

Summary of Results (Nov 2, 2021)

Access Assistant project, RERC on AAC, Koester et al.

Very positive results from this user study. Participants liked the prototype and strongly agree that they will use it during eval sessions with their clients. High agreement that it seems easy to use and covers the important aspects of the assessment process. Participants generally thought using AA could be done in the 30-60 minutes they have for an eval. Those in hospital settings noted that the time and workflow required would be a better fit for outpatient than inpatient because inpatient usually requires assessing a lot of things at the same time. Participants also liked the Plan Ahead section, but some would not use it for every case due to time / workflow constraints. Making AA available on computers and tablets, with ability to access data from more than one device, will cover what participants need.

The tables below summarize the results for specific features we asked about during the study. The [Trello board](#) contains more details about UI changes that might be needed as well as the specific “related features” that participants requested.

Rated Features	Rating	UI change needed?	New related features requested?	Summary
Learn More links	4.00	No	No	Everyone liked the Learn More links. Even an experienced person may have areas they aren't as familiar with, and it would be very helpful for those who are new to AT evals.
Session report	3.75	No	Yes	Participants liked the report as a way of objectively communicating what occurred in the session and sharing that with all stakeholders, including teachers, referral sources, and funders. They like getting such a comprehensive report without any extra work, while still having the ability to customize it if desired. 8 thumbs up!
Free-choice activity	3.75	Suggest things to look for	No	Participants understood the distinction and see the need for both types of activities. May want suggestions of what to look for during your-own activities.
Built-in activity	3.75	No	No (but not asked)	Appreciate objective nature of data from built-in activities.
Contexts info	3.75	Minor rewording	Yes	Overall felt this was important feature. Some feature changes suggested.
Vision eval	3.75	Add'l content, checkboxes	No	Everyone agreed that some sort of vision eval is important and that what we have is a reasonable approach to it. Having checkboxes is great, and we could tweak the existing checkboxes to make it even better.
Feature-matching	3.67	Yes - entire feature	No	[no summary]
Remedies	3.50	No	No	Participants liked having remedies because they include things participants hadn't thought of and sometimes access methods just need a little tweaking to make them work.
Notes during Test-drives	3.25	No	No	Participants generally liked the idea of Notes supports.
Filter access methods	3.00	Bigger See More. Wording changes. Info on order of display	Yes	Participants liked being able to filter/sort access methods but some confusion about the category names that we gave.
Body graphic	3.00	No (unless Remove)	Yes, if keeping feature	Participants with comments were fairly supportive of the use of a visual. There were suggestions for other ways to achieve a visual representation.
Duration of Test-drives	2.50	No (unless Remove)	Yes, if keeping feature	There was mixed interest in the duration timer (as compared to Notes), possibly because it wasn't clear to everyone what the duration timer did.
Two computers	about 3			Some interest - but would need to be easy to setup

Unrated Features	Rating	UI change needed?	New related features requested?	Summary
Prospects and Picks		Yes (C.1 below)	Yes	This made sense to some but took some thinking or was confusing for others. Consider how to help users decide what's still in the running without making a premature final decision.
Motor Eval		Possibly (B.1 below)	Yes	Three participants stated this 2 step approach for motor eval makes sense. Multiple comments related to desiring more detail and more direction on how to choose body sites. Positive comments on ability to prioritize sites and offering tips for sites.
Main Goals		Possibly	No	There is agreement that goals are clear for 3 participants, however "emerging access" continues to be a source of confusion.
Choose-a-method		Bigger See More. Info about order of display.	No	Concept seems helpful especially for novices, or when working with less familiar access methods. It's actually a strength that the methods are generic types rather than specific products. Beefing up the descriptions will help people learn what they don't know.
Other reports		Not right now	Yes	Participants liked being able to see how data changes from session to session. Even better if it could be a single page summary and favors objective measures. One concern that this might not be all that helpful for the procurement of devices.
Priority Activity		No	No	Overall likes narrowing down of focus

Key Additional Items to Address, identified from Confusion / Concerns and Feature Requests:

Votes: [1=sooner, 2=later, 3=never]

A. Overall

1. ++ Onboarding – tell users what AA is for and who it is for. Clarify prerequisite knowledge and skills. While it is not primarily a tool for training practitioners, it will enhance knowledge and skills for many. 4 [1 1 1 1]
2. Validate (and design) advanced workflows:
 - a. ++ For jumping around and/or skipping questions 4 [1 1 1 1]
 - b. ++ For resuming an assessment next week 4 [1 1 1 1]
 - c. ++ For addressing new goals as old ones are achieved 4 [1 1 1 1]
 - d. For revising client info 7 [1 2 2 2]
 - e. For fully achieving a Main Goal, including getting to a final decision 7 [1 3 2 1] [Overlap with C.3]
3. ++ Incorporate seating / positioning content, into all sections 4 [1 1 1 1]
4. ++ Reduce user uncertainty about how their answers affect future path / behavior of AA, for all sections (esp Gather Info and Eval sections but also Review) 4 [1 1 1 1]
5. Help users know what to expect visually, e.g., with a progress bar to show how much is left in each subsection 8 [2 2 2 2]
6. Address desire / need to hide some info from client 8 [2 2 2 2]

B. Eval Section

1. Physical eval
 - a. ++ Clarify: they are just observing, not yet using AT 4 [1 1 1 1]
 - b. Specificity of selecting body sites. Need AA to lead users? Or just allow more specific choices? 6 [2 2 1 1]
 - c. Provide info on relative difficulty / learning for different body sites 8 [2 2 2 2]. [Cover it in Learn More]
2. Add a short hearing eval? 8 [2 2 2 2]. [Could be in Other. Icon suggestion?]

C. Decision-making

1. ++ Address confusion related to Prospects and Picks – see Trello Confusion/Concerns list for details. 4 [1 1 1 1]
2. Address more general feature-matching in some way. Give users a choice about whether to use FM? 8 [2 2 2 2]
3. Support “the endgame” – help users choose a specific product, once they’re in the ballpark. Avoid making a premature decision, too. Investigate the “right” options, to the “right” amount of depth. 7.5 [3 2 2 2.5 😊]. [group thoughts about this in my notebook. Will add to pivotal.]

Implications for what to build

Initial focus on implementing the “Do an Eval” section with the following constraints:

- Initially support the full access goal. Emerging access would be the next goal to add, followed by low tech access to communication.
- Initially support your-own activity. Add built-in activities after that.