

# CMSI 370-01

## INTERACTION DESIGN

Fall 2015

### Assignment 0924 Feedback

Because we have not yet fully explored the scopes of outcomes *1b* and *2b*, these proficiencies have a maximum value (for this assignment) of |. For outcomes that get +’s (or |’s for *1b* and *2b*), there isn’t much more to say except “keep doing it that way.” :) Feedback for other proficiencies focus on specific points of improvement in order to advance. The answer to “how do I improve my proficiencies” is always “do what I write down in the feedback.”

Josh Kuroda

*jkkealii / jkkealii@gmail.com*

*Notes while reading:*

- Holy smokes, that’s a great, professional-looking style! Let’s see how well the first impression stacks up :)
- That study summary is concise yet almost complete. “Almost” because...this would also have been a good place to name the metrics. And, following that, the familiarity of the users is also not documented but should be (as this determines whether times are learnability vs. efficiency).
- OK, Section III.A says “most users were new to both applications.” That means the times indicate learnability. And that also means you should have used that term from the get-go! Plus, the qualifier “most” is a bigger issue than it sounds, because this implies that some of the measured times are efficiency and not learnability. That mucks up the data a bit.
- Good that you included the full data set, plus anecdotal data. Sometimes good insights come from there.
- Very good move to anchor your heuristic analysis on the two guidelines documents. Good also that you realized that, because Kindle is seen here running on iOS, then it is also fair to look at the Kindle app through the lens of the iOS guidelines as well.
- Good observation about the menu choice in both apps. Someone might then say that Kindle’s choice was driven by the larger number of menu options (> 5) in the app. Then again, someone might counterargue that this *should* have been reduced to five or less, with the less important or frequent ones moved to a submenu. So, plenty of discussion to do there still.
- Hmmmm, you were “measuring both speed and satisfaction”—but I don’t see the satisfaction measured outside of the anecdotal comments. Quantification is better—it is still considered a metric, after all.
- OK, the *conclusion* finally names the metrics using their recognized terms. Should have done this throughout the report! (though the “most” qualification casts some doubt on learnability)

*Overall commentary:* OK, the first impression is largely retained by the quality of the report. A point of improvement in the study is the need to quantify satisfaction. Remaining points of improvement are in the report: need to consistently use official terminology, plus characterization of users should be more explicit. The analysis is extremely well done though, and is well-grounded in guidelines documents.

*1a — + ...*Analysis works well, clearly connecting the data to guidelines compliance or violation.

*1b — | ...*Your analysis is well-grounded, using the right supporting information.

*2a — | ...*The dings in the study and report come to roost here.

*2b — | ...*You do a good job of using the information found to draw an interaction design conclusion.

*4d — + ...*Good information use, including figuring things out with LaTeX.

*4e —* Nicely LaTeX’ed...but one commit? Surely you did not do all of this in a single sitting (and if you did, you shouldn’t). (*/*)

*4f —* Submitted on time. (+)