

CMSI 370-01

INTERACTION DESIGN

Fall 2015

Assignment 0924 Feedback

Because we have not yet fully explored the scopes of outcomes *1b* and *2b*, these proficiencies have a maximum value (for this assignment) of |. For outcomes that get +’s (or |’s for *1b* and *2b*), there isn’t much more to say except “keep doing it that way.” :) Feedback for other proficiencies focus on specific points of improvement in order to advance. The answer to “how do I improve my proficiencies” is always “do what I write down in the feedback.”

Flanders Lorton

florton / freeflowingvortex@gmail.com

Notes while reading:

- Pity about the missed standardization on the collection of data. Complete data for 10 people will still suffice, but the idea that there might have been more is a little tantalizing.
- The measured times are not clearly identified as learnability or efficiency. Which is it?
- (gets to next section) Ohhhh, you timed everyone and *then* decided if that time was learnability or efficiency based on the user’s experience. I can see this now, although I would have immediately presented the data already separating learnability from efficiency because it is not useful to see those numbers side-by-side anyway.
- Also, what is your third metric? Errors seems to be the one, but if so, then these should be quantified.
- This section is well-illustrated, but with the separation of learnability and efficiency here, it displays some inconsistency of structure compared to the previous section.
- ...And your third metric turns out to be satisfaction. OK, I did not see that coming, because there was no satisfaction data! If the intent was for the comments to reflect satisfaction, then that is insufficient because there is no objective quantity that can be attached to that. A quick survey or questionnaire would have done the trick.

Overall commentary: The study lacked some standardization, but that is clearly documented here and can be worked around. The core issues with the study methodology are the commingling of learnability and efficiency, and the missing quantification of satisfaction. This muddles the data a little, and for satisfaction it does not facilitate easy comparison. Not that the qualitative assessment is not useful; it just isn’t applicable to certain interpretation approaches. As for the document, the mental model reasoning is clear and the illustrations support your assertions well. However, there is a dearth of supporting concepts from the course: no guidelines were used, and no principles were referenced. This makes the difference from a “common sense” analysis to a grounded approach that shows knowledge of the discipline.

1a — +

*1b — / ...*This is where the missed course concepts impact the outcomes.

*2a — / ...*The report is strongest in the discussion section; however the initial conflation of timing data plus the missed standardization of the study impact here. Also, a clearer structure reminiscent of formal scholarly work (introduction, methods, discussion, conclusion) would strengthen the flow of the report.

*2b — | ...*Conclusions from the information that *is* used are well-formed and supported by illustrations.

*4d — | ...*The “information use” clause is affected by the need to use more concepts from the course.

4e — Good phasing though commit messages can be more descriptive. Plus, files are not in the requested location and the repository is not private yet. (*/*)

4f — Mostly submitted on time, with a catch-up correction on September 27...we’ll let that one go based on its relative size. (+)