CS377E Spring 2016: Group Heuristic Evaluation
Instructor: James Landay, Julie Stanford, Jenny Mailhot

Summary of Heuristic Evaluation of Prototypes (Group)

Due: Wednesday, May 11th, before class (12:30pm)

Overview

The goal of this assignment is to summarize the heuristic evaluations and assign severity ratings to violations so that the project teams can fix the most important problems found in their project prototype UI. A template file for your group report has been created for you, and you can access the link by finding your project on this spreadsheet (https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1TDJChkMlZfdF9icl7YDCPt96tgt4_ItoKLSAPDlRLCg/edit#gid=0).

1. Problem Statement

One sentence description of the UI you are evaluating.

2. List of Heuristic Violations

You will be summarizing the HE reports along with the others who evaluated the same project.

A. List each distinct problem with a unique number: You may have to merge similar reports from different evaluators. For example:

   report #1:
   5. [H2-4 Consistency & Standards]
   The interface used the string "Save" on the first screen for saving the user's preferences, but used the string "Update" on the second screen. Users may be confused by this different terminology for the same function. Use "Save" everywhere.

   report #2:
   18. [H2-4 Consistency & Standards]
   "Update" and "Save" are used interchangeable in the interface. This is confusing. Pick one!

   Those reports are listing the same violation. You should give it a unique number and only list it **once** in your summary report (with the **best** possible description). *List the anonymized reviewer ID (e.g., "A", "B", ...)* of each reviewer who found the violation. This will help you with bookkeeping later.

B. Indicate the heuristic violated.

C. Assign it a severity rating based on the following ratings defined in lecture:
   0 = not a problem, 1 = cosmetic, 2 = minor, 3 = major, 4 = UI catastrophe

Your report will list each of the problems found in the following format:

Problem # [heuristic violated] [severity rating] [reviewer ID(s) of those who found it]:
Description of problem, reasoning why it violates the heuristic, & suggestion for fix.

For the above example, you might write:

> **1. [H2-4 Consistency & Standards] [Severity 3][A, B]**
> The interface used the string "Save" on the first screen for saving the user's preferences, but used the string "Update" on the second screen. Users may be confused by this different terminology for the same function. Use "Save" everywhere.

3. Summary of Violations

Your report will also summarize the number of violations found in each of the ten heuristic categories, the number of violations found in each of the severity categories, and give a total number of violations in the entire interface. Fill in the table provided for this in the template we've provided you.

4. Summary of Recommendations

Merge together the general recommendations each of you made in your individual reports and make sure that they are coherent and consistent.

CS377E Spring 2016: Group Heuristic Evaluation
Instructor: James Landay, Julie Stanford, Jenny Mailhot

Deliverable

Your deliverable is the report (in PDF) and is due by the end of the day of your studio (e.g., Thursday night or Friday night). Your typed write-up should follow this outline with separate sections for the top-level items. It must be named appropriately and shared with the teaching staff on CourseWork.

1. Problem (one sentence description of project idea and the UI you are evaluating)
2. List of Violations found w/ in format described above
3. Summary of violations (table in template)
4. Evaluation statistics (table in template)
5. Summary of recommendations

Grading Criteria

Report (100 pts)

- Problem Statement (10 pts)
  - Does the problem statement make a solid attempt to holistically capture what the application seeks to achieve? Does it describe core elements of the UI?
- List of Heuristic Violations (60 pts)
  - Is the list a readable and digestible report that follows the given format for listing problems? Does it avoid reporting repeat problems? Is the description about the heuristic violation detailed enough to be actionable?
  - Does the list properly cover the individual reports that were given?
  - Does the list give good coverage of the actual problems in the medium-fi prototype?
- Summary of Violations (20 pts)
  - Was the provided template used to accurately sum up all of the violations?
- Summary of Recommendations (10 pts)
  - Were the general recommendations made by the individual evaluators merged in a coherent manner?