

**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.

Anthony B. Menjivar

*TonyMenji*

*1a* — No cohesive heuristic evaluation was performed (or at least documented), and so you have not shown that you understand how mental models are formed and mapped between developers and users. There are scattered bits of commentary here and there, but not enough to constitute a concerted effort. (–)

*1b* — Your work indicates a superficial understanding of the five usability metrics. Your report states them and show a basic knowledge of their meaning, and data was indeed gathered, but the way that the information is reported back shows a great need to review what it means to have a metric and how best to document this information. The use of *memorability* is furthest off-base, and the timing information is never clearly categorized as learnability (“time to figure things out”) and efficiency (“time to perform a known task”). Errors and satisfaction are closest, but in the end they are still not presented in an effective manner, and for satisfaction, the report never states how you acquired those “out of 10” ratings. (–)

*1c* — No analysis using specific interaction design guidelines, principles, and theories, nor any other concepts discussed in class, was seen in your report. (–)

*2a* — You seem to have successfully conducted and documented a real-world usability study. However, the report of this study presents the gathered information in a most ineffective way. The report neither prioritizes the selected metrics (to help with a final decision) nor correlates them well to underlying concepts. These activities are integral parts of conducting the study. (–)

*2b* — As already mentioned, no heuristic analysis is seen in your report, and thus there is also no interaction design decision nor recommendation regarding the three systems. As mentioned, there are hints of connectivity between things that were observed and the results that emerged, but those are scattered all over the place, with inconsistent levels of detail. It is also not enough to just make observations and guesses—you also need to use the vocabulary of the field. The report contains none of these elements.

Finally, there were many mechanical corrections here and there; enough to be extremely distracting. Please review the changes and comments in the document for these issues. (–)

*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 incorrect use of metrics, and the lack of guidelines, principles, and theories are the primary drags on this outcome, because these imply 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 a tiny bit late, and also not exactly as specified in the instructions. (|)

**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.

Anthony B. Menjivar

TonyMenji

### **Updated feedback based on commits up to 12/13/2013; only re-reviewed outcomes are included:**

*1a* — There is still no cohesive heuristic evaluation in your report, and so you have not shown that you understand how mental models are formed and mapped between developers and users. Your conclusion comes closest to doing this, but it barely starts looking at differences among the applications before it's suddenly all over. (–)

*1b* — Your final revision shows a better understanding of what the five usability metrics mean, but there are still some stark gaps. First, the paper does the right thing by not mixing memorability into any of the measurements anymore, but the section that discusses it clearly starts in the wrong direction before it cuts short abruptly. Next, your treatment of efficiency goes too far in the opposite direction: you failed to recognize that your iTunes users *are* showing you efficiency with the times that you measured. The issue is that you just can't lump those times with the others. Still, wouldn't it be interesting to look at those for iTunes, then compare those to learnability? I mean, if a proficient user on one system takes longer to perform a task than a *novice* user on another, that makes for something interesting, right? (/)

*1c* — Still no analysis using specific interaction design guidelines, principles, and theories, nor any other concepts discussed in class, was seen in your report. (–)

*2a* — Your report presents your study's information in a slightly better way, but it still neither prioritizes the selected metrics (to help with a final decision) nor correlates them well to underlying concepts. As mentioned before, these activities are integral parts of conducting the study. (–)

*2b* — You are a little clearer about calling out which systems performed best with each *individual* metric, but without proper prioritization, you are unable to “declare” an overall winner. Plus, with still no heuristic analysis, we have no qualitative sense at all of why one system did better over another.

Finally, there is still a great need for mechanical corrections here and there; enough to be extremely distracting. The mid-sentence break in the memorability section is particularly glaring, but really there is a lot of that here and there: incomplete sentences, awkward phrases, copied paragraphs, etc. It really is not acceptable to submit something that you yourself have not read through at least twice more. (–)

*4d* — You have successfully ported your work over to LaTeX, and did a generally good job of it. However, as mentioned before, that was not the primary issue with this outcome. Your treatment of metrics is definitely better, but the report still lacks substantial conceptual discussion using the vocabulary given in class. It really still looks like you barely used the available information given in class to perform and report on this usability study. (/...a higher / than before, but still not enough to go |)