Some thoughts on improvable things

- Too many designs, not enough problems. What is the problem your design is going to solve? See group K for a nice example of a problem that doesn't yet have a design.
- Scopes too big.
- Proposing features that, if you're not careful, will result in you focusing on the back end, like automated intelligent tagging or personalizing clothes recommendations.
- Not enough justification of why the design is important enough to use, or why people will take the time to learn it or use a separate design. Designs have costs. It takes time to enter your wardrobe. Will people do it? Why?
- No actual users. By "representative" users I don't mean what kind of people are you designing for. I mean specific, breathing people that you talk to on an ongoing basis. Who are they?
- Not enough detail about user populations (e.g., from surveys) or methodologies for data analysis (how did you analyze what you learned)? We were pretty lenient about this in the mini-project grading. It matters because it helps readers/teammates/yourself/managers/gradation know how much to trust your data.
- Scenarios overall were pretty good, although a little explicit discussion of the design choices and issues they highlighted would have been even better. A few groups didn't use paired scenarios, and this was probably wrong. They can be used to sell the product or as a kind of extended persona to record information from user testing, but those are not the main reasons to use them.
- Groups are not yet thinking about evaluation. One group talked about hosting simulated parties to test their tools for facilitating introduction... yessss!
- There was some consideration of alternate designs and directions not taken in the additional notes and requirements section, and that will be useful for the final report.
- Multi-modal interfaces (some interaction on a laptop, some on a mobile) are good, but be careful as you go forward to prototype all parts of the interface.