Evaluation Plan

- # **Initial Conditions**
  - ## **Participants**
    - The target audience of 'active' user is rather limited (although it has large impact on the life on a large number of teachers and students; they have to cope with the timetable they get)
    - We will focus on the person in charge of timetable generation in school (lets call him the TimeTableist)
      - This means limited 'resource' with limited time.
      - Additional drawback: it is holiday-time in my country ! (could not foreseen that when selecting topic for homework 2) but this drawback has one advantage they may have more time for this experiments if they are available
      - I have identified 3 schools where I know people teaching at + 3 other school in case of impossibility or denied rendezvous
      - There is a potential extension of the number of TimeTableist available via the early TimeTableist (as advertised below in a specific** question for the test)
  - ## **Location**
    - Default is at school, this will allow to check computer resources available to the person in charge.
    - If when the rendezvous is setup the TimeTableist tells me, I do it at home, then the best place to do the test is at her/his home for the same reason.
  - ## **When**
    - Get rendezvous with these people, their time is to be my time.
  - ## **Consent**
    - Adapt provided template.
- # **Test**
  - ## **What is tested ?**
    - We want to check the steps before the 'intelligence' of the program makes its 'magic'. So we will focus mainly on new input tasks (students, teacher, ...), new events that may influence input and constraints either self assigned or external.
    - The program has to fit the needs of the TimeTableist or it will not be used. To cope with the constraints is the a minimal requirement.
  - ## **Methodology**
    - Feedback mode
      - Think aloud
        - These people are used to decide, they are over-busy people, this tool is not going to steal their job it is a helper tool
    - Within-subjects
      - Limited resource is imposing this way of doing.
      - 1 person will drive the experiment
      - 1 person will observe
      - Note this configuration has to be announced when rendezvous is setup
  - ## **Training**
    - No too much since used punctually over a time with 1 period of heavy use and they do not have a lot of time available for us
      - In fact we proceed step-by-step, starting with the problem decomposition items, and finishing with the most challenging part (from our point of view), this a de-facto progressive effort.
  - ## **Environment Questions**
    - School Demographics Questions
      - Number of Teacher
      - Number of Students
      - Number of Classes
      - Number of ClassRooms
      - Number of Persons involved in TimeTable generation
        - We suspect answer is 1 but is this true ?
    - Computer Environment Questions
      - Browser used
      - Screen Resolution used
      - Compare implicit(observed) replies with what they say
      - See if tablet make sense in this specific context
        - We think it is OK for specific view but some of the global views require a big computer screen
    - Sociodemographic questions

See if tablet make sense in this specific context

Evaluation Plan

- Sociodemographic questions
  - The type of people is clearly identified, they share the same characteristics except of few we need to figure out
    - Are they paper-and-pencil or computer minded ?
    - Are they scientific (math, ...) or not ?
  - Rem: these 'environment questions' may be answered aside the core rendezvous, they may be answered over the phone before or after the rendezvous but they need to be addressed.
    - There is an obvious exception for browser and resolution used
- **User Scenario under test**
  - Add 1 student
  - Add 1 teacher
  - Add 1 course
  - Manage 1 ClassRoom
  - Setup Rules
  - Free test
    - Be prepared/leave some place for the unexpected even it may not be compared between testers.
      - It may be a good source for further testing if required... or further features improvement
- **Measure performed**
  - All the 'Environment Questions' raised above
  - During the design phase we managed to leave free form fields to catch missing items
    - Use of Comment fields
      - Repetition of content in Comment fields
        - If we see some input in there, it means it is a candidate for a new field in form (-> in the database)
    - Use of other constraints
      - It means this constraint is missing in the list
        - Verify it is not very specific to 1 school else we need to update the prototype
  - Number of aloud comments: I cannot formulate that additional constraint
- **Additional Questions at the end of the experiment**
  - Contacts
    - **Do you have some colleague in another school for more testing ? (would you please introduce me ?).
      - These people are probably more critical since they do not have any link with me.
      - They may be required when re-deign would have been done to finalize the application.
        - Since resource are limited, good introduction is a key to get in touch with key person in a small amount of time. The anonymous way is more lengthy and potentially unsuccessful in this circle of people.
  - Our design
    - Is there any item in fields that does not make sense to you ? (in other term are they useless ? or never used !)
    - Is there any family of constraints that is missing ?
      - Based on what was observed, we shall try to synthesize missing item into family (organize them in related chunks)
  - The current way of doing TimeTable
    - How did you do it until now ?
      - This allows us to compare with our proposed solution to the TimeTableist problem.
    - How did you take constraints into account ?
    - What are the constraints you take into account ?
    - What are the constraints you cannot take into account ?
  - Rem: these questions are raised during the rendezvous
    - Always leave them a possibility to add observation after rendezvous if any but we should not get any after 48 hours