CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2013

Assignment 0926 Feedback

As stated in the assignment, outcomes *1c* and *2b* max out at **|** for this assignment, because the class had not yet covered the full range of relevant concepts at this point in the semester.

Abdulrahman M. Alzaid   *AbdulZaid*

1a — Your work shows an understanding of how mental models relate to interaction design, with well-chosen illustrations of important points. You express the substance of these connections well, but mechanics and phrasing can use significant improvement. (**|**)

1b — You state, describe, and record the chosen usability metrics largely correctly. The distinction of users' familiarity with each application is an important positive aspect of your approach, with the subsequent interpretation of times as learnability vs. efficiency being the best you can do given this situation. You largely use these metrics well, except for when you attempt to add up learnability and efficiency times to make a "combined" assessment. This adding-up is not applicable to the situation—learning something new and using something familiar are very different situations. Just keep them separate throughout and your treatment of the metrics will be much better. (**|**)

1c — Your analysis focuses primarily on mental models, which is good, but makes no mention at all of guidelines, principles, or theories, and that is a big negative. There is thus virtually no indication in your report of the degree of knowledge you have of these concepts. (**–**)

2a — You have conducted a real-world usability study, and as a first go-round it is pretty decent. Measures were captured appropriately, with specific errors captured in detail and mostly proper handling of user familiarity, leading to the separation of times as either learnability or efficiency. However, your report is missing an explicit *prioritization* of usability metrics based on the tested application—you address performance on a metric-by-metric basis, but miss out on an overall statement considering *all* of the metrics; and such a statement implies some prioritization. Your documentation of the study also suffers from a number of typos, misspellings, and phrases that need rewording (see highlighted areas to get an idea of what needs more polish). Enough spoilers here to drag the proficiency down. (**/**)

2b — Your mental model discussion is the strongest part of your analysis, but unfortunately it is also the *only* part of your analysis. This proficiency is not dragged down as much as *1c* because your mental model analysis at least shows that you can *use* class concepts to make well-founded interaction design decisions, but nevertheless you were explicitly asked to go beyond that. (**/**)

4d — There's some disappointment that you weren't able to give LaTeX a go, but that is just a personal observation and not a knock on this outcome. The lack of guidelines, principles, and theories is the primary drag on this outcome, because it implies a gap in how you used the available information given in class to perform and report on this usability study. (**|**)

4e — You committed and pushed successfully, but (a) you sent this to a different repository and (b) you had only one commit. Between the two, it is (b) that is more severe—the very point of using version control is to allow you to make progress in distinct milestones. This was your first go so we won't be too severe, but definitely look to commit more often in future work, especially the programming assignments. (**|**)

4f — Submitted on time, although not exactly as specified in the instructions. (**|**)