

**CMSI 370-01**  
**INTERACTION DESIGN**  
Fall 2013

**Assignment 1105 Feedback**

Andrew T. Sullivan

*atsullivan*

1a — Your paper shows some understanding of how interaction design relates to mental models, but admittedly does not address this explicitly. This comes from the way you talk about Pfeiffer's metrics and how they affect usability. Generally sensible and understandable, but missing out on fully demonstrating understanding because it doesn't use our established vocabulary and terminology. (I)

1b — Your coverage of the usability metrics in this paper is definitely of sufficient breadth. What is in question is a deeper understanding of what these metrics mean and what is behind their validity. With the sole exception of cognitive load vs. learnability, the paper seems to generally accept Pfeiffer's flavor of these metrics without question, when in fact there are points that are worth calling out, like the change in measurement unit for efficiency from a flat-out time measure to a "1-to-10" score. I think there is room here to be more critical and questioning of the Pfeiffer approach; the assignment is about "evaluating the evaluator" after all. (I)

1c — A major gap in the work is the lack of explicit mention of interaction design guidelines, principles, theories, and other concepts seen in class so far. Involving these ideas would have, I think, held up a more insightful mirror on the quality of Pfeiffer's evaluation. It would also have given you a more solid foundation for critical analysis of the activity. (I)

2a — Your paper is a "study of a study," which is perfectly fine. Missing here, though, is additional background from the literature that would have served as a nice arsenal for evaluating the quality of the Pfeiffer work. Without this background, the Pfeiffer report sort of stands alone and it becomes hard to refute the conclusions that this report draws out. (I)

2b — Your final conclusion (a little trickier to pick out than expected because you don't have explicit sections and there seems to be a stray paragraph at the end of the writeup) is based solely on usability metrics, which can be appropriate but in this case is not quite successful because there are still some valid questions that can be asked about their approach. Adding other concepts to the mix might have focused those questions better. (I)

4d — Your lack of additional references outside of the Pfeiffer report itself is definitely a weakness, as has been pointed out in the other outcomes. Without other information, it is very difficult to challenge what is otherwise a polished, professional document—and, as already stated, there definitely are valid areas to be challenged, outside of the cognitive-load-vs.-learnability question that you do point out. (I)

4e — Your commit count is a little less than what would be appropriate for work of this scale, and the commits all took place within less than 48 hours. This is not the timetable that is envisioned for an assignment like this. Try to spread the work out a little better. In addition, your commit messages can certainly be more descriptive—virtually every message was just some variation on "adding more." Added what? And was it all just adding? Ideally there is a proofread cycle somewhere in there. (I)

4f — Paper submitted on time, but responses to questions from Dr. Hellige's talk were not submitted. (I)