

CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2014

Assignment 1 | 27 Feedback

Due to time constraints, feedback has been limited to an overall assessment here with accompanying proficiencies. If you have questions on what you see here, please let me know.

Daniel Levine, Adrian Ruiz, & Michael Kinney

dannymlevine / dannymlevine1@gmail.com

This is certainly a good idea and a natural fit, to join Oculus Rift with the Nimble Sense. I think, though, that despite the many images, I would have had trouble, from just reading your paper, exactly *what* the two of these devices would do together. Had I not spoken to you that one time in the Keck Lab, I don't think I would have understood what you were doing until deep into the paper.

I think the issue here is that there is a lot of focus on their individual capabilities, but not too much with them together. For example, only Figure 2 shows the devices together somehow. Figure 3 is a little confusing because the caption says the Oculus Rift is "on its own," but the pictured user is trying to reach for an object as if the Nimble Sense *were* watching it. Figure 4 now switches to *just* the Nimble Sense. Finally, Figure 5 intends to show a little something on how the two devices would interoperate, but what is shown is not complete. It isn't until Figure 6 that a truly concrete illustration of Rift + Sense interaction emerges. And so, yes, I do mean that some sketching from you, no matter how crude, is needed in order to get your idea across. This is most useful in your second scenario, which I think is the one that truly starts to show the potential of Rift + Sense interaction. But alas, it lasts a single paragraph then is over.

So, getting past that and just "cheating" by factoring in our conversation in the Keck Lab, what else can we say? Your design rationale is ultimately quite short, devoting one paragraph to two ideas, "Know Thy User" and "Choose an Interaction Style." I would have peppered design rationale language *throughout* your paper, because ideally that rationale should be the foundation of your decisions anyway. Your usability metrics forecast is pretty thorough at least, although a little cursory. I found myself asking more questions when reading that section. For example, how does one reconcile your view of weak errors against strong learnability and efficiency? Won't errors drag those down? For satisfaction, there seems to be an overriding assumption that the technology itself is satisfying, and that immersion is automatically appealing. How will that square with having goggles and a camera on your head all the time? It's not that I think you're going down the wrong path, but that you're not looking too far down this path.

Random Notes:

- Still some occasional non-LaTeX quotes...remember it's just `` and ''.

1a — |

1b — +

2b — |

4d — | ...You cite mostly product/mainstream information here, where I think you could have gained some good insight from scholarly/research work in the area of virtual environments, gestural interfaces, and [somewhat] augmented reality.

4e — +

4f — +