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."

Nicholas Soffa   *SoffaKing88 / zaramath88@gmail.com*

Notes while reading:

- "User performance" is not a usability metric. Stick to the precise terms; there would have been no problem with saying "efficiency, errors, and satisfaction" directly in this sentence.

- For the first task, there is an observation that some users could not find a menu item on the Xbox One. But this is also supposed to be an efficiency measure. The problem here is that efficiency assumes that users are familiar with the system. However, if they merely could not find an item, that appears to contradict the condition that they know their way around. Casts some doubt on the process here.

- For game search, there is also some doubt of the PS4 subjects' knowledge, because as reported, they actually were not familiar with the PS4's autofill feature.

- "User satisfaction was very similar"—but where is the data? How was this measured?

- The heuristic analysis would have benefited from screenshots. Words like "cluttered" and "simple" are potentially subjective, and best supported with illustrations so the reader can judge for themselves.

- That last sentence about the search engine seems out of place; the whole rest of the paragraph was about main screen layout, but not this sentence.

- The suggestion at the end is a nice idea, but not really what we're looking for with this report.

- Finally, the analysis was purely common sense; no course terms, guidelines, or principles were used. There is some mental model-ish analysis but the phrase "mental model" itself does not come up so it is not clear if there was an awareness that this concept was being used.

Overall commentary: The report leaves some questions on whether efficiency was truly measured vs. learnability. This ambiguity hints at insufficient familiarity with terms used in the class. Satisfaction was supposedly measure but no data was supplied. The heuristic analysis brings up some decent common-sense points, but they are not well-illustrated and do not make use of concepts or terms learned in class.

1a — **|** …Decent but intentionality is unclear.

1b — **/** …No actual concepts mentioned in the heuristic analysis; only metrics stated, but even those are potentially used incorrectly.

2a — **/** …Lack of precision in terms and missing satisfaction data are major holes.

2b — **/** …In addition to missing concepts, little supporting evidence like screenshots.

4d — **+**

4e — A single commit…of a 1-byte file. I'll give you another chance to commit this without prejudice. Do verify that things landed correctly on the GitHub website. (*update—correct file not seen; commit was on time but not pushed…good to see the file there, but that was still a single commit:* **/**)

4f — Submitted on time. (**+**)