

SUMMARY Program Review testing scenario (December 16 & 17, 2013)

Date: 12-16 & 17/13; online and in person testers

Testers: 8 testers. 7 in person(observed) and 1 online; 7 Firefox; 1 IE

1. *Introduce link and have requestor use their last year's data. Observe and record testers' navigation and use of the online form.*

Observations:

- User logged in then went to last year's program review and began to cut/paste
- User scanned the complete form before starting.
- No issues.
- User tried to 'tab' over to the next cell in table option. Thought that would work but did not. Felt it was easy enough to figure out to use the mouse/cursor BUT identified could be an issue for some.
- No problem logging in
- Liked that content field is limitless
- Almost everyone had questions about how to change the format of the text and change the size of the font. (One tester tried to match the fonts)
- Tester was unsure about 'how to tab'. Multiple users wanted to 'tab' to next field not scroll.
- A comment was made that all the information was all on one long page, rather than a "next" button. Tester had to scroll down to see the information.
- One user asked if the questions/major fields could be presented in separate pages
- One user 'typed' embedded links and when clicked on those links only went back to 'master program review listing' (home); pasted links works
- User (math faculty) asked about how they complete if they're an academic discipline but do have an advisory committee should they include assessment/input in their review?

To do's/actions for the program:

- Header needs to be added for 3B IPC. A column needs to be added for "cost." Double check embedded links.
- **Instructions** need to advise users about formatting; do you want to set a standard?
- **Instructions** need to clearly inform users that if user needs to cut/copy from 'pdf' they would have to reformat content.
- **Instructions** to users need to advise users on how to create tables within the text block. Some users expressed that some fields provided as text boxes (no tables) they might want to create a table.
- **Instructions** need to advise users when including links to copy and paste not type
- **Instructions** remind users to log in with their smccd ID w/o domain (i.e. maddenb...then password)
- **Instructions** should address 'advisory committee' section completion for academic disciplines – is it applicable?
- **Instructions** should provide a detailed process for faculty specific to toggling between their last years review and inputting to the form

2. *Observe did the user save frequently? Were they able to find necessary resources easily to complete review*

Observations:

- A couple of the users saved as they completed sections of program review.
- User pasted table into field and checked out table formatting successfully.
- There were no requests for resources.
- A tester did not save after working on a few sections. Tester did see save.
- Tester thought the content would 'auto save'
- It was unclear where the document will save to. Auto-spacing feature favored.
- Some testers saved frequently. For those that did not, the "save" option was there. For the testers that looked for other resources, they were generally easy to be found.
- User asked if SLOs could be pre-loaded
- User asked about uploading data (copy data from SARs); this was addressed during testing. User can export to excel then copy to program review
- Some Users asked about not including CTE section for programs with no CTE (3A)

To do's/actions for the program:

- More rows are needed to complete resource requests (the users have had to insert rows).
- **Instructions** need to clearly advise users to 'save'; the form does not 'autosave'
- Confirm that SLOs can be preloaded and include in instructions
- In the case of the Library they have overlap with 'center usage' section; discussed providing an additional 'generic' form field for programs that may need additional specific information (applicable where programs have requires for two different types of program reviews).
- View/print – user wants to see what it looks like now so message okay.
- Logout – user suggested that a different message is provided at this point so it is very clear to the user they are leaving the online form (save!).
- Consider customizing instructional program reviews for programs that CTE is non-applicable (i.e. remove section).
-

3. *Inquire from tester about the use of the online form. How did it feel? What suggestions do they have?*

Feedback:

- Tabbing in the table section goes to next field. (User needed to arrow over to the field).
- The form is easy to use.
- The text editor function is great.
- I tried many (but not all) functions and they seem to work well.
- Before going to submit I would want to print; showed user print/view and how to save as 'pdf' and print.
- The course outline description cost field needs to be corrected.
- When seeing the print preview, a tester saw a "black screen".
- An email reminder is needed.
- Users looking forward to using the program next year.
- Simple, great; will be especially great next year!

- User suggesting setting up the form so it scrolls and the header information stays stationary for the user as they work through the form.
- User(s) identified they would 'print' to provide a copy to the Dean (or others) for review
- All users felt the form was very straightforward and easy to use
- Save as 'pdf' to computer. Link didn't come through to 'pdf' in all cases.
- One user asked about 'spell check'; it was confirmed that spell check was available.
- One user wanted to log out and go back to the list (home).
- User suggested that the 'default' font could be larger when cutting/pasting content to form

To do's/actions for the program:

- Instructions need to clearly inform the user that they should arrow over to sections in a table not 'tab'.
- The course outline description cost field needs to be corrected.
- Instructions/training should be provided to Deans
- Instructions – determine if we will be setting a 'standard' default for formatting and if so, include in instructions.
- Instructions need to clearly explain log out as compared with view/print.

4. How did you *start and complete your program review last year?*

- All users identified they received an email to start the process. Other than student services tester the users identified that they received the email from Academic Senate. In the case of student services James C. came to an SS meeting and reviewed.
- A few users identified they went to PRIE to access the program review forms.
- Users expressed difficulty finding some resource data on PRIE; suggest include most pertinent resource data with online form (Program Review website) access webpage.
- Users identified that they would cut/paste from the old program review

4a. How do you envision the process working going forward (*new online process*) from *the start and completion of program review?*

- a. All users identified they expect to receive an email to start the process; most expect the email to come from Academic Senate and to include a link to the online program review form. One user expected the email might come from IBPC.
 - i. Student Services: expects James/Academic Senate rep. to come to SS meeting and provide information for accessing online program review form.
- b. Users expect they will do both cut/paste from old program review along with collecting data and going to PRIE for specific program data.
- c. One user expressed that they expect to receive reminders for program review deadline/deliverable.
- d. Probably will not compose program review within online form. Expect to print and share; most likely via word document.

5 Any other feedback.

- Auto spacing – I like this!
- Provide 'draft view'
- The font and size of the text needs to be changed. Consider standard font size!
- Nice work!