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."

Vic Frolov   *VicFrolov / vicfrolov@gmail.com*

Notes while reading:

- Watch those LaTeX quotes—not consistently using `` `` `` and `` '' ``, sometimes falling into standard double-quote characters.
- Learnability implies that the users had never used Apple Watch nor Google Glass before…but this shouldn't just be implied. It should be stated explicitly to avoid any confusion.
- Error data sounds good but is expressed in reverse: instead of counting error incidences, the information was reported in terms of the number of users who committed an error. This is not inaccurate, but it does not capture the possibility that the same user may have committed the same error multiple times—a factor that can be relevant in assessing usability.
- Again implied is the way satisfaction was measured. It sounds like the users were asked to supply a rating from 1 to 10. But again, better to be explicit than implicit.
- Believe it or not, that discrepancy between satisfaction and other metrics happens a lot. There was a well-known study where users expressed a preference for toolbars with icon buttons over pure menus, even though they performed faster and with fewer errors when using pure menus. Draw your own conclusions **:)**
- Parentheticals should be preceded by whitespace.
- You're using LaTeX, so take advantage of its full figure support: give your figures numbers and captions.
- What's with all the `\par` directives?
- A little too much marketing information to start the heuristic analysis section (prices, social commentary)—not really related to mental models nor usability.
- …and heuristic analysis is over before it started. Beyond the product description, there is very little substance to connect the results to design choices, adherence to guidelines, known principles, etc. Some mental model ideas were touched on, but not followed through to the data. If anything, the results were just repeated in this section, but not connected.
- Ack, BibTeX not used for the references. Another missed opportunity.

Overall commentary: Short of some missing procedural glitches (user population; error counts by user than overall rates; how satisfaction is measured), the study part of the report is clear and thorough. The analysis is very thin though, barely touching on course concepts. No guidelines are referenced, and the sole take-home is "users know touch screens better"—certainly more can be said about that. If that alone were true, then setting the reminder should have been better on the Apple Watch also, but it wasn't.

1a — **|**
1b — **/**
2a — **+**

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."

2b — **/**

4d — **+**

4e — Good phasing, decent messages. But please add *.DS_Store* to your *.gitignore* and don't commit build products (e.g., **.aux*, **.log*, etc.). (**|**)

4f — Submitted on time. (**+**)