

# 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.”

Dustin Kane

*ranneyd / dustinpkane@gmail.com*

*Notes while reading:*

- Classic subject-verb agreement: “There are a variety...” should be “There is a variety...”
- Informative historical recap in the introduction there.
- Yes, thank you for explicitly addressing user proficiency w.r.t. learnability vs. efficiency measures.
- Table 1 makes sense as a user-centric data capture record and Table 2 provides a decent summary; ultimately though a metric-centric report, aggregating learnability, efficiency, and errors regardless of the individual user that supplied the data, is ultimately more useful in assessing usability. (i.e., a hybrid of Table 1 and Table 2 where learnability, efficiency, and errors are clearly partitioned but detail is not yet aggregated)
- For the small margins (e.g., Google Drive’s < 5% efficiency difference in document creation), statistical methods will likely eliminate some leads as effectively ties. But that’s fine, such analysis was not in the scope of this assignment. Besides, other differences do appear intuitively significant anyway.
- The side-by-side of OneDrive and Word is appreciated, plus the connection to the collected data. There is an interaction design term for that—wish you had used it :)
- Lots of good observations...but where’s the supporting framework? Both companies have extensive guidelines documents; many of your observations harken to established principles. Those should be brought to bear so that the report goes beyond a “common sense” analysis.
- The post-mortem on the document revision task is well thought-out; I agree with the points raised. This is very useful in case the study is to be conducted again later, facilitating improvements in the method.
- Conclusion makes sense and properly addresses the study’s scope. Certainly for the given tasks the numbers invite unequivocal conclusions, but also as certain, they are not the complete usability picture either.
- I’m a little surprised there are no references; surely the historical recap, at least, was derived from somewhere, even if just Wikipedia?

*Overall commentary:* The study is well-executed and well-documented, with the analysis also written clearly, with good reasoning and effective illustrations. What’s missing is the underlying conceptual framework—short of the usability metrics and the mental model, no guidelines are used nor principles mentioned. This is a very unfortunately spoiler to what is otherwise a clear, reasoned report.

*1a* — + ...This aspect is unequivocally excellent.

*1b* — / ...Unfortunately this is the weak spot.

*2a* — + ...I will go ahead and max this out because what *is* there is well done.

*2b* — | ...Also on the “what is there is well done” rationale, setting this to the max value is appropriate.

*4d* — | ...This also reflects the miss on “using available resources.” They were underutilized here.

*4e* — Good phasing, decently descriptive messages. (+)

*4f* — Submitted on time. (+)