

2007- May - 11 Meeting Agenda and Notes

In attendance: Herb, Paul, Rich, Colin, Kathy, Ron, Dave, Tara, Mike, Shaw-Han, Seamus, Daphne, Clayton, Gary

Agenda:

- * Introductions / interest in heuristic work
- * Update from Clayton on accessibility heuristics research
- * Review/thoughts on material shared so far
- * Discuss heuristic checklists: Accessibility Heuristic Checklist, Usability Heuristic checklists to ponder
- * Discuss evaluation protocol / format (straw man)
- * Need volunteer evaluators
 - o same evaluator for usability and accessibility?
- * Identify leads for Sakai, Moodle, uPortal heuristics (some thoughts on responsibilities):
 - o Coordinate / create activity list for each project
 - o Split evaluation into reasonable chunks (2 - 3 hours for each evaluator)
 - o Coordinate review
 - o Coordinate synthesis of findings, prioritization & recommended solutions
 - o Coordinate/write report for communities
- * Other?

Notes:

WCAG 2 Principles

1. Content must be perceivable
2. Interface components in the content must be operable
3. Content and controls must be understandable
4. Content should be robust enough to work with current and future "user agents" (ie. browsers and assistive technologies)

Agreed to intergrade usability and accessibility heuristic into one

An evaluator will evaluate in both respects. Perhaps there are some mentoring opportunities. Paired evaluating, pairing up different expertise?

We will create teams (working groups) for each product (Sakai, Moodle, uPortal)

We'll standardize the protocol across all projects and customize scenarios of use to each kind of application

Perhaps Moodle and Sakai will share some scenarios. It would be good to find some shared activities across all 3.

Heuristics Working Group Volunteers

Accessibility: Mike (lead), Rich, Colin

Sakai: Daphne, Kathy, Seamus

uPortal: Tara, Daphne, Colin, Kathy?, Gary?

Moodle: Ron (lead), Herb, Dave

Continued meeting with Colin, Clayton, Gary, Paul...

- We need to create the protocol and the process
- today's meeting focused a lot of content - "what are the right checklists to use"
- discussed heuristics vs cognitive walkthroughs. perhaps a hybrid will work best for us. This kind of evaluation has worked well in the past for Daphne. So we use heuristics as our guide to walkthrough specific scenarios. One of the scenarios is a general overview of the application which helps get to the intent of a heuristic.
- Clayton to put together a straw man of the process and protocol. As a group we can then collectively build the diagram and continue to improve it as we learn through doing.
- A couple UCamp ideas: 1) capture video of screen reader or keyboard only users to show at UCamp, 2) set up a kiosk w/ screen reader turned on and have people "be a screen reader user"
- Talked about the idea that heuristics can require a lot interpretation so usually require some expertise in accessibility and design principles, etc. What is the right level of granularity for us. Do we need something more like a checklist? Perhaps we have both.

Chat Transcript from Breeze Room

[Chat Transcript from May 11 2007 Heuristic Analysis Meeting](#)