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."

Justin Sanny   *jsannyjr / jsanny1@lion.lmu.edu*

Notes while reading:

- NBD, but the official name is "Google *Glass*"—singular. No worries, I won't let this impact things **:)**

- It is important to note that learnability requires users who are *unfamiliar* with a system. The fact that learnability is the given metric implies this to be the case, but it is better to be explicit than implicit.

- Average and other aggregate data definitely form the basis for reasoning about it, but the raw data would still be nice to show!

- Ah OK, the raw data are in the tables. Might have been better to refer to them earlier **:)**

- Good move, calling out the products' respective guidelines. I was left wanting more **:)** Also, illustrations would have brought some of the points home better.

- Typo in conclusion section: "preformed" should be "performed."

Overall commentary: The report is easy to read, flows well, and contains most of the requested information. I was momentarily concerned that the raw data was not included, but further reading showed that it was. The use of the respective guidelines documents was exactly what I was looking for…and as such I wish there was more of it. I would have liked the analysis to go a little deeper, exploring a few more points and providing support for the text, in the form of screenshots or other illustrations.

1a — **+** …Very well done, you followed users' impressions well.

1b — **|** …Also good, with good inclusion of guidelines documents.

2a — **|** …This is where the points of improvement land. The study was executed and documented fairly well, but the analysis could have gone a little further. The proficiency is not lower because the analysis *does* take the right approach—we would just like it to do more of the same. Plus, illustrations.

2b — **|** …What you have is decent; we wish it were more, but that is already reflected in *2a*.

4d — **|** …Small note here, is that the citations should have gone after the conclusion. But that is a minor point. Overall you made good use of available information, but a point of improvement would be to make *more* use of this information.

4e — A single commit for the initial submission, followed by…another one *just today*? Either way, one commit does not show good phasing. Plus, the containing folder name is not as specified in the instructions. (**/**)

4f — Well something *was* committed on time—will have to compare this to October 12 to make a final call. But for now, OK we'll take it. (**+**)