboarding experience that sets the logo maker apart hasn’t been carried over. Instead, the user chooses templates for each asset type, not unlike many design or office productivity tools in the market already. It’s a “DIY” experience optimizing for the user’s preference, not a designer experience integrating their expertise.

From my understanding, AI and the logo onboarding data will be integrated later. At the moment, it considers colours, shapes and logo. These attributes only slightly elevates the experience so that I can create an asset faster but there’s no sell that it would be better. E.g. would it advise on contrast, clutter, or effectiveness as a designer would.

I recommend taking a step back and determining the value a designer brings in the creation of key assets. What kind of questions would they ask? How do they back up their recommendations? What kind of variations will they present? How do they weigh an owner’s opinions? How would they consider cohesion? I would test an onboarding experience and that takes insights from the logo maker as inputs. The tools in the GPE are still necessarily, but should be considered a secondary, optimization experience as opposed to the main value exchange.

### Execution

The UI is slick and clean from a static perspective. Shades of gray sets a better visual hierarchy. The tool is mostly intuitive across features (background vs. shapes), but slightly confusing within it (background vs. background variations). Specific usability concerns are addressed in the Appendix.

I’m excited to see it combined with interactions as seen in the logo maker.

It is still unclear how users will transition from the logo maker into the GPE, or if it’s to become one tool. I see this relationship to be critical the GPE’s success.

# **Appendix**

## First Impressions

Marketing Site

Unsure of primary target audience:

* To be validated:
  + Do users care about the relationship with the designer?
  + Do they get more out of it than a just the end product itself?
  + Do they grow as people or as a business from having that relationship?
  + How do designers differentiate themselves from a tool?
    - How do they differentiate themselves from other designers?
    - E.g. Designers can advise you on cosmetic choices but also *why* it’s better.
  + Is Looka the cheaper (benchmark pricing) or better alternative? How?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Proto-personas** | “I need a logo” | “I’m starting a business” |
| **Attitude** | I know what I need. I want to get it done. I’m looking to execute my vision. | I’m looking for the right thing for my business. Thinking long term. This is the kind of brand I want to create. I am looking for expertise. |
| **Values** | Speed. Efficiency. | Details. Relationships. A story. |
| **Goals** | Design a professional logo and get it out there. Looking for a tool.  Static assets. | Build an experience that reflects my business. Looking for a partner.  Dynamic tools to support growth |
| **Potential gateways** | Logo maker | Package/plans |
| **Usability Concerns** | Primary CTA walks the users through the logo builder experience, but speaks to building a brand. A brand is more than its logo.  **Information architecture.** Multiple CTAs linking to the same thing. Noise with other offerings.  Same template used for different offerings makes it hard to differentiate and decide what is being looked at. | It was communicated that Looka wants to recreate the experience of sitting next to a designer, but the platform presents itself as generator. The marketing message says one thing, but there isn’t anything in the tool that reinforces it.  **Information architecture** doesn’t support the dynamic experience. Hard to navigate between the offerings. Main navigation doesn’t support the holistic vision/hierarchy.  **What do people care about?** Business cards, website, logos. Brand guidelines for business owners? They’re for designers and developers. Potential entry way. |

General usability concerns:

* Repetitive content when users are trying to learn what you’re about e.g. “Make your own <industry> logo for free”
* Get Started CTA competes with “Sign Up”
  + Arguably Get Started is more important. Imagine higher conversion after they’ve created something they wanted to preserve.
* Small carousel touch targets on the hero.
  + Generally carousels don’t get a lot of click throughs. I imagine this is even less so.
* Feature sections seems fragmented
  + Made more so by the amount of white space and templated content pages
  + Animations and multiple examples
    - “Logo ideas” (rename to serve purpose? E.g. Inspiration/Examples/Gallery) should be enough to demonstrate variety and flexibility
  + Interesting idea on the industry logo best practices
    - Kijiji Auto did something similar with high intake
    - Positions itself as the expert

Logged In Experience

* User journeys
  + I have created a logo and created an account to save it
  + I haven’t created a logo, but signed up [rare? -> Onboarding experience?]
* Empty saved logo page
  + What’s the difference between “Generate More Logo Ideas” vs. “Get Started”
* Logo generator
  + Why surface reviews here? The user is going down the conversion funnel. Was there concerns that requires social proof here?
  + Opportunity to guide the user through the “proper” choices.

## Comments About User Research Findings

* Demand for service offerings beyond logos
  + Business cards as a primary way to entry (do people still use business cards?) How do physical assets get realized?
* Guidance on how to use the tool (a tutorial) vs. guidance on how to run the business vs. guidance on good effective design

## GPE: Prototype Review

Marketing Site

* Recommend revisiting the information architecture to present service offerings in a way that is aligned with the type of audience (“looking for a single use tool” vs. “looking for a platform” vs. “looking for an expert”), or business lifecycle (e.g. “I’m starting a business”, “trying to promote a business”, “I want to run a campaign”)
* Visual cues to distinguish offerings and sections

Logged In Experience

* Consistency of UX and design language
  + Blue header competes with the working area in terms of boldness and scale.
  + GPE frame inconsistent with logo maker (white header, limited CTAs).
    - Better visual hierarchy.
* Steps taken to minimize the “time to master” the app for most users
  + Overall layout is familiar and aligned with most online editing tools (format, squarespace) and social apps
  + Unclear how slide 1 gets to slide 2 in the prototype
  + Can’t tell what are the parent and children controls.
    - The the bar are the selection controls.
    - But what about the actions beside the canvas? What is “1 of 2”? What is the “copy” icon? What is the “delete icon”?
  + Unclear when the tab is white vs. gray.
    - The white is one level deeper? e.g. once background photo is selected, you can choose photo and filter and search? Change opacity blur and reflection?
  + Background tab encapsulates colour, images, and patterns
    - But “foreground” separates shapes and images. Opportunity to simplify?
    - Difference between “images” vs. “photos”?
    - Can background be “illustrations”?
  + Unclear how the “Text” tab works.
* Logical fit of the GPE experience with the Logo maker experience
  + Unclear at the moment
  + Is it meant to be one editor in the end?
  + They seem to be two separate tools. The only connection is the automatic import of logos through the “Logo” tab. The user theortically could’ve also imported an external logo via the “Image” tab.
* Highlighting and maintaining the value of variation based design
  + Only noticed the white tabbed background meant “variations”. The logo maker jumps directly into variations with no between steps.
  + How many variations is enough variation? Some are better than others. The tool doesn’t discriminate but perhaps it should.
* The presence of delightful touches throughout the experience
  + It’s aesthetically pleasing, but not “delightful”
  + Hard to say in static design
* Adherence with the goal of bringing the experience of sitting next to a designer online
  + None; very much a tool
  + A designer isn’t just someone you sit next to executive ideas. They don’t start from a blank canvas.
* Other comments
  + Unclear how it will continue the narrative from the marketing website starting with the visual language
  + Unclear what would the entry page/dashboard look like
  + Where does AI come in?
    - Is it just the colour palettes and logos?