CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2014

Assignment 0925 Feedback

Because we have not yet fully explored the scopes of outcomes *1b* and *2b*, those proficiencies have a maximum value (for this assignment) of **|**. That proficiency, for those outcomes, carry the signal "keep doing what you're doing."

Jackson Souza   *jacksonsouza / jacksonsouza@me.com*

Well-written and well-reasoned…but not well-illustrated. That is the primary shortcoming in what is otherwise an engaging and interesting heuristic analysis. There was also some disconnect between the metrics and the analysis, as if the specific numbers seen (higher efficiency, fewer errors) merely said "iOS performed better," after which they were locked away and the analysis was then solely focused on "better" as a quality rather than "faster" or "less error-prone." An imbalance was also noted between references to Android guidelines vs. iOS—Android guidelines seemed to be used more than iOS guidelines, thus leading to the impression that the performance differential was more about what Android did wrong vs. what iOS did right, when the reality is probably somewhere in between.

1a — I think there is certainly an understanding of mental models here, but a number of items pertain to visual characteristics and as such would have greatly benefited from illustrations/figures. This sort of undermines the whole "mental model" thing because now, here, *you* have a mental model to transfer to the reader and the lack of figures impedes that transfer. (**|**)

1b (max **|**) — Good use of guidelines and some principles, although as mentioned Android seemed to get called out more than iOS. Plus, what you called "continuity," as logical as that name is, actually *does* have an established term, used and agreed upon by multiple parties. And thus…you should use it too. (**/**)

2a — The documentation of the study was somewhat disjointed in the end because of the specific results found and how those results informed the analysis. Plus, the aforementioned lack of illustrations definitely weakened the report's impact. Fortunately, the writing voice is clear, and sufficient proofreading appears to have been done (outside of the realization that integrating the two items more closely would have produced a stronger report), so that keeps things from falling too far. (**|**)

2b (max **|**) — Guidelines and principles, aptly named or not (and well-illustrated or not), were still applied well and build a decent case for explaining the measured results. (**|**)

4d — **+**

4e — Let's work on that habit of using GitHub *while* you work and not solely *after* you're done. (**/**)

4f — **+**