<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 22</td>
<td>Class Overview</td>
<td>François</td>
<td>First day of class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Jan 29 | **Main paper:** Greenberg & Buxton (2008). Usability Evaluation Considered Harmful  
Other resources: Kaye & Sengers (2007). The Evolution of Evaluation  
Zhai, S. (2003). Evaluation is the worst form of HCI research except all those other forms that have been tried.  
This paper is appropriated from a more traditional social science literature to (hopefully) shed some light on the discussion. The selection of this paper is apparently decontextualized, as the subject matters and arguments are quite different from Greenberg & Buxton (2008). I was trying to locate a paper discussing the intellectual roots of quantitative/qualitative methods from a more general, methodological point of view. The paper might not be the best one for the purpose, but the discussion on measurement validity appears to reveal a more sophisticated face of empirical methods. Maybe what could hinder HCI design is not quantitative usability evaluation, but inappropriately practiced methods and analyses.  
| Feb  5 | **Topic:** Energy Efficiency and UI design  
**Context Paper:** Mark Weiser, Some computer science issues in ubiquitous computing, Communications of the ACM, v.36 n.7, p.75-84, July 1993  
[Text (searchable)](http://example.com) | Blazej Kot |
| Feb  12 | **Topic:** Sustainable Technologies  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic: Online Communities</th>
<th>Main paper:</th>
<th>Foundational Work:</th>
<th>Reading For Fun:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic: Tangible User Interfaces</th>
<th>Main Paper:</th>
<th>Foundation Work:</th>
<th>Hyunyoung Song</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic: Supporting Electronic Reading</th>
<th>Main Paper:</th>
<th>Historical Perspective:</th>
<th>Nicholas Chen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic: Managing Bias in Information Retrieval Applications in the Social Sciences</th>
<th>Main Paper:</th>
<th>Other Reading:</th>
<th>Stephen Purpura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Date  | Spring Break | | | |
Mar 26

**Topic: Growing pains**

**Main Paper:**

**Other Readings:**
Harrison, Tatar and Sengers. "The Three Paradigms of HCI"

Card, English, and Burr: "Evaluation of mouse, rate-controlled isometric joystick, step keys, and text keys for text selection on a CRT." [A scan off this paper can be found on the Reference Material page. You will need to be logged in to access it]


---

Apr 2

**Topic: Persuasive Technology & Health**

**Main Paper:**

**Background Readings:**
The depth of Fogg’s work is often questioned, but he provides excellent summaries of theory and technique in the area of Persuasive Technology. His CHI paper should provide you with terminology and context. His book is available on google books and is a very interesting, albeit light read worthy of skimming to see if you have further interest.


Fogg, B.J. *Persuasive Technology*

---

Apr 9

**Topic: Interactive Public Displays**

**Main Paper**

**Other Readings:**


Greenberg, S. and Rounding, M. (2001). The notification collage: posting information to public and personal displays. Proceedings of CHI’01, p. 514 - 521. This paper has been cited extensively in this design space.

---

Apr 23

**Topic: Places and Spaces**

**Main Paper**

**Other Readings:**

---

CHI’09 review


Akera, D., Simpson, M., Jeffries, R., and Winograd, T. 2009. Undo and erase events as indicators of usability problems.. In proceedings of CHI’09, pp. 659-668. (Hyunyoung Song)


---

Do not forget to complete the class evaluation survey. Thanks.