

Intranet Directory

Prototype Usability Results

Second Wave of User Testing

Summary of Findings

METHODOLOGY

We conducted six usability tests on the paper prototypes of the Directory Manager, between September 12-23. All six users came from IT and non-administrative divisions, except for one physician. By completing the following 7 tasks, we determined the ease-of-use of the Directory Manager in its second prototype draft design. The success/failure of the prototype design usability is documented in detail in the following pages.

Seven tasks tested

1. Find a list of the 2 most recent publications by Doctor Alison Andrews, Dermatology Consultant.
2. You need to get access to blood in storage. Find the service and make that request.
3. You have started a project team and want to publish information about your members and your work, to recruit and "get the word out". Publish this information.
4. You are preparing a mailing to all who work in Graphics and Illustration. How do you get the list of names?
5. You want to contact everyone in the same organizational group as Graphics and Illustration. Find out which section that group is in, and its peer groups.
6. You are in the group "Graphics and Illustration" at Mayo in Rochester. You have created a new service and want to publish information on the intranet so that people can find it and request that service from the group. How would you list a new service for your group? Describe the service, add a contact person, etc.
7. You are, for this scenario, Dr. Alison Andrews. Update some part of your professional profile.

RESULTS

Results and responses echoed findings from the first wave of user tests. Specifically, the interface layouts meet expectations and are found usable. The combination of content at profile pages (Professional, Group and Service) appear valuable to these users. Two pages deserving their own special mock-ups (based user feedback) were created after 2nd wave tests finished. Those two new pages are: "Project Team Profile" and a "Request Form" Template.

Clearer verbal and visual representations of content, additional functionality, and relationships to other internal software are the most common user feedback to the prototypes. Users also shared ideas about how to integrate the Directory Manager into the larger intranet context.

Language Preferred

Organizational Chart is always a visual representation.

- Organizational Chart is understood by a thumbnail image of a flowchart, more than the words "organizational chart".
- Most users overlooked the list of "Organizational Chart" links on the Group Profile page in favor either of finding the information in the Group Description or the Related Groups list.

Organizational Relationships should be embedded as links in written content.

- Information about organizational relationships should be a part of the group description (of a Group Profile page) or in "breadcrumbs" representing organizational affiliation (at the top of Professional or Service Profile pages).

Policies and Procedures on a Service Profile Need Annotation.

- Users would not know the value of a policy on their decision to contact a service unless the policy was annotated to clarify the importance of that policy to that service, group or team.

Group Profile: Non-Institutional Group (e.g., Teams)

Teams are slightly different from institutional resources like sections or units, because

- the team exists to accomplish a specific outcome and *may* not provide services, and
- the members are responsible to a project in ways that may not be reflected in their institutional title (therefore need to adjust their role in a specific project team profile page).

For this reason, non-institutional teams need to be clearly differentiated from institutional groups (units, sections, work areas) by

- Definition (resident assignments, project-specific teams, task forces, WIDGIT-type teams),
- Titling (Team needs to mean something specific), and
- Interface elements that distinguish teams from groups (using color, content of page, etc)

Visual Layout Preferred

- Buttons for service requests should be at the top of the page above the text, or be immediately visible as one of the actionable interface elements.
- Contact information should be at the top and left of each profile page. Consistency in layout is essential for speed and accuracy in using the intranet.
- Titles for each content type should be readable at scan-speed, especially on the professional profile page.

Functionality Expected

Email Distribution Lists

- Users expect to assemble selected email addresses at a Search Results or Group Profile page to create a distribution list. Incentives to narrow the list are welcome, including the ability to sort the list by role and relationship to specific interests, application support, project teams and/or committee involvement.

Export to Excel

- Exporting selected names from a Search Results list or Group/Service Profile page to an Excel file would then be “mail merged” into a Word document for intra-clinic mailings. This functionality would save administrative users a lot of time that they currently spend assembling Word documents and mailings by hand, or they call the secretary and request this same file.

Search Narrowing Capabilities

- “Did You Mean..?” recommendations for alternative search strings at search results increased users understanding of corporate language. They expect to click on these alternatives to activate a new search, *not* to add those words to their current search results.
- This functionality is desired also for spelling of names and difficult words.

Search Results

- If a search accurately spells/identifies a group, person or service by name, the resulting page should deliver that specific profile page, by skipping the search results page. Search results should not list similar matches if an exact match exists.

Error Message Support

If a “New Group” desires to use a name that is already taken, these users expect to see:

- At a minimum, the name of the group, their description, the contact person and the timeframe for completion of this group’s activities.
- Higher-status users want to know who is the group sponsor (i.e., the chair of the committee or the head of the related section/unit/division, etc) and see contact information.

Professional Profile has Organizational Relationships, too.

- Several users in IT want their profile to show where they “live” in the organization. It would be enough for the system to generate the organizational hierarchy from their group name to the Division level (or if at a Division-level already, then to the Foundation and other sites).

Professional Profile Customization

IT users anticipate having “Technology Interests” but not “Clinical Practice Interests” or “Research Interests”. They also want to list:

- User Groups (ex: Java, Crystal Reports)
- Task Forces (as set up by Committees)
- Current Projects (pulled from IT Inventory which has a system contact identifier)

Integration of Directory Manager into Intranet

Add New Group

- This functionality exists in the context of the current “Depts/Groups” page. It would be possible to sort that list of departments and groups, search by keyword, review by org. chart relationships, and add a new group with ties to an existing group or committee.
- Additionally, many users see “Add New Group” as an adjunct to a committee’s e-minutes.

Search by...

- *Role:* Sometimes information is valuable only to a specific role like Clinical Assistant or Supervisor. Being able to send an email to the people listed on a page of search results for a search under “role: Clinical Assistant” would facilitate communications within that employee peer group. One user spends a lot of time finding the Chair of a specific committee; would like to search for “role: Chair” and a keyword identifier in the Group/Committee field.
- *Interests:* The goal of finding the right person for a specialized task makes the information about an individual’s “interests” especially popular and valuable to all those who tested the prototype. To make the most of interests, users expect to search by interests. It may be necessary to sort results by expertise, certification or other distinguishing details. Users expect to search others’ interests as specialties and areas of expertise. General subject interest areas are believed to be valuable only to assess unmet demand for classes.