ASSIGNMENT 3 – HEURISTIC EVALUATION

DUE: NOVEMBER 26, 2024

OVERVIEW

Perform an expert evaluation of another group's low-fi prototypes by applying Nielsen's heuristics. This assignment must be done **individually**: schedule a time to meet other group members and complete the work by the deadline. You can use the lab hours devoted to this assignment to find a prototype to evaluate and complete the work in the following days. Please, read the **entire** document carefully.

Note: This assignment will not receive feedback, cannot be repeated or redone, and will be evaluated in the version submitted on GitHub by the deadline.

ORGANIZATION

1. **As a group.** Each group must receive *at least* one heuristic evaluation per prototype. You will likely need to receive 3-4 evaluations (overall, both prototypes) and are responsible for finding the required evaluators. Be generous if some students are looking to do an additional evaluation. During the evaluation session, one of you will act as the computer and the other as the facilitator (see slide 35 of Low-fi Prototypes). The computer will manipulate the pieces of the prototype; the facilitator will greet the evaluator, explain how the session works, and provide the evaluator with the three tasks, the project solution, and any needed context (e.g., "you are acting as a high-school student preparing for a marathon").
2. **As the individual evaluator.** You, individually, must perform at least one heuristic evaluation on another group's paper prototype. You are responsible for finding a prototype to evaluate. See below for additional details on the process.

INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION

1. **Schedule a session to evaluate another group's prototype.** Schedule a time to meet with members of another group. You will have to evaluate only one of their low-fidelity prototypes. The other group will choose which prototype and give you all the needed information to conduct the evaluation (namely, the three tasks, the project solution, and any contextual information). If you evaluate more than a prototype, it must be with different groups (max one prototype per group).
2. **Conduct a heuristic evaluation of the prototype.** With the information shared by the other group at the beginning of the session, evaluate the paper prototype by applying Nielsen's ten heuristics (also listed at the end of this document). You must use the prototype according to the three tasks you received from the other group.
    a) Use the provided template as a guide for conducting the evaluation and taking notes. The *final version* of that report must be submitted by the deadline of this assignment.
    b) Keep the list of heuristics in front of you while using the prototype and take plenty of notes.

c) Specify which heuristic(s) each problem you found is related to. If a problem is not strictly related to any heuristics, mark it with "HN: Non-heuristic issue."
d) Add a rating for each identified problem by applying Nielsen's severity ratings: 0 = not a problem, 1 = cosmetic, 2 = minor, 3 = major, 4 = usability catastrophe.

Focus on giving feedback on the *available functions* rather than pointing out missing features.

DELIVERABLE

By the due date, you must:

- Upload the report of the individual evaluation as a PDF in an "A3" folder in your group repository, named *<student-id>-<Name>-<Surname>.pdf*.
  Please, remember that this assignment will be **evaluated** in the submitted version; no updates will be considered after the deadline.
  If you evaluated more than one prototype, pick the evaluation you prefer: you must submit one report with the evaluation of one prototype.
- Share the same report with the group(s) you conducted the evaluation. They will use the results from the evaluations to proceed with the next assignment.

GRADING CRITERIA (100%)

The individual assignment will be evaluated in the form submitted by the deadline, and no changes will be possible after. The criteria outlined below follow the structure of the provided template for the individual report, indicate the focus of the evaluation, and the relative weight of each aspect of the assignment.

Evaluated project (5%)
___ Description is accurate and clear
Execution (20%)
___ The process is well executed
___ The summary clearly reports the main pieces of information
Violations (45%)
___ Found a large percentage of violations
___ Variety and non-repetition in violations found
___ Found some less obvious violations (in addition to the more obvious ones)
___ Descriptions of violations are clear and easy to understand
___ Rationale for the used heuristic is clear and valid
___ List is organized and follows the template
Summary and recommendation (30%)
___ Error-free content and table
___ General impressions and trends noticed across the find violations are included
___ Recommendations and feedback that don't fit the violations are rich

NIELSEN'S HEURISTICS (+1) AND SEVERITY RATING

Heuristic #	Heuristic Title
H1	Visibility of system status
H2	Match between system and the real world
H3	User control and freedom
H4	Consistency and standards
H5	Error prevention
H6	Recognition rather than recall
H7	Flexibility and efficiency of use
H8	Aesthetic and minimalist design
H9	Help users recognize, diagnose, and recover from errors
H10	Help and documentation
HN	Non-heuristic issue

Rating	Description
0	I don't agree that this is a usability problem at all
1	Cosmetic problem only: need not be fixed unless extra time is available on project
2	Minor usability problem: fixing this should be given low priority
3	Major usability problem: important to fix, so should be given high priority
4	Usability catastrophe: imperative to fix this before product can be released