MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

MITBI - Option A

| Title | Number | Criteria | | Dashboard |

□ **Search by Account Title**

Account Title: 11111   (Search)

Results for "11111"

Collapse All

- ☐ 1331000 Mit Press-Editing Expenses
  - ☐ 1331100 Mit Press-Editorial Acquisitions
  - ☐ 1331200 Editorial Development
  - ☐ 1331300 Editorial Development
  - ☐ 1331400 Editorial Development
  - ☐ 1331500 Editorial Development
  - ☐ 1331600 Editorial Development
  - ☐ 1331800 Editorial Development
  - ☐ 1331001 File Management Department
  - ☐ 1331900 Mit Press Bradford Books Series
- ☐ 1332000 Mit Press-Production Department Expenses
  - ☐ 1332200 Mit Press Production Department
  - ☐ 1332100 Mit Press-Design Department Expenses
- ☐ 1333000 Mit Press-Selling Expenses
  - ☐ 1333800 Intl Sales Expense Cambridge
  - ☐ 1333001 Mit Press-Electronic Marketing
- ☐ 1333100 Mit Press-Promotion Expenses
  - ☐ 1332900 Space Advertising
  - ☐ 1333200 Text Direct Mail
  - ☐ 1333400 Direct Mail
  - ☐ 1333600 Exhibits Operating Expense
  - ☐ 1333701 Google Ad Revenue

Due to the small sample size for participants, we were not confident in the ability to remove outliers in the SUS Scoring. The MITBI that was tested obtained a SUS score of 75 which is generally accepted as fair usability. Usability believes that through enhancements and design tweaks, the project team can raise the SUS score into the 80's.

Page four represents the typical questions that are asked after a participant completes a task during the testing session. The first section regarding MITBI information and preference over existing systems is something we should monitor and retest. If they do not improve in the future, we would recommend a more intensive user research be conducted by Usability to understand where the disconnect is between established systems and MITBI.

1. Finding: When a user searches for a cost object number and there is an exact match, by loading the page with the cost object data, we are projecting a monthly efficiency gain of 37.3 hours per month across all end users.

(112,000 cost objects reviewed per month time 1.2 seconds saved by loading default data, equals 37.33 hours per month)

2. Finding: Three out of the five participants noted that they "don't care" about the day of the week being indicated on the page.
Recommendation: Remove the day of the week and standardize all date fields to have the same format and we recommend mimicking what is already used in SAP.

3. Finding: The UI used in testing had dual date ranges, for committed and actuals which confused users. This issue appears to be addressed with the single date range field.

4. Finding: The row shadings confused participants as to its meaning. In the pretest exercise only one of the five participants indicated that they would shade vertically. Most participants merely wanted black, red for negative values, and bold for summations.
Recommendation: Remove shading with the exception of alternating rows. We would also recommend reviewing the numeric value coloring. While red was universally understood individuals did question the difference between blue and black and attempted to click on the black text to understand what was and was not clickable.

1. Further Research: At present two participants indicated that they would download the summary into Excel so that they could clean it up before sending it along to department heads. We recommend researching this further either through more user research or analytics from the pilot. If there is a dominant format that we can default to, we may be able to identify another efficiency gain for end users.
(hand movement to mouse, mouse targeting, clicking, etc.)

2. Finding: The default order for categories for the GL appears to be inverted from what three users informed us the order should be; Direct Expenses, Indirect Expenses, Revenue.
Recommendation: Since changing the order contradicts their learned behavior, it would be best to redo this to match their mental models, therefore reducing error and search time.

3. Finding: When clicking on the details for a budget hit (debit / credit) an end user can lose position with in the page, due to long journal voucher entries, details being loaded at the bottom of the record, and lack of contextual information.
Recommendation: Extend the "Details for Summary Item:" to include the row title that references the charge the user is looking at. For example, "Details for Summary Info: Salaries" or "Details for Summary Info: Equipment".

4. Finding: Another item that participants noted is a summation for the details section.

5. Further Research: One participant noted that it would be helpful if Admin Staff, Support Staff, Faculty, etc, had their salary summed rather than detailed out for them. Because of the lack of familiarity with budgeting outside of IS&T, this may be something to research further as it could prevent users from having to perform the summation themselves.

6. Finding: For the detail section, participants noted that "Cost Collector" and "Group Code" meant nothing to them and should be removed to allow for greater spacing and less header compression.

MITBI - Option A

Hi, John Doe | logout

Title | Number | Criteria | Dashboard

Search by Account Title

Account Title: 11111 | Search

Results for "11111"
Collapse All

- 1331000 Mit Press-Editing Expenses
  - 1331100 Mit Press-Editorial Acquisitions
  - 1331200 Editorial Development
  - 1331300 Editorial Development
  - 1331400 Editorial Development
  - 1331500 Editorial Development
  - 1331600 Editorial Development
  - 1331800 Editorial Development
  - 1331001 File Management Department
  - 1331900 Mit Press Bradford Books Series
- 1332000 Mit Press-Production Department Expenses
  - 1332200 Mit Press Production Department
  - 1332100 Mit Press-Design Department Expenses
- 1333000 Mit Press-Selling Expenses
  - 1333800 Intl Sales Expense Cambridge
  - 1333001 Mit Press-Electronic Marketing
- 1333100 Mit Press-Promotion Expenses
  - 1332900 Space Advertising
  - 1333200 Text Direct Mail
  - 1333400 Direct Mail
  - 1333600 Exhibits Operating Expense
  - 1333701 Google Ad Revenue
  - 1333500 M.I.T Press Publicity

<< 1331000 >> Mit Press-Editing Expenses

Supervisor: Sims /Michael
Profit Center: The Mit Press
Fund Center: GO-MIT PRESS/BOOKS
Start Date: Tue Jul 02 1991
End Date: Sat Jan 02 1904

GL Hierarchy: CEMIT-1
Display: Table
Date Range: ___ to ___
Include Children: ☐

Update

Budget vs. Actuals | Revenue vs. Expenses | Reports

CEMIT-EX62 Expenses:

Download Summary: – Choose Format –

GL Category	Budget	Actual	Commitments	Balance
Expenses	30,000.00	33,500.00	0.00	-3,500.00
Direct Expenses	30,000.00	33,500.00	0.00	-3,500.00
Operating Expenses	30,000.00	33,500.00	0.00	-3,500.00
Materials & Services	30,000.00	33,500.00	0.00	-3,500.00
Total	30,000.00	33,500.00	0.00	-3,500.00

Copyright MIT 2009

GL Category	Budget 1	Actual	Commitments	Balance

Details for Summary Item:

Detail Report: Excel | Download

GL Account	MIT ID	Full Name	Employee Type	Dist. %	Dist. Amount	Commitment Start	Commitment End
400607-001	9XXXXXXX	Wright, Jaguar	Admin Staff	100.00	0.00	11/01/2008	04/30/2009
400250-001	9XXXXXXX	Clinton, Hillary	Admin Staff	100.00	30,693.88	07/01/2006	10/31/2006
400250-001	9XXXXXXX	Clinton, Hillary	Admin Staff	100.00	369,936.60	07/01/2006	06/30/2012
400250-001	9XXXXXXX	Black, Jack	Admin Staff	100.00	46,194.22	07/01/2006	08/31/2007
400250-001	9XXXXXXX	Simone, Nina	Admin Staff	100.00	405,000.00	06/01/2007	06/30/2012
400250-001	9XXXXXXX	Simone, Nina	Support Staff	432.26	27,016.13	05/01/2007	05/31/2007
400602-001	9XXXXXXX	Marx, Karl	Support Staff	100.00	217,734.00	08/01/2007	06/30/2012

Close Details

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

◆ Find/review cost object　　■ Expense details　　▲ MITBI

This tool provides me with all the information I need:
Does not provide the information I need ▲ Provides the information I need

The color coding and shading were used effectively and assisted me in using this tool:
Color/shading not effective ▲ Color/shading is effective

Compared to the means I use today to review budget and cost objects, I would prefer to use this tool:
Do not prefer to what I use now ▲ Prefer to what use now

How easy was this task?
Not Easy ■ Very Easy

Compared to existing tools, I would like to use this tool to complete this task?
Would not use ■ Would Use

Were the categories / icons clear?
Not Clear ■ Very Clear

Was the navigation intuitive for this task?
Not Intuitive ■ Very Intuitive

How difficult was this task?
Very Difficult ■ Not Difficult

How easy was this task?
Not Easy ◆ Very Easy

Compared to existing tools, I would like to use this tool to complete this task?
Would not use ◆ Would Use

Were the categories / icons clear?
Not Clear ◆ Very Clear

Was the navigation intuitive for this task?
Not Intuitive ◆ Very Intuitive

How difficult was this task?
Very Difficult ◆ Not Difficult

0　0.5　1　1.5　2　2.5　3　3.5　4　4.5　5