

## Step 1: Reflection

Create a document answering the following:

- Which existing websites out there most inspired your web site design thus far?

I began looking at various artist website to get an idea of how best to present a portfolio - those I found most exciting were both smart and funny - working intelligently and with UX quirks which added an extra layer to the site, for example: <http://www.emmahart.info/>

- Which parts of the design are you most proud of?

I really like my menus - esp. the exhibitions section - although finding a clear and ambient way to link all these is still a task to tackle.

- What struggles did you encounter in your design process?

Once the structure is in place (this is in process) the big struggle is in curation - deciding what projects will be included.

- Which struggles did you encounter during page development?

Knowing when to kill your babies - as I'm experimenting I tend to give too much distraction and movement to the eye which then becomes confusing - after a certain point the page needs to be pulled back and simplified

- What did you learn from making your project responsive?

I like this a lot - although I don't use many devises - I appreciate mixing pixels, ems and %, and it helps to simplify the site.

## Step 2: Reviews

Review a website from group 1 and a website from group 2 of the following list, commenting on each website's layout,

typography, navigation, and overall flow.

## Group 1

<http://www.sagmeisterwalsh.com/>

Very nice, smart, playful, deceptively simple... ie once you start you realise the page took a lot of work. Type is kept simple - the studio's work is quite dense and so the type needs to be calm.

On certain pages there is a lot of text, very ordered, readable, in columns, all sans-serif - very Austrian :)

Nav is esp nice from the home page - the 2nd nav bar lacks any dominant aesthetic - but as the pages are content heavy it works.

Flow is ok - there is a new website in development and I imagine this is something they are working on - at times for the hip-ness of the site it feels a bit clunky and dated...

overall = uber-polished!!!

## Group 2

<http://www.spectrumpowderworks.com/>

Ah spectrum! It's a shame, the wordmark is dated - red (which is apparently the colour that our eye is drawn to first) - and doesn't fit at all with the rest of the site - or at least there is no dialogue between them so you feel they are not represented by this site much - it's just a functional thing - but not fun. Rest of the type is simple - a bit website by numbers - and a bit too text heavy. Colours are alternatively hard to read / hurt your eyes a little.

Navs - bad - strange lines dotting out or slowly levitating - the navs change from page to page with different font sizes and different effects.

Layout always changing, a bit confusing.

Flow....

Overall = Bad site but big heart! making use of lots of effects which makes it in the end something of a jumble... for a company that mainly uses colour on design objects - especially bikes - they could have something much slicker!

### **Step 3: Submission**

Submit your responses to you mentor.