

Peer review of Midterm Report for group "Personal Travel Planner" (PTP)

Review conducted by the group "Public Transport Forecast"

Anne Holøien (anneho)
Harald Maalen (haralm)
Ågot Ligaarden (aagotl)

Nov 16th, 2007

General remarks

The review is based on this document:

<http://inf3260.yoghurt.strind.no/index.php/Wonderdocument>, accessed Nov 15th, 2007.

Our starting point when reviewing the report has been Jo's general comments to the wonder documents:

"Here are some general comments for the projects - pointing to issues to be covered in the mid-term report and then the final report.

Structure:

Please make sure that the report (mid term, and the final report) cover the following topics:

- Understanding of use and users (methods, what you have selected, why, when etc).*
- Prototyping and design (methods, what you have selected, how, who etc).*
- Evaluation (methods, what you have selected, how, what etc).*

References:

Please include at least 5 references for the mid-term report."

Problem analysis

The problem space and the intended functionality are clearly expressed. It is presented as an interesting project, and there are several interesting questions raised. However, we can not see that all the questions do get an answer in the report. Maybe this will come in the final report? We advice you to only raise questions that you either answer or at least make a comment on later in the report.

Users

Assumptions about the user group are made clear, and that is good.

We are still a bit confused about your approach and who your target-users are.

First you will design for a university professor. Well, are they necessarily idealistic professionals with computer literacy? It is also a very narrow user group.

Next you will observe travellers. It is unclear what you expect to get out of this.

Next stage is interviewing some people. Where are the professors now? How many will you interview? How will you analyse your answers?

From this you expect to have a better view of who your users are. But you do not say how you analyse your data.

You call this a *focus group*, but maybe you use this term wrong? (Sharp et al., 2007, p 302)

What happened to the professors in the focus group?

Your questions in the different stages of the analysis look relevant.

Based on the user interviews it should be possible to state some usability and user experience goals for your design. Maybe in the final report?

Prototype

The prototype is described with some dialog windows in a story board style. Gives a good overview. You describe both a lo-fi prototype and a coming hi-fi one. Seems like a reasonable approach.

From your description of the lo-fi prototype it is a bit unclear to us how this is thought to function. Is it supposed to fetch appointments from different calendars and melt these into a new one? Does the application read appointments, recognize the places and the time for appointments and then find alternative itineraries automatically?

You use the terms horizontal and vertical view of the application. Maybe a good idea to define your terms? They are not intuitive for other people.

Evaluation

The description of how you plan to evaluate seems good, although it is not very detailed yet. Maybe a good idea to put your heuristics in a list, that will be easier to read.

References

The report lacks references. We suggest that you try to link your work stronger to the course literature, refer methods, frameworks etc. which you use in your design process.