

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

## Assignment 0926 Feedback

As stated in the assignment, outcomes *1c* and *2b* max out at | for this assignment, because the class had not yet covered the full range of relevant concepts at this point in the semester.

Thomas E. Bramanti

*jadengore*

*1a* — Your heuristic evaluation shows a good understanding of how mental models are formed and mapped between developers and users, and you provide concrete illustrations of this. (+)

*1b* — For the chosen metrics of learnability, efficiency, and satisfaction, your work demonstrates an initial understanding of their meanings but not a complete one. The tests conducted sound like they actually conflate both elements of learnability (“figuring things out”) and efficiency (“how long it took”). In addition, learnability is presented here as a score or level, when, like efficiency, it is actually a measure of time. For satisfaction, data are provided, but there is no mention of *how* these scores were determined. (/)

*1c* — Your analysis makes good use of specific interaction design principles and a little bit from guidelines and theories. The analyses are illustrated well by screenshots, and the application of the concepts is generally appropriate. Keep this up as we accrue more concepts and things will work out well. (|)

*2a* — You have successfully conducted and documented a real-world usability study. As indicated previously, some of the measures and methods were based on misunderstandings about the metrics, but that “ding” has already been applied in *1b*. You document the results sufficiently, and correlate them well to underlying concepts. One thing that *is* missing is a prioritization that determines an overall “winner” based on metrics. Yes, on a per-metric basis, there are clear leaders, but what is your judgment *overall*? Making this call requires prioritization, which allows you to make a choice when one system does well with one metric but not as well with another. Explicitly making this choice is important, despite a diversity of factors, because, “out in the field,” that is what you will have to do—out of multiple design options, you will choose to develop *one*. That requires the ability to navigate differences in performance plus a clear prioritization when certain factors are “tied.” (/)

*2b* — You draw effective conclusions from your data, and your reasoning is expressed in an appropriate tone with generally correct mechanics, given the information presented in class so far. Continue with this as we advance further into the class and this will “max out” nicely. (|)

*4d* — Your work shows good use of the resources at hand with an ability to figure things out on your own (e.g., LaTeX). (+)

*4e* — You committed and pushed successfully, with decent commit messages and a “starter” frequency of 3 commits. As you get the hang of things, you’ll want to get more granular with your commits, especially for the programming assignments. (|)

*4f* — Submitted on time. (+)

### Updated feedback based on commits up to 12/3/2013 (only re-reviewed proficiencies are listed):

*1b* — The revised procedure described in the “improvements” section more correctly captures the learnability and efficiency metrics. Still no sign though on how satisfaction was captured, but that is minor compared to the misunderstanding on learnability and efficiency. (+)

*2a* — You explicitly identify satisfaction as the priority metric and provide a reasonable basis for this prioritization. The results revealed an interesting inverse relationship between satisfaction and efficiency. (+)