Evaluation of Project 3
CIS 443/543 User Interfaces - 2019
By Anthony Hornof - December 1, 2019

Student: **Mamtaj Akter**

---

1. Does the study provide an informative, substantial, and ***useful evaluation*** of a user interface?
Points: **7** / 10

---

2. Does the ***methodology section clearly explain*** the experimental design and how data were collected?
Points: **10** / 10

---

3. Was the ***experimental design*** a good design (such as, well-balanced, with good validity)?
Points: **8** / 10
It is hard to understand the descriptions of the systems. You face the same challenge as in Project 1, describing the dynamic nature of the systems with static diagrams. State transition diagrams, or something like that, could have helped.
I would consider the six "tasks" more as "subtasks". In other words, people don't typically go to a computer with a goal of scrolling through a menu, but rather to read a book or some other human-oriented goal.
It would have been helpful to have the tasks written down, to reduce the interaction between the participant and the experimenter.

---

4. Was a ***script followed***, and did it incorporate Apple's Guidelines for Conducting User Observations?
Points: **9** / 10
Mostly yes.
Craig asked multiple times if he was doing the right thing, and the experimenter reassured him that he was, sort of polluting the data.
I would not add "for people with visual impairments" in a script for people without visual impairments. It can be problematic to ask people without disabilities to imagine themselves as having a disability.

---

5. Are the observed ***data summarized*** in a useful and informative manner?
Points: **7** / 10
It is hard to understand and to see the relevant trends in the line graphs, including Figures 1.1. to 7.3. I don't see the point of all the figures that only show the performance for one system.
The bar charts (Figures 8.1 through 9) are much more useful (and they could use error bars) and show a clear trend.

---

6. Were ***threats to validity identified*** and combatted against?
Points: **10** / 10
Good job switching the names of the systems after you learned participants shared their opinions.

---

7. Was ***useful video data*** collected?
Points: **7** / 10
There was no name on the envelope that was used to submit the video.
You should not use participant names to identify the data (as in the video file names).
It is kind of hard to watch the video and understand what is on the user's mind, such as what he or she is trying to do, or whether he is she believes they are making progress towards a goal. Some think-aloud might have helped, pausing periodically for the user to speak, if necessary.

---

8. Does the analysis ***identify interesting trends*** in the data and ***propose explanations*** for them?
Points: **7** / 10
Yes, but it is a little hard to easily extract them from the Discussion section. The writing could summarize more concisely.

---

9. Did the ***class presentation*** concisely convey the experiment and conclusions?
Points: **10** / 10
Very good. The behavior of the systems could have been explained better, such as with a state transition diagram.

---

10. Is the **report complete**, well-written, clear, and useful?
Points: **8** / 10
Good and detailed. Much of the writing uses more words that necessary, such as the first paragraph on page 6, the last paragraph on page 20, and much of the Discussion section. Your writing challenge is partly one of editing.
Some of the paragraphs
There is a misspelling in Figure 1.3.

Total Points: **83** / 100

Class criterion for this assignment: **91** (The "criterion" policy is discussed in the course syllabus.)
Numerical score after applying criterion: 91 <== This is your score for this project.