

**CMSI 370-01**  
**INTERACTION DESIGN**  
Fall 2013

## Assignment 0926 Feedback

As stated in the assignment, outcomes *1c* and *2b* max out at | for this assignment, because the class had not yet covered the full range of relevant concepts at this point in the semester.

Michael A. Fraser

*mfraser42*

*1a* — Your heuristic evaluation shows a good understanding of how mental models are formed and mapped between developers and users, especially with regard to the WiFi task. Unfortunately, treatment is uneven, and even with WiFi, your discussion could have been substantiated better (e.g., screenshots). Had you applied the same level of analysis to the other tasks things would have been much better. (|)

*1b* — For the chosen metrics of learnability, efficiency, and satisfaction, your work demonstrates an initial understanding of their meanings but not a complete one. The tests conducted actually conflate both elements of learnability (“figuring things out”) and efficiency (“how long it took”). Fortunately, you show that you are aware of this issue, and are also aware of how the user population’s particular characteristics may have skewed the results. Ideally, though, these potential issues could have been caught in the planning phase, and some tweaks to the study could have addressed this better (e.g., interpreting times as efficiency for experts but learnability for novices). (|)

*1c* — Your ability to analyze the study and its results is apparent in your treatment of the WiFi task, but it stops short there when it really should have been applied evenly across the board. This would have allowed you to bring more guidelines, principles, and theories into play rather than addressing a single principle (consistency) alongside how mental models were transferred. (/)

*2a* — You have successfully conducted and documented a real-world usability study. In doing so you noticed some issues with your study’s design, and for the context of this assignment the awareness is sufficient (wouldn’t you love to redo it though?). You document the results sufficiently, at both the narrative and numeric level. Some correlation with mental models also takes place, although as mentioned this should have been done more broadly.

You also establish a preliminary prioritization that determines “winners” for certain categories. Ideally, though, you should take a stab at making an *overall* judgment call. Making this call requires disciplined prioritization, which allows you to make a choice when one system does well with one metric but not as well with another. Explicitly making this choice is important, despite a diversity of factors, because, “out in the field,” that is what you will have to do—out of multiple design options, you will choose to develop *one*. That requires the ability to navigate differences in performance plus a clear prioritization when certain factors are “tied.” This specific study may not lead to a very realistic “final decision,” but it’s still worthwhile to go through the exercise. (|)

*2b* — You draw effective conclusions from your data when you did so, but the issue is that you didn’t do this consistently. Further, there were enough typos to be distracting and also to signal that you didn’t quite get enough polish cycles in there. Those do matter, and do affect this proficiency (though the lack of broad-based analysis is still the weightier problem). (/)

*4d* — Your work shows good use of the resources at hand with an ability to figure things out on your own (e.g., LaTeX). (+)

*4e* — You committed and pushed successfully, with decent commit messages and appropriate frequency. Seems you have a bit of a cleanup problem though—you have two copies of your *usability-study.\** files. I made the assumption that the ones in the *usability-study* subdirectory are the authoritative ones. In which case, you should eliminate the copies. Use *git rm* (git remove) to do so. (|)

*4f* — Submitted on time. (+)

**CMSI 370-01**  
**INTERACTION DESIGN**  
Fall 2013

## **Assignment 0926 Feedback**

As stated in the assignment, outcomes *1c* and *2b* max out at | for this assignment, because the class had not yet covered the full range of relevant concepts at this point in the semester.

Michael A. Fraser

*mfraser42*

### **Updated feedback based on commits up to 12/13/2013; only re-reviewed outcomes are shown:**

*1a* — Your revision broadened its mental model analysis to the other two tasks in your test, and the improvement is significant, enough to warrant an increase in proficiency. (+)

*1b* — Your new “chapter” on an alternative test design looks to measure the learnability and efficiency metrics much better than before, plus eliminate extraneous errors. Overall, a good demonstration of how well you [now] understand what these metrics mean and how to record and capture them. (+)

*1c* — Your analysis has much better breadth in your revision, giving all tasks more or less equal time now. The mental model connections are clearer, although mention of guidelines, principles, and theories can still be improved. The proficiency can be justifiably increased, though, on the strength of the improvement in mental model analysis on all three tasks. (|)

*2a* — Your resubmission successfully addresses the structural flaws in your original study and describes appropriate changes to make to both the test subject pool and actual procedures in order to make results more reliable. Your final judgment discussion didn’t change, though, so the original feedback to that still applies. In any case, the correct study design is of greater importance here, and so can warrant a change in the proficiency. (+)

*2b* — Your resubmissions draws conclusions from your data more broadly and across all tests and areas, enough to improve the proficiency. Polish also seems to be better, although some stragglers were still spotted (check the diffs). But, improvement overall, so that’s good. (|)

*4e* — You have removed unnecessary files from your repository, and your revision cycle shows better granularity and commit messages overall. (+)