**Cognitive Walkthrough**

SUS Score 85

**A.Log into Moodle (User Goal: Access the system)**

1.CW Questions (Lewis et al., 1990):

\* Is the goal clear?

2.Evaluation Results and Problem Records:

\* Yes, but the login page lacks visual cues for first-time users.

**B.Navigate to Dashboard (User Goal: Locate COMP course)**

1.CW Questions:

\* Is "Dashboard" or "My Modules" visible/intuitive?

2.Evaluation Results and Problem Records:

\* Yes, the top navigation bar is transparent, but the "Dashboard" content is redundant (such as unrelated NSS surveys).

**C.Find COMP Course (User Goal: Enter course page)**

1.CW Questions:

\* Can the user find the target course in "Recently accessed modules" or "My Modules"?

2.Evaluation Results and Problem Records:

\* Users only understand part of it. The "Recently accessed modules" list is unsorted (requires scanning).

**D.Locate Coursework (User Goal: Access assignment details)**

1.CW Questions:

\* Is the DDL prominently displayed?

2.Evaluation Results and Problem Records:

\* No, DDL is buried under "Workshop" → "Coursework 1" subpages.

**E.Confirm DDL (User Goal: Verify deadline)**

1.CW Questions:

\* Is the deadline format clear?

2.Evaluation Results and Problem Records:

\* Yes, but it requires multiple hops (e.g., from "Workshop" to "Coursework 1" page) and DDL is not highlighted on the summary page.

Each step of the page transition executed by the user is logically structured and clearly defined, ensuring that the accurate presentation of each page achieves the intended user objectives.
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