P7: Experience Evaluation Plan & Simple Evaluation

Eateractive

Nacho Average Team

Kotoko Yamada, Courtney McKee, Sebastian Torres Retana, Ritika Gupta

Part 1: Basic Evaluation Plan

Context:

You are a restaurateur of a family-owned Italian restaurant and often find yourself having very busy days, due to the popularity of your restaurant. You find it difficult to keep track of the traffic coming in and out of the restaurant; as a result, you struggle to ensure that business is flowing normally and the restaurant is not losing customers due to long wait times. You would also like to digitize your menus to provide customers with comprehensive visual information about the food and drinks your restaurant offers. Moreover, you hope to make the menu interactive to streamline your job of changing the menu items, when necessary.

Task 1: Viewing real-time traffic visualizations

First we will have the user navigate to *Restuarant Pulse* and then within that section, navigate to the *Live Traffic Feed* tab. We will check to see if they understand what they are looking at and then have them click on a certain time (5pm) to get more information about the traffic situation at that hour. From this info we will ask how long the average wait time is and how many parties are waiting.

Gauge for Completion
This task is complete when the user determines the average wait time and how many groups are waiting at the restaurant (at 5pm).

Task 2: Deleting a party from the queue

In this task our user will navigate to the the *Queue* tab in the *Restuarant Pulse* section. They will then delete a party named Tyler from the queue.

Gauge for Completion
This task is complete when the user deletes the party named Tyler from the queue.

Task 3: Adding a category and item to the menu

In this task, our user will first navigate to the *Menu* section. Next the user will add a category called "Happy Hour" to the menu. Once the happy hour category is added, the user will add a food item to that category. They will add a picture, nutrition info, price, and the name of the dish: "bruschetta".

Guage for Completion
This task is complete when the user has input the picture, nutrition info, price, and name of the dish.

Participant Profiles:

Our target users are family-owned restaurant owners who need help with keeping customers happy. The restaurants get busy and customers, not wanting to wait for long periods, leave. Our user is someone who wants a system that allows them to keep track of busy hours and the amount of people at the restaurant. Our demographics are not based on age, but rather on restaurant owners that already use a POS system.

Participant 1 (S1): The first user is a student who helps manage a family shop with his parents in Greece, and has run into the occupancy issues that were part of the premise of our study. He is familiar with customer service and ensuring that people flow through the family shop.

Participant 2 (S2): The second user is a junior in sociology and is minoring in informatics. She works as a hostess at an Italian restaurant. She has some experience working with a POS system because she has been a hostess for about two weeks.

Participant 3 (S3): The third user is a freshman in pre-engineering at the UW. Although she has not experienced working in a restaurant, she has used POS systems before within her club activities.

Participant 4 (S4): The fourth user is a recent college graduate and currently works as an Analytics Consultant at a large company. He has had significant experience working with a POS System (Square), as he previously worked for several years as a barista.

Part 2: Simple Evaluation

Motivation:
Our motivation in conducting a usability test for Eateractive is to better comprehend how our restaurateur users will interact with Eateractive. We would like insight and suggestions on how to improve the interaction flow and functionality of Eateractive,

focusing on points of improvement for daily use in a restaurant setting. We will use the feedback to make Eateractive a better resource for family-owned restaurateurs.

Methods:

Our testing for each participant consisted of 3 parts:

1. Pre-Observation Interview:

We asked the following four questions before testing to understand the background of each user.

    a. What is your occupation?
       This provides info about what they do on a regular basis.

    b. Have you ever in worked in customer service?
       This provides info about whether or not they have had experience working with customers.

    c. Have you ever worked in a restaurant? If so, what system did the restaurant use to keep track of data?
       This provides info about whether or not they have had experience in the restaurant business and what type of system(s) they have worked with.

    d. Are you familiar with the functions on the POS system?
       This provides info about whether or not they understand what a POS system is.

2. Task Completion and Observations

For this phase of the usability test, we had each participant complete the three tasks in order, using our paper prototype of the Eateractive system. We focused on providing as little help as possible throughout the tasks to identify any natural sources of confusion or difficulty that could be accommodated by changes to the system.

3. Post-Observation Interview

This phase of the usability test was meant to reflect on the results of the test, and further assess the strengths and weaknesses of Eateractive. These are the questions we asked:

    a. Which features of the app were confusing and how could they be changed?
       This provides info about what we should change in our POS system.

    b. Are there features we should add or remove?
       This provides info about what tools could potentially be added or deleted to make the POS system more useful and comprehensive.

    c. What part of the system would you use most often?
       This provides info about which part of the POS system they would use most during their work day (and why).

Findings and Suggestions:

Finding 1 - Users were unclear with the *Restaurant Pulse* label
While coming up with labeling schema for the processes that we were including in our design, we made it a goal to steer clear of very "used" or "bland" labels to make our features more memorable. The label we initially chose for the diagnostics section was "traffic". We decided against this, as we felt that this label didn't accurately reflect all of the information included in the section. This information includes occupancy of the restaurant, in terms of reservations made and tables occupied. The label that we decided to include for the prototype was *Restaurant Pulse,* which was agreed to be one that gives life to the service while alluding to how the restaurant was doing ("checking its pulse"). Participants S1-S3 were unclear with what this label represented when running through the tasks, and asked for clarification. Once clarification was made, the idea started to make sense to them. We found that the label should be revisited to make it more intuitive that diagnostic information is found in this tab.

Suggestion 1 - Choose a more descriptive name for this label, or allow user (restaurant owner) to set it themselves
We have decided to rename the *Restaurant Pulse* using the name *Analytics Overview*. We all feel that this is a more descriptive name that is intuitive for users to navigate through when looking for traffic and occupancy data. With a better label, we hypothesize that users will be able to spend much less time looking for the sections included in the section and streamline moving through the tasks.

Finding 2 - User was unclear about what the restaurant live feed symbols meant and what the graph was showing
Participant S2 shared that they did not understand what the symbols meant in *Queue* tab. They were not sure if they were meant for the number of people working or waiting to be seated. Our goal of the symbols were to show party sizes and then use those colors on the graph to show the waiting time. Participant S2 also said that the graph was confusing because they did not understand what it was completely showing. The axis was not clear to them because all it said at the bottom was empty or packed. Our goal was to have the graph show how many people were waiting depending on party size.

Suggestion 2: Be more descriptive about the axis and change the look of the graph
We have decided to change the live feed visualization completely. We will be creating a line graph with the times of the day on the bottom. Instead of the user having to interpret the graph based on party size we will change it to the time of day. A line graph will allow for a cleaner interface, and support more information in a graph that is easier to read and

comprehend. We will also user a 12 hour clock instead of a 24 hour one, as user S4 noted that our existing format was a bit odd and unfamiliar.

Findings 3: User was unclear about what the different symbols meant for editing a category versus editing a menu item
While trying to add a category, participant S3 first pressed the pencil icon, which is for adding items. Participant S3 commented how the icons were not consistent since add category was a word button and add category was a icon. In addition, the participant S3 noted how the add category button was placed where the next category would be made but the add item was not.

Suggestion 3: Make labels consistent and intuitive
From the findings and suggestions we got from participant S3, we have decided to move the add item button. Since the participant liked how "add category" was where the new category would be created, we decided to keep the position, but change the name to "edit tabs" so it it supports more features. The new "add item" button will be in the place where the next new item would be, to be consistent.

Findings 4: User was unclear of where to click on the graph to see more information about the current traffic
Participant S4 experienced some confusion while trying to complete the first task. When the time came to click on a certain hour (5pm) to receive more info about the corresponding traffic situation, he was unsure of where to click. He debated between clicking on the bar graph itself or on the "17:00" label to the right. In our paper prototype, we had a pop-up appear when the user clicked on the label (versus the graph); the pop-up contained information about the current time, the situation (i.e. whether the restaurant was at full capacity), the average dining time, and the number of groups waiting. However, it was not clear to users that such a feature even existed.

Suggestion 4: Allow users to hover over the graph to depict more traffic information for each hour
Based on our findings, we have decided to change how users must interact with the page to learn more specific traffic information. Instead of having users click on the labels, we will have more information appear when a user hovers over each hour in the graph. We have also decided to include some text to clarify to our users that they can hover over the graph to learn more. When a user hovers over each point on the line graph (see Suggestion 2), a box will appear, with information about the wait times at that hour, for several party sizes. Any hours beyond the current time of day will use average traffic data to predict wait times.