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. (**|**)