Evaluation of Project 2
CIS 443/543 User Interfaces - 2019
By Anthony Hornof - November 19, 2019

Student: **Mamtaj Akter**

1. Observe and Interview Two Users. Do the participant observations and interviews, and the scenario, accurately capture the true complexity of the task? Were the studies conducted in an earnest manner?
Points: 18 / 20
Very good. It could be more clear in the scenario what you actually observed. It sounds like you did not
    go on the actual bike ride, which would have been ideal.

2. Write a scenario based on the interview materials. Is the description of the user interaction complete, well-written, useful, and clear? Is the scenario written in an earnest and thoughtful manner?
Points: 15 / 15
Very good introductory paragraph. Very good structure and topic sentences.
You could leave off your participant's last name, especially for an actual publication.
Very good structure and flow to the story.
As a story, it sort fizzled out at the end, without conveying a resolution, or a feeling of accomplishment,
    for example. In a good story, some kind of dramatic tension gets resolved at the end.
Jack and Henri could be better-introduced as people, like characters in a story. What gets them excited?
    What motivates them?
The scenario could capture more social and emotional aspects of the event. This prose format is
    particularly appropriate for capturing these aspects, whereas HTA is ideal for decomposable tasks.
    Your notes from the interviews capture all kinds of emotion and excitement. It would have been great
    to carry that into the scenario.

3. Conduct a hierarchical task analysis (HTA). Does the HTA provide a thoughtful and accurate decomposition of the task hierarchy, with roughly equivalent levels of abstraction at each level of the hierarchy? Is the HTA adequately annotated so that the task decomposition is completely clear?
Points: 18 / 20
Good. Thorough.
In terms of readability, it is hard to follow the lines from page 1 to page 2. Some kind of labels like (A),
    (B), (C) or (4.2), (4.3) could be used.
The plans are good and thoughtful.

4. Write a brief reflection on the project. Does it demonstrate analytical and critical thinking?
Points: 15 / 15
Good. Yes, designing good interfaces is difficult, but talking to users is that always that hard to do.

5. Is the submission clear and well-written, following the "Good Writing" guidance in the syllabus?
Points: 8 / 10
Overall, very well written.
In "primary media of traveling", media should be "mode" or "means".
A few grammar issues. Please try to figure out a way to work on this. The syllabus offers suggestions.

6. Initial Submission. Was an initial submission turned in? Was it complete and on time?
Points: 10 / 10

7. Write some GOMS methods. Do the GOMS methods follow the structure of the methods in the two readings? Are the GOMS methods complete and accurate?
Points: 10 / 10

Total Points before applying criterion: 94

Class criterion for this assignment: 98 (The "criterion" policy is discussed in the course syllabus.)
Numerical score after applying criterion: 96 <== This is your score for this project.