

CMSI 370-01

INTERACTION DESIGN

Fall 2015

Assignment 0924 Feedback

Because we have not yet fully explored the scopes of outcomes *1b* and *2b*, these proficiencies have a maximum value (for this assignment) of |. For outcomes that get +’s (or |’s for *1b* and *2b*), there isn’t much more to say except “keep doing it that way.” :) Feedback for other proficiencies focus on specific points of improvement in order to advance. The answer to “how do I improve my proficiencies” is always “do what I write down in the feedback.”

Ed Seim

SirSeim / sirseim@gmail.com

Notes while reading:

- Good idea, documenting user familiarity.
- Aaand the times very nicely bear out the difference between the two user groups :)
- Tables are fine for numeric detail, but some other visualization might have helped convey additional insights about the metrics.
- Uhhh where’s the satisfaction data?
- Section 3.1 typo; “collectio” should be “collection;” “It” should be “If;” “wuld” should be “would;” “google” should be capitalized; “advtange” should be “advantage.” Etc.
- Involving the purchase model for Kindle is a touch unfair, because that is partially motivated by Apple’s policies. Probably best to have bought the book already, so that the task is focused on the app.
- Nice observation about user expectation on search behavior. That is mental model thinking right there.
- No error analysis? I guess that was not one of your official metrics, but you did collect data. And considering that there is nothing on satisfaction either, de facto your analysis ends up with just two metrics.
- Yikes so many more typos.
- Despite minimal Amazon guidelines, note that Kindle is still an iOS app, and it would still be fair to look at Kindle from the point of view of *those* guidelines.
- Ooooooh section 4 could have really benefited from screenshots. Especially 4.4 when you claim that arguments can be made both ways.

Overall commentary: Lots of good seeds here but the overall impression that I get is...unfinished. Study looks good, but satisfaction is nowhere to be seen despite being mentioned in the introduction. Error data was collected but barely mentioned. The analysis is sound for what is there, but there’s a lot that isn’t there too, including the already-mentioned missing metrics and the lack of illustrations. Finally, typos may be a small thing but they do convey [lack of] polish—it doesn’t look like you re-read this much after typing it.

1a — + ...some good ideas here; not done justice by the rest of the content.

1b — | ...the understanding and usage are definitely there, but...

2a — / ...execution and documentation fall quite short, as noted already.

2b — / ...what is there is used well, but the missing metrics and illustrations weigh the good stuff down.

4d — + ...good job using the guidelines as reference points.

4e — Very well-phased, with descriptive messages. (+)

4f — Submitted on time. (+)