CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2015

Assignment 1124 Feedback

Josh Kuroda   *jkkealii / jkkealii@gmail.com*

Notes while reading (asterisks indicate major observations):

- LOL I can see through the fancy French **:)** I'm OK with the tongue-in-cheek tone as long as you show some real interaction design content in here and reason through them effectively. We'll see… (cue suspenseful music)

- You cited the PCAP; why not YouTube and BigOven, too? (inline, that is; I know they're at the end) (*4d*)

- The ideas for tiles and circular menus speaks to a clear overview of the interface—a sketch, even just hand-drawn and scanned, would have helped illustrate this better. (*1a*)

- And here comes the "Rationale" section…arg, too short. You mention efficiency and a mental model built on multitasking, but that's it. Need. Moar. (for example, in your design, you mention the initial tile/menu coming up under the user's hand—that's Fitts's law; you should have mentioned it…mentioning it is the difference between just accidentally hitting upon a good design element vs. demonstrating that you did this *intentionally*, building on the knowledge you have) (*1b, 2b*)

- The usability metric forecast also makes sense, and the learnability and error analysis are steps in the right direction. What's missing is the terminology. "Lack of visual cues" is right, but why? The reason is that the two major interaction styles—menus/forms/dialogs and direct manipulation—*rely* on something's visibility in order to be learnable. With menus/forms/dialogs, it is the use of recognition vs. recall (you can't recognize something if you can't see it) and with direct manipulation, it is the very definition that elements must be visible in order to be manipulated. *That's* what we want to see: concepts from the class being connected to your interface design. (*1b, 2b*)

- Your use of memorability is incorrect. Memorability is not strong because a user will see something often; it is strong because the interface will *remind* users how to do something that they've already learned even if they've been away from it for a long time. (*1b*)

1a — **+** …This part comes across well.

1b — **/** …As mentioned, this part, not so much. Metrics and mental model are there, but that's it. Plus there are missed low-hanging fruit (Fitts's Law) and some errors (memorability).

2b — **|** …You didn't have too much to work with, but you worked with them decently. Can't go much higher because again not a lot was included from the "toy box" of established concepts.

4d — **|** …Good job with putting the pieces together to envision something new; that external sourcing is great, but internal sourcing (that pesky concepts thing again) could have been better.

4e — **|** …Given the scope of the work, increased granularity is appropriate.

4f — **+**