intel.

UX Continuous Improvement

UX Case Study

Technology

Enterprise UX

Research Ops

Role
Senior UX Designer

Duration
2008 initiative

PROJECT FOCUS

A continuous improvement model for complex Intel product experiences

Intel product teams needed a more disciplined way to identify high-value UX issues, document recommendations, prioritize improvements, and communicate decisions across product, engineering, and business stakeholders.

Research-driven
evidence

Repeatable
improvement loop

Measurable
improvement loop

Case Study Overview

The initiative helped move UX work from isolated fixes toward a repeatable operating model for identifying, prioritizing, and improving product experiences.

WHY IT MATTERED

Intel product teams needed a practical way to make continuous UX improvements visible, measurable, and easier to prioritize.

- Product experiences were complex and touched different user groups, technical workflows, and business needs.
- Improvement requests arrived from many channels without a consistent triage model.
- Teams needed a clearer connection between research findings, design recommendations, and implementation priorities.

CONTRIBUTION

I helped turn fragmented UX feedback into a repeatable improvement model that teams could understand, prioritize, and act on.

- Established a continuous improvement process grounded in user research and measurable UX criteria.
- Conducted interviews, usability reviews, heuristic analysis, and stakeholder alignment sessions.
- Translated user feedback into prioritized recommendations, design updates, and reusable documentation.
- Helped cross-functional teams make better product decisions by connecting UX findings to business and user impact.

Problem Statement

Intel needed a more reliable method for identifying high-value UX issues and turning them into prioritized product improvements.

WHAT WAS NOT WORKING

Improvement work was often reactive, fragmented, and difficult to compare across products.

- UX issues were identified inconsistently across teams and product areas.
- Support feedback, stakeholder requests, and usability concerns were not always translated into a clear roadmap.
- Teams had limited shared criteria for deciding which UX issues mattered most, and tools for gathering data were fragmented.
- Design recommendations needed stronger evidence, clearer prioritization, and better communication.

DESIGN CHALLENGE

Create a continuous improvement model that connected research, design recommendations, prioritization, and measurable product impact.

- Make research findings actionable for product, engineering, and business stakeholders.
- Create a practical framework for ranking severity, effort, value, and user impact.
- Build a shared language for continuous improvement across teams.
- Ensure changes could be tracked, communicated, and refined over time.

Design Goals

Create a practical improvement system that helped teams move from subjective requests to evidence-based UX decisions.

01

Improve evidence

Ground recommendations in research, usability patterns, and observed user friction.

02

Support prioritization

Give teams criteria for deciding what to fix first based on impact and effort.

03

Increase transparency

Make UX issues, status, and rationale easier to communicate across stakeholders.

04

Enable reuse

Create methods and templates that could be applied across teams and products.

05

Close the loop

Track whether shipped changes reduced friction and improved the experience.

North star: make continuous UX improvement easier to understand, prioritize, ship, and measure.

Discovery and Research Conducted

The work combined research, stakeholder input, expert review, and repeatable documentation to expose the highest-value improvement opportunities.

Interviews	Discussed product needs, pain points, success criteria, and recurring UX concerns with stakeholders and internal teams.
Usability reviews	Reviewed critical flows to identify friction, unclear labeling, task interruptions, and inconsistent interaction patterns.
Heuristic analysis	Evaluated experiences against usability principles, information architecture, content clarity, accessibility, and visual consistency.
Support signal review	Used known user and stakeholder feedback patterns to identify repeat issues that needed prioritization.
Comparative analysis	Looked across similar experiences and product patterns to clarify what good looked like and where standards could improve.

Research goal: turn scattered signals into clear, comparable, and actionable product recommendations.

Design Process

A repeatable path helped the team move from discovery to prioritized improvements and stakeholder communication.

01

Understand

Gather research, support signals, stakeholder input, and usability concerns.

02

Define

Identify patterns, severity, user impact, and business relevance.

03

Prioritize

Compare issues using value, effort, urgency, and measurable impact.

04

Design

Translate findings into IA, flow, interaction, and visual recommendations.

05

Communicate

Package rationale, next steps, and implementation guidance for teams.

Operating Principles

The model was designed to be practical enough for teams to adopt and rigorous enough to support decision-making.

Evidence first

Use research and observed behavior before opinions.

Clear criteria

Make prioritization visible and understandable.

Practical delivery

Translate insight into specific product actions.

Continuous loop

Measure, learn, and refine after release.

Solution

The solution was a continuous improvement operating model for turning research into prioritized, trackable UX improvements.

PROCESS

A structured path from UX evidence to product decision-making.

- Established an intake and evaluation flow for usability issues and enhancement opportunities.
- Created a shared method for documenting findings, severity, recommendations, and next steps.
- Helped teams connect user pain points to roadmap priorities.

MODEL

A decision framework for ranking UX opportunities.

- Balanced user value, business value, effort, confidence, and risk.
- Made tradeoffs easier to discuss with product, design, engineering, and leadership.
- Reduced the chance that design work was driven only by preference.

ENABLER

Reusable templates and communication artifacts.

- Research templates for interviews, usability notes, and evaluation findings.
- Design recommendations translated into concrete IA, flow, and visual updates.
- Follow-up mechanisms to measure whether shipped improvements reduced friction.

Continuous Improvement Framework

The framework gave teams a practical way to evaluate, prioritize, and communicate improvement work.

01	**Intake**	Capture issue, source, user impact, and business context.
02	**Assess**	Rank severity, frequency, confidence, effort, and risk.
03	**Recommend**	Define the design response, rationale, and expected outcome.
04	**Track**	Follow the issue through delivery and compare results after release.

Measurement and Prioritization

The system connected qualitative evidence to practical prioritization criteria, making UX improvements easier to compare and discuss.

01

User impact

How much friction or confusion the issue created.

02

Frequency

How often the issue appeared across users, tasks, or products.

03

Business value

How closely the issue aligned to product and organizational goals.

04

Effort and risk

How difficult the change would be to design, build, test, and support.

Results and Impact

The initiative helped create a stronger foundation for measurable UX improvement across complex Intel product experiences.

Clearer

UX priorities

Shared criteria

Better

team alignment

Cross-functional clarity

Repeatable

improvement loop

Research to action

WHAT IMPROVED

- Created a more disciplined way to identify usability issues, document recommendations, and prioritize product improvements.
- Improved stakeholder alignment by making UX findings easier to understand, compare, and act on.
- Helped shift conversations from individual preference to evidence, user impact, and measurable value.
- Established reusable practices that could support future research, design reviews, and continuous improvement cycles.

Key Takeaways

The project strengthened how design insight was captured, prioritized, communicated, and converted into product action.

01	**Evidence created alignment**	Research and usability findings made product discussions less subjective and more actionable.
02	**Structure improved velocity**	A clear operating model reduced ambiguity and helped teams understand what needed to happen next.
03	**Reusable practices scaled better**	Templates, criteria, and documentation made the approach easier to repeat across other initiatives.
04	**UX became easier to measure**	Teams had a stronger path from issue identification to implementation and follow-up learning.

Why This Project Matters

This project shows how I approach complex product environments where teams need structure, alignment, and practical design leadership.

Systems thinking

I looked beyond isolated UI fixes and helped define a model that could support ongoing improvement.

Research to action

I connected qualitative evidence, heuristic findings, and stakeholder input to concrete product recommendations.

Cross-functional clarity

I helped make UX priorities easier for product, engineering, and business stakeholders to understand and support.

Reusable impact

The work created repeatable practices that could continue delivering value beyond a single release.

60-Second Talk Track

A concise overview of this project

PRESENTATION SCRIPT

“This project was focused on creating a more disciplined continuous improvement model for Intel product experiences. The challenge was that UX issues were often identified through scattered feedback, stakeholder requests, and usability observations, but teams did not always have a shared way to compare, prioritize, and act on them. My role was to help structure the process: gather evidence, evaluate severity and impact, translate findings into design recommendations, and make the work easier to communicate across product, engineering, and leadership. The result was not just a set of interface updates. It was a repeatable approach that helped teams move from subjective opinions to evidence-based decisions, making UX priorities clearer, more measurable, and easier to act on over time.”

Close with: “The value was creating clarity in a complex organization, then turning that clarity into measurable product improvement.”