

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. (+)