

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.

Andrew R. Kowalczyk

frodosamoa

1a — Your heuristic evaluation is very preliminary, and barely addresses how mental models are formed and mapped between developers and users. (–)

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 is too cursory to make good use of specific interaction design guidelines, principles, and theories. Mental models are mentioned, but neither illustrated nor followed through. (–)

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 — As already mentioned, your heuristic analysis is extremely preliminary as submitted, and hardly makes any kind of interaction design decision or recommendation regarding the three systems. (–)

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 appropriate frequency. Funny, looking at your *git* log side-by-side with the first-timers, it struck me how *palpable* the difference is between how you use *git* and how the newbies do. Well done! (+)

4f — Submitted on time. (+)

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

1a — Your heuristic evaluation provides a thorough analysis of user mental models and how each shopping site caters their user interfaces to these models. (+)

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. (+)

1c — Your heuristic evaluation discusses menus, forms, and dialogs in detail, but hardly mentions any other interaction design concepts like guidelines or principles. (/)

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. (+)

2b — You provide a sensible basis for how each shopping site would fare in terms of metrics. (|)