CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2013

Assignment 1206 Feedback

Abdulrahman M. Alzaid   *AbdulZaid*

1a — Your dream design paper does not address mental models at all. As the many inline comments say, the paper focuses on what a 3D scanner can do, and not *how* a user communicates with a 3D scanner. The latter is the interface; the former is the functionality or application. (**–**)

1c — Your mention of interaction design concepts is a mixed bag. You mention some of the metrics, but get one of them wrong (effectiveness is not a metric). You identify certain phrases as being interaction design concepts, but if they are, you are not using the established terminology in class. "Good understanding of user needs" *could* possibly be a reference to the "Know thy user" principle from Shneiderman, but if it is, *then you should use the exact terminology*. You also mention "finishing the task at hand without making unnecessary attention to itself"—what concept is that? I don't recognize it. There are many other examples, mentioned in the inline feedback. (**–**)

2b — Because your mention of interaction design concepts is shaky, then so is your use of them to make interaction design decisions. Perhaps the closest segment is how you correctly identify this application's sensitivity to errors. I agree with that. But, so what then? How do you guard against that? How does the system tell the user where to put the object? How does the system tell the user when/how much to rotate it? Again, there is hardly an interaction design decision in sight, so *2b* remains undemonstrated. (**–**)

4d — The very mix-up of functionality vs. interface strongly suggests that you have not been able to use available resources to understand what a "user interface design" is. The application itself really stretches what the homework defines as acceptable for this assignment. There seem to be misunderstandings all around. At least you found an interesting starting point, in the form of that figure from makerbot. But you need to build more around it instead of focusing on its raw functionality (capability, speed, real-world applications, etc.) (**/**)

4e — Your commit frequency and messages are appropriate for this work. Timing could have been better, but it was the last assignment for the semester, so… (**+**)

4f — Submitted on time. (**+**)

Updated feedback based on commits up to 12/14/2013; only re-evaluated outcomes are included:

1a — Your revised paper shows better focus on how a user interacts with a 3D scanner. A discussion of what the user needs for effective scanning is present, alongside a user interface description that seeks to address those needs. A spoiler here is the lack of illustration of the *actual* design; you have a barcode-scanning app which is similar but not identical, then another showing a large hardware setup. These convey some of the ideas but not the exact concept. (**|**)

1c — Your revised paper mentions a decent collection of guidelines and principles, with a clear statement as well of your dream interface's primary interaction style. I do think for the latter, you missed that the very handling of the object also involves direct manipulation, and the feedback you are envisioning also has that orientation. Finally, with such specific sources, they should all be in your references. (**|**)

2b — Your revisions now appropriately describe a 3D scanner user interface design, alongside a reasonable rationale for your design decisions. If only we can *see* that design firsthand now, even as just a sketch… (**|**)

4d — You have successfully separated the difference between utility and usability in your revision, and there is definitely a better focus on usability here. You have also found some sources to support your work better, although here too you should also cite the interaction design literature, not just the 3D scanner. (**+**)