

Pro-File Usability Test Plan

Pro-File Prototype Usability Test #1 (Question Submission and Scheduling)

Moderator: Tony Bullard

Tutor: Erick Valencia

Mentor: Kathleen Tucker

Background

We will be testing the prototype for our Pro-File app, a woodworking expert advice service. Using our persona, Cathy Price, we will be focusing on the process of submitting a question to an expert, and scheduling a meeting with an expert.

Goals

As an early prototype, our goal is to ensure that the above two processes are usable and efficient, and do not require training before they can be used.

Test Objectives

Testing the Question Submission and Scheduling process for any errors, and measuring its efficiency and user satisfaction in these processes.

Methodology

All tests will be moderated, with a mix of In-Person and Remote meetings. We will use our personal mobile device for In-Person meetings, and a Figma instance and Google Meet for the Remote meetings.

Participants

We will utilize a combination of friends, family, and co-workers in an attempt to get a sufficient variety of users while working within our restrained schedule. Participants will consist of both woodworkers and non-woodworkers, to ensure the app's terminology isn't too obscure for beginners.

Schedule

Scheduling is to be determined. Due to the lack of compensation, we will have to be flexible in the times and places we meet with our participants to reduce their burden as much as possible. This will require us to be prepared as if we were utilizing guerilla testing.

Sessions

Sessions will be 10 to 15 minutes in length. We will explain the purpose of our test, introduce participants to the testing software, allow them to attempt the given tasks, and then ask them questions about the experience.

Equipment

For In-Person meetings we will use our personal mobile device, a clipboard and paper to record results.

For Remote meetings we will utilize Figma, Google Meet, and our personal computer. Participants will need a computer of their own with a webcam.

Metrics

The main metric for these early tests will be error assessment, utilizing Nielsen's rating scale. Secondary metrics will be quantitative satisfaction data via a satisfaction rating scale.

Pro-File Usability Test Script

Prototype Usability Test #1 (Question Submission and Scheduling)

Introduction

Hello [NAME], I'm Tony and I want to thank you for taking the time to sit with me for this brief usability test. I'll be asking you a few questions about yourself and then asking you to try out a prototype of an app I am designing called Pro-File.

I want to assure you that it is the *app itself* that is being tested, and not you. You cannot make any mistakes during this study. Your genuine thoughts, actions, and questions are the most valuable thing you can offer at this time. Any errors or confusion we may encounter during the test is valuable data for improving the prototype, and does not reflect poorly on you in any way.

Knowing that, I want to assure you that any and all data collected during this study will be used solely for this study and the design process of the Pro-File app. It will not be shared with anyone else.

I want to encourage you to “think out loud” and ask any questions that come to mind as we go through this process. Feel free to explain why you're doing what you're doing while navigating the app. Any thoughts you have during the testing is valuable information.

Before we get started, do I have your permission to record audio and video during our conversation?

1. Do you have any questions at this time?

Background

Pro-File is a service that connects woodworkers with woodworking experts , via video chat, to help them solve problems they run into while building. While you may not be a woodworker yourself, your input on the app is still very valuable. In cases where woodworking knowledge is needed, I will provide you with the necessary information or present you with a parallel scenario to help you understand the mindset of our ideal user.

2. What experience do you have with creative building hobbies, like woodworking, sewing, painting, baking, gardening, etc?
3. When something breaks around your home, how likely are you to consider fixing it yourself?
4. When you don't know how to do something that you need to do, how do you find the needed information?

5. How do you feel about asking an experienced person for advice on something you're working on?

Open-Ended Questions

Thank you for answering those questions. Now we'll move on to the app itself.

Before we touch anything, looking at the homescreen here, let me know your first impressions. What does this screen tell you? What questions does it raise? What actions do you think you'll be able to perform from this screen?

Thank you for that feedback. Feel free to provide the similar information as we move on to testing specific tasks within the app.

Tasks

For here on we will be acting as if you are currently working on a project and have encountered a problem that you do not know how to solve. For our purposes, it does not need to be woodworking specific, or specific at all. Just think of the things that might come to mind if you needed help with something.

6. Let's say you have a project that you're unable to finish because of a problem, within the app, create and submit a question to an expert.
7. Let's say you had already submitted a question to an expert. You have received a notification saying they have responded, and would like to set up a video chat with you. Within the app, please schedule a meeting with the expert.

Satisfaction

8. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being impossible, 5 being effortless, how did it feel to submit a question to an expert?
9. On that same scale, how did it feel to schedule a meeting with an expert?

Wrap Up

And that brings us to the end of our study. Thank you so much for lending your time and experience to this study. Do I have your permission to contact you with any follow up questions in the future? Thank you again for your time, and have a great day!

Pro-File Usability Tests Report

Conducted 11/20 - 12/27

Tests were performed in-person, using a Figma prototype on a mobile phone. Recording was done using a GoPro aimed at the mobile phone, allowing to document both audio of the interview, and how users performed inside the prototype.

Participants were overall comfortable during the testing period. Very few apologies about misunderstanding the prototype. This leads me to believe that my test script adequately explains the purpose of the test.

I could improve my script by adding more “check ins” to pull further thoughts and questions out of the participants. Despite this, participants were generally willing to offer input at the end of each study.

P1 Paul Jones

Paul is an IT engineer with plenty to say! He spent much of his time thinking deeper than the screens presented in front of him, and thinking about the data processes behind functionality. Appreciated simple, clean design, but felt color would help differentiate things. Very curious and wanted to click around on icons for functions not yet implemented. He mistook the sample question as a tutorial, and this caused some confusion in the study. I adjusted the script to make sure this didn't happen in the future studies.

P2 Matt Gray

Matt is a hardware store manager, and seemed to gel with the app immediately. He performed both tasks without any issue, only commenting that it would help to add color for the notification icon. His description of each page translated all the important details we'd hope to give our users.

P3 Noah Bullard

Noah is a student, focusing on computer science. He did not appreciate the “big plus” icon, and preferred to have that functionality listed in the hamburger menu. He was able to perform both tasks without much friction once he found where to add a question.

P4 Teresa Bullard

Teresa is a Nurse Examiner that gave short, concise answers. She understood the interface without issue, and was able to perform both tasks flawlessly. She was happy with the design, but gave little feedback.

Below are the issues surfaced from testing:

Issue 1: [Error Rating 2] Users expected “Add Question” functionality to be located in the Hamburger Menu

Suggested Change: Add functionality to the Hamburger menu.

Evidence: 2 of the 4 Participants went first to the Hamburger Menu when asked to add a question.

Issue 2: [Error Rating 2] Home Icon returns to original dashboard after question submission

Suggested Change: Remove/Grey Out Home Icon during submission confirmation.

Evidence: Participant 3 chose to use the Home icon instead of the “Home” Button within the question submission confirmation screen. This caused an error in the prototype, forcing a reset during the test.

Issue 3: [Error Rating 2] Choosing “Add To Calendar” during meeting confirmation does not function

Suggested Change: Remove “Add to Calendar” until functionality is ready

Evidence: 3 of 4 Participants pressed “Add to Calendar” on the Schedule Confirmation page.

Issue 4: [Error Rating 1] Notification Icon not noticeable enough

Suggested Change: Add color to icon

Evidence: Participant 2 struggled to identify which Question on the dashboard had a notification

Issue 5: [Error Rating 1] User Expected Meeting Scheduling to be in Hamburger Menu

Suggested Change: Educate user through Onboarding / Provide link through notification

Evidence: 2 Participants first looked to the Hamburger menu for this functionality.