Assigning Professors to Classes
Midterm Presentation

Matt Fritz
Denise Ma
Donald Stern
Mike Tang
Evan White

The Problem

- No current system for assigning professors to classes.
- Excel is currently used
  - Time consuming
  - Error prone
  - Local
- Users have to keep track of a lot of information
  - Course types
  - Different types of Professors
  - Preferences
  - Availability of Professors

Example

Preliminary 2009-10 Teaching Plan Q.xls (read-only) - OpenOffice.org Calc

File Edit View Insert Format Tools Data Window Help

B46

OpenOffice.org update available
Click here to start the download.

	A	B	C	D	E
1	AY 09-10 Informatics Teaching Assignments rev 9-24-09				
2	Faculty	FQ	WQ	SQ	Notes
3	Chen	171, 231a		163	-1 assistant
4	Dourish		ICS277	242	-1 exercising PhD graduation clause, -1 ACE Director
5	Hayes	148, 201	231b		-1 assistant
6	Jones	211	295 (Testing)	115	-1 assistant
7	Kobsa		131	132, 233	-1 for seving in trial position of Personnel Case Advisor
8	Lopes		241, 141	123, 295 (Virtual Worlds)	
9	Mark	ICS3	162, 263	44	
10	Mazmanian			161, 295 (Org)	can move 295 around or make different assignment, -2 new hire agreement
11	Nardi	139w, 261		203	-1 seminar coordinator
12	Olson, G	153	205	143 (w/Redmiles)	-2 new hire agreement; +1 deferred from 0809; needs additional course or service
13	Olson, J	191A (w/Ziv)	151	191A (w/Ziv)	-2 new hire agreement
14	Patterson	133	CS221		-1 assistant, -1 center director, -1 owed from AY0809; can only reduce to 2 so owe 1 again next year.
15	Redmiles	209s	209s	209s, 143 (w/OlsonG)	
16	Richardson				-4 Dean
17	Sim	111	111	217	-1 assistant
18					
19	Taylor		113, 221	117	-1 center director
20	Tomlinson	161, 295 (GreenIT)			-1 199 release (one time only); -1 partial leave
21	van der Hoek	121	122		-2 Associate Dean for Student Affairs
22					
23					
24	Kay	H21, INF41, ICS398a, ICS90 (w/Pattis)	ICS4, ICS398a, US197B (w/Berkelhamer)	ICS398b, INF269, US197C (w/Berkelhamer)	
25					
26	Pattis	ICS23, ICS90 (w/Kay)	H22, INF42	H23, ICS6	
27					
28	Frost	ICS52, INF125/CS113	ICS52, CS171, INF134	INF125/CS113, INF43	

Undergrad / Grad \ Faculty Loads Informatics /

Sheet 3 / 3 PageStyle_Faculty Loads Informatics STD Sum=0 125%

The Solution

- Design a new system from the ground for assigning professors to classes.
  - Web-based
  - Drag and drop for ease of use.
  - Provide information about professors
    - Course Load
    - Requests and requirements
  - Provide information about courses
    - Type(level)
    - Requirement
  - Log-in for different user access

Methods

- Interviews with key stakeholders to learn system requirements
- Building a prototype
- Heuristic evaluation with HCI experts
- Cognitive walk through with team members
- Usability test
- Attempt to organize tests with stakeholders

What we have done so far

- Interviews with professor and admin
- Working prototype
  - One initial prototype that was designed based on interview with professor
  - Second prototype based on interview with admin
- Cognitive walk through with team members.
- Contacted potential users for Heuristic evaluations.
- Found back-up users for Heuristic evaluations.
- Completed some Heuristic evaluations.

Admin interview results

- Actual schedule and planned schedule.
- Color coding for class types (seminar, project, etc.)
- Undergrad and graduate courses
- Summer not handled by the admin.
- Notes for courses.
- Warning if rules are broken
- Two years in advance

Heuristic Evaluations

- Done with two users.
  - Both undergrad Informatics majors.
  - One was an HCI specialist.
  - The other had a background in interface design.
- Done on a laptop with an 11.1 inch screen and a resolution of 1378x768.
- Evaluations were performed at the student center.
- Both users were briefed on the systems features and were given log-in information but otherwise did not receive instructions unless they asked for it.

User1's Impressions

- Mostly focused on trying to break the system.
- Did not like the drop-down menu for navigation and found it cumbersome to use.
- Suggested having a default value for the drop-down menu.
- Found adding and removing courses from the system was intuitive.
- Found adding professors to courses was problematic depending on where he dragged and dropped the professor.
- Liked the ability to add notes to a course and found it to be an easy-to-use feature.
- Overall liked the system aside from some complaints.

User2's Impressions

- Focused more on the interface and not the functionality of the system.
- Liked the feature for course information drop-down.
- Was confused during course creation about what information the system was expecting. Suggested default values.
- Found the drop-down menu hard to use for navigating the website.
- Suggested having extra navigation features.
- Overall liked the system.

Cognitive Walk-through

- Number of courses a professor is teaching is not given by the system.
- Help menu would be useful.
- Color key.
- Navigation menu not obvious and cumbersome to use.
- Default value of "OK" for course removal, could lead to accidental course deletion if not careful.
- Site will not work with Internet Explorer.

Decisions left to be made

- When should we present the system to stakeholders for evaluation?
- What type of test or evaluation should the stakeholder perform
  - Heuristic evaluation vs. Usability test.
- What kind of equipment will we need for a usability test?
- Finalize a list of tasks for the usability test.
- Working iteratively vs. performing all evaluations at once and then changing the system.

Problems with the project

- Satisfying the admins requirements while completing the project within the time frame of the course
- Difficulty including all members during interviews
  - Large group makes it overbearing
  - Schedule conflicts
  - Keeping members informed
- Hard to find testers with background in Informatics
  - Many schedule conflicts during testing weeks
- A few usability problems with system to be fixed
  - Professor names vertically drag to infinity
  - Professor names cannot be removed once added

Schedule Breakdown

The Time Plan/Task Allotment:

    1. Elicitation

        - Interviews (*by 5th week*)   -   Two (2) Completed

            - Questions prepared as a group (*4/15*)

            - Interview given by: Matt and Mike

    2. Implementation (*by 6th week*)   -   Completed

        - Brainstorming done as a group

        - First prototype put together by Donald, Matt and Denise

    3. Primary Evaluations (*by 7th week*)   -   In Progress

        - Heuristic Evaluation   -   Completed

            - Prepared by group and deployed by Evan, Mike

        - Cognitive Walk-Through

            - Prepared by group and deployed by Evan, Mike

        - Use-Case

            - Prepared and deployed by group

Schedule Breakdown (cont.)

4. Revision *(7th-8th week)** -   In Progress
   - Editing of interface based on findings from evaluations

5. Secondary Evaluations *(7th-8th week)** -   Upcoming
   - Cognitive Walk-Through
     - Prepared by group and deployed by Evan, Mike

6. Finalize Interface (9th week) -   Upcoming
   - Final implementation by Donald, Matt and Denise
   - Final Paper Draft by Donald, Matt and Denise

Phases 4 and 5 are iterative and may thus be repeated as necessary over the 2 weeks allotted to them

Prototypical

http://www.burbankparanormal.com/inf132/

Thank You!

Questions?