Assignment 0918 Feedback

Joe Crawley

(you didn't really have an individually distinct report from Terran's, as instructed in the assignment; that also generally weakened my evaluation of your submission)

1b — Your writeups demonstrate an understanding of the metrics involved in this assignment quite well. (**+**)

1c — Your guidelines writeup starts out in the right direction, but ultimately falls short. You have a good source with clear rules, and you have screenshots for one site, *match.com*, and you draw a conclusion that this site rates best overall. However, that conclusion is weakened because you don't show supporting examples from the other sites (presumably those would show weaker compliance with the *usability.gov* guidelines, yes?). Plus, you just quote the guideline and show a screenshot, which actually includes a lot more elements than just what the guideline states. So, this part needs more discussion and explanation than what was already there. (**/**)

2a — Your sense of how users approached or modeled the two systems is explored and explained well. (**+**)

2b — Although the recording and reporting of usability metrics results was clear, the conclusion does not make any specific prioritization of which metric is most important. Remember that one context within which you may be doing this "for real" is to make a decision on which user interface to implement. A decision like this leans heavily on your usability metric prioritization. (**/**)

2c — Your interface decision was made somewhat easier by the general dominance of *match.com* in the metrics, and you do come out and say this fairly clearly. What's missing is your view of how this correlates with guidelines compliance. It sounds like you feel that *match.com* does also comply with the *usability.gov* guidelines better than the others, but there is not much evidence for this in that section of the document. (**/**)

4d — Resource and documentation use is well-demonstrated. (**+**)

4e — Commit frequency is, well, *once*. I know that this isn't a coding assignment and therefore lends itself to fewer versioning milestones, but at the same time you probably still worked on this submission in more than one stage. So that needs to improve. The lone commit message that you have seems fairly descriptive, but I will need to see more in order to make a better call. (**/**)

4f — Submitted on time. (**+**)

CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2012

Assignment 0918 Feedback

Joe Crawley

(updated feedback based on your commits on or before 12/8/2012; only re-evaluated proficiencies are included in this update)

1c — Your guidelines writeup has a decent selection of guidelines from a well-identified source (*usability.gov*), and you assess how each system fares with each guideline in a manner that shows your understanding. Screenshots are included for every system and every guideline, and this helps greatly in getting your points across. (**+**)

2b — Your updated writeup still does not include a clear identification of how important each usability metric is for a dating website. Is learnability more important than efficiency? How about satisfaction? You should make an unambiguous statement about this. (**/**)

2c — Although your guidelines audit includes much better detail and evidence than before, you still do not correlate this review to your (presumably unmodified) conclusion that *Match.com* provides has the most usable interface of the three. Put yourself in the role of a decision-maker, choosing one of these three user interfaces for your own dating website—you have to make a call. (**/**)

4e — Commit frequency and phasing is much improved, with descriptive messages. (**+**)

Assignment 0918 Feedback

Joe Crawley

(updated feedback based on your commits on or before 12/13/2012; only re-evaluated proficiencies are included in this update)

2b — Your latest version now includes a clear, explicit discussion of usability metric priorities for dating websites. The given priorities and the explanation behind the order are stated well, and make specific references to the characteristics and features of a dating website.

The one fly in your priority ointment—and this may well have been how things went down, in which case there is nothing we can do about it except learn the lesson for future reference—is that you determined this priority *after testing was concluded*. Like I said, what's done is done, and it can't be changed. But remember, in case you find yourself designing user interfaces one day, you want to set those priorities *before* the system is developed, much less tested! Sure, you can interview testers later on to see how they felt; but that is an assessment you make later, and not something to be retroactively transferred as "your" usability metric priorities. Even the assignment writeup says so: "Make sure to state and explain the priorities that *you* gave to each metric." (|)

2c — Your decision on which system had the best user interface is clearly stated, alongside the reasons for this choice. As written, your choice is based solely on how *Match.com* fared in terms of the usability metrics. You forgot that there was a whole other section before that, showing that *Match.com* also generally followed your chosen guidelines better than the others—coincidence? Probably not. But this is unaddressed by your writeup, and perhaps now we will never know **:)** (|)