

CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2012

Assignment I 129 Feedback

Chase Blokker

1a — Your core idea is clever, but your paper presents just that, the core idea. It does not include a rationale for the idea, nor much less link it to the mental model you would like to convey to the user. (/)

1c — There is no explicit mention of any interaction design guideline, principle, or theory in your writeup at all. There is an allusion to skeuomorphism, but no reason given for why this choice is made. (/)

1d — The ball tilt idea suggests that you have chosen to combine direct manipulation with menus/forms/dialogs, but there is no explicit mention of this as an intentional choice, so there is no clear demonstration of your knowledge or understanding of interaction styles. (/)

1e — Knowledge of affordances is suggested by the skeuomorphism reference and the ball tilt maze, but again these are all implicit. You need to show clearly that you know what you are saying, and that all of your choices are fully intentional and well-founded. (/)

2a — It is clear that you wanted to deliver the ball-tilt maze experience to your users, but there is no rationale or mapping for how this addresses the real-world interaction design needs of Headmaster's users. (/)

2c — You have the early beginnings of some analysis when you mention the possibility of user error in your dream interface, but beyond that there is no further use of knowledge from the course in making an interaction design decision. (/)

4d — No explicit references or citations are made beyond the ball-tilt maze mention. There is little evidence here that you used available resources to inform your dream interface design decisions. (/)

4e — You have only one commit, although its message is decently descriptive. Even at this fairly preliminary-looking stage, I think you could have broken up the work a little bit more. (|)

4f — Submitted on time, but what is there looks unfinished. (|)

CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2012

Assignment I 129 Feedback

Chase Blokker

(updated feedback based on commits up to 12/14/2012; only re-evaluated outcomes are included)

1a — Your core ideas are more comprehensive and better-expressed in this version, with improved reasoning behind these choices. References to users' mental models of the application exist, although they more specifically address their mental model of the labyrinth game rather than the mental model for Headmaster. There are hints of this with the revised Google-like search interface; more of that, pertaining to other Headmaster-specific features or functions, would be what puts this over the top. (I)

1c — You explicitly reference Apple's iOS Human Interface Guidelines as the basis for the "conventional" version of your interface, and generally follow them in your description. Some chosen guidelines are a given, though—that is, if you use standard iOS controls, you will largely satisfy the "Controls should look tappable" and "App structure should be clean and easy to navigate" guidelines, so those are almost trivial mentions. Better-treated are "Design for touch" and "Let people scroll," with your descriptions of assorted swipes and gestures in the sections that follow. Conversely, guidelines and principles are somewhat underutilized in describing the labyrinth interface. Overall, you started to move in the right direction here, but both broader and deeper coverage would be needed to merit a +. (I)

1d — You address interaction styles more explicitly in this version, and connect their strengths and weaknesses to your choices and intentions with your dream design. But your reasoning and motivation are generally better stated here, with references to the respective interaction styles and relatively better coverage than the other interaction design issues for the paper. (+)

1e — Knowledge of affordances remains centered on skeuomorphism reference and the ball tilt maze, but this is addressed a little more explicitly now. I think there was a missed opportunity in that you could also have discussed affordances with regard to the "conventional" version of the user interface—what tells the user which is swipable? What parts invite scrolling and other gestures? There are some nice aspects there that would have completed your treatment. (I)

2a — Overall, your labyrinth idea remains audacious and a bit of a stretch—sort of like including Solitaire with Windows. But the fact that this analogy can be made speaks to your improved addressing of real-world use cases to your design. The conventional elements, particularly the revised search and touch-adapted student sections, also address real-world use very well. (+)

2c — You address usability metrics much better in this version, talking about them explicitly and connecting them to the different interaction styles in your design. Your treatment is particularly good when connecting metrics to the revised search interface. That portion just gets you over to + territory, although admittedly I wish you did it more just to really nail that proficiency. (+)

4d — iOS Human Interface Guidelines are now referenced, in addition to the labyrinth game. However, your expanded coverage of interaction design concepts also begs explicit citation of sources such as our textbooks and other sources. Your use of the information is evident, but not clearly documented. (I)

4e — Your resubmit commit log shows better phasing, and even more descriptive messages. (+)