CMSI 370-01

INTERACTION DESIGN

Fall 2015

Assignment 1020 (due 1022) Feedback

All applicable outcomes can now reach maximum proficiency values with this assignment.

Christopher Dellomes *cjdellomes / cjdellomes@gmail.com*

Notes while reading Resizing:

- Regarding the overall "resizing" page: the intent is to actually cover *all* types of resizing, and not just windows. (*1a*, *4d*)
- Typo in *Typical Appearance*: "mousce icon." (*2a*)
- Having a single version of the resize cursor illustrated can be misleading. Ideally this is a grid showing all varieties (diagonals, vertical, horizontal). (*2a*)
- For the state diagram, the edges should be labeled with the actions taken. For example, the arrow leading from **standby** to **resizing** should have a label like "mouse down on resize boundary" or something like that. The text actually says something close to this in the last paragraph. (*1a*)
- For the *Component in Action* section, can the video be embedded? And if not, maybe at least include a still thumbnail which then links to the video. (*2a*)
- Given the limitation in scope to just window resizing, the *Variants* section is predictably very brief (which should have been a sign that your perspective of resizing was a bit too narrow). But if we break out toward other instances of resizing, this can be quite rich and illustration-filled. (*1a*, *2a*, *4d*)
- In *Priority Metrics*, I think a little more detail is needed for learnability. The issue is that some modern platforms don't have a visible "handle" to represent a resize point; it is just the border. How does a completely new user discover this capability? Running the mouse over borders is one thing, but with the rise of mobile devices, one *might* encounter users who are not familiar with this. Something to consider here. (*1a*)
- Efficiency is not addressed in *Priority Metrics*. Maybe it doesn't matter, but you should still say that, so that the reader does not think you forgot about it. However, there *is* an interesting point to consider for efficiency: how does traditional window resizing compare to, say, side-by-side full-height windows (i.e., the feature introduced in Windows 7)? (*1a*, *1b*, *2b*)
- The *Key Characteristics* section is way too thin. Is it really just feedback (although the point about a guide rectangle vs. live content resizing is a good one)? How about the use of Fitts's law to make the resizable "handle" are just the right size? How about Clearly Marked Exits, in case a user wants to unconditionally cancel a resize operation? Or finally how about consistency, so that a user can reliably recognize any object that is resizeable, not just windows in particular? This is the main section to demonstrate your *1b* and *2b* outcomes, yet there is very little here. (*1b*, *2b*)
- Specific references are decent, but how about the general conceptual ones like Nielsen or Shneiderman? Also, do the Windows guidelines say anything about resizing? (*4d*)

Notes while reading Zooming:

- The state diagram for zooming is mislinked. (*2a*)
- The *Component in Action* video strikes me as somewhat rough, not very well-made nor spoken; surely there is something better out there. Or, you can make your own. (*2a*)
- For *Variants*, I think you missed a pretty common application that uses zooming: maps! (*1a*)
- Plus, this is a prime section to have illustrations, due to the different kinds available. (*2a*)

CMSI 370-01

INTERACTION DESIGN

Fall 2015

Assignment 1020 (due 1022) Feedback

All applicable outcomes can now reach maximum proficiency values with this assignment.

- The *Priority Metrics* section has some good insights—I do indeed agree that the learnability of zooming is not great. +(*1b*, *2b*)
- And what's with that inconsistent spacing between the second and third paragraphs of *Priority Metrics*?
- Like *Key Characteristics* in the Resizing page, this one is also too thin. The very issue that zooming has with learnability can be explored more here: consistency, for example, can help users recognize when something is even *zoomable*. Consistency also emerges when it comes to keyboard shortcuts: despite what your page says, sometimes the zoom in/out keys *are* different from one application to another. Visibility is also a potentially important characteristic. There are definitely a few more. (*1b*, *2b*)
- The *Platform-Specific Instances* section, like *Variants*, is a prime place for illustrations. The text, as it is, is nearly a repeat of what came before. Instead it should focus on the finer points of this behavior on specific platforms. (*1b*, *2a*)
- References here have similar issues to the Resizing page, and are actually a tad less related: you've got iOS but not Windows; and general references are not used. (*4d*)

1a — **|** …You've captured things to a degree, but missed the more general case, particular with resizing.

1b — **/** …In the end, only metrics and the single principle of feedback are mentioned, and those were explicitly prompted. Not much else in terms of other concepts and information.

2a — **|** …Execution is OK, but not amazing either. Some errors/typos are noticeable; more images/illustrations would have been good; the chosen videos aren't that great.

2b — **|** …There are some nice seeds here, especially in the *Priority Metrics* section, but this is limited by the number of actual interaction design concepts that are brought to the table.

4d — **|** …References for specific technologies are OK, but there are sources whose use is implied but not mentioned (e.g., Nielsen), and localized citation would have also helped the reader discern which reference was used where.

4e — You successfully issued a pull request. Commit frequency and messages are good, plus they are nicely spread out over a period of around 8 days. Some effective work and time management there **:)** (**+**)

4f — Submitted on time. (**+**)