recognize, diagnose, and recover from errors) is that the system does not provide error information when filling a field. Things that can be recommended for future improvements are on the Login page, if the user enters user data with the wrong input, then there is an incorrect warning or an appeal at the bottom of the Login form.

5. Kesimpulan

Based on the results of the research conducted, it is possible to produce an improved user interface design on the Evolution Web Application which is designed using the User-centered Design method that meets the needs of users in this system display. including changes to the layout of features, pages and menus that make navigation flow efficient and easy to use by users. Changes to the colors, buttons, and icons that are minimalistic and in accordance with the wishes of the user make the user comfortable when using this web application. The addition of a page on the main menu which is the CSA Report which can make it easier for users to view and download CSA documents that are running at a certain time. This shows that in this study, using the User-centered Design method resulted in a better user interface design for Evolution Web Application users.

Based on the results of the second Focus Group Discussion conducted with users, Feedback by users refers to the concept of usability according to Nielsen (1993) resulting a positive response from users. There are 17 positive answers from the five users for each statement related to the usability of the concept and 3 feedback for future improvements. This can be a measure of success in the design improvements made and design improvement and this study with the method of Focus Group Discussion (FGD) is satisfied for the users of Evolution Web Application. The results of the Heuristic Evaluation with 3 Experts resulted in 3 answers having a severity value of 2 indicating (fixing this should be given low priority) and 3 answers having a severity value of 0 (I don't agree that this is a usability problem at all) which refers to the principle of severity ratings in Heuristic Evaluation. This shows that in this study, using the Focus Group Discussion and Heuristic Evaluation methods resulted in a user interface design that is in accordance with user needs and can meet the concept of Usability.

Bibliography

- [1] O. V. Bitkina, H. K. Kim, and J. Park, "Usability and user experience of medical devices: An overview of the current state, analysis methodologies, and future challenges," *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, vol. 76. Elsevier B.V., Mar. 01, 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.ergon.2020.102932.
- [2] R. A. Powell, H. M. Single, and R. A. Powell, "Focus Groups IS A FOCUS GROUP? Downloaded from," 2012. [Online]. Available: http://intqhc.oxfordjournals.org/
- [3] A. Chammas, M. Quaresma, and C. Mont'Alvão, "A Closer Look on the User Centred Design," *Procedia Manufacturing*, vol. 3, pp. 5397–5404, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.promfg.2015.07.656.
- [4] R. Molich, M. R. Ede, K. Kaasgaard, and B. Karyukin, "Comparative usability evaluation," *Behaviour and Information Technology*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 65–74, Jan. 2004, doi: 10.1080/0144929032000173951.
- [5] J. Nielsen, R. Molich, and J. Bitnet Denmark, "CHI 90 Procee&qs HEURISTIC EVALUATION OF USER INTERFACES," 1990.
- [6] M. F. Kamaruzaman, N. M. Rani, H. M. Nor, and M. H. H. Azahari, "Developing User Interface Design Application for Children with Autism," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 217, pp. 887– 894, Feb. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.02.022.
- [7] C. R. Woodyatt, C. A. Finneran, and R. Stephenson, "In-Person Versus Online Focus Group Discussions: A Comparative Analysis of Data Quality," *Qualitative Health Research*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 741–749, May 2016, doi: 10.1177/1049732316631510.
- [8] J. Nielsen, !!!"5? Human Factors mComputing Systems CHI'94 * 'CekbIa/mg hkdepewie)fce' Enhancing the Explanatory Power of Usability Heuristics."