CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2013

Assignment 1024 Feedback

Andrew T. Sullivan   *atsullivan*

3a — The Ajax functionality that was supposed to have been added for this assignment barely goes beyond what was provided as examples in class. The submitted work still shows a significant gap in the *dynamic* aspect of how a user interface is constructed—i.e., how a user interface changes when information is added, modified, or removed. You need to make the Ajax code your own, in a way that conforms with your original user interface vision, in order to do better with this outcome. (**/**)

3b — As mentioned in *3a*, there is hardly any interactive behavior in your code beyond what comes "out of the box" with Bootstrap and the code given in class. Thus, there is very little evidence of proficiency in event-driven programming. The direct manipulation assignments emphasize this element more strongly, so really aim to make an impact there, or keep working on these pages to add more dynamic behavior. (**/**)

3c — MVC remains predominantly M here, with V being still very minimal and C being limited to what was shown in class. This remains very much in "benefit of the doubt" territory. (**|**)

4a — The Ajax functionality that is present in the submitted work is barely different from the sample one given in class. It is a good starting point, but you did not go much further than that starting point. The character code looks like it was started then abandoned, the result being a redundant second `getJSON` call that should never have been there, with user interface code that looks unfinished at best. The other way that you could have strengthened this outcome for this assignment was to try the other Ajax calls (character creation; character editing; character deletion; random item creation). Implementing just two is indeed OK, but implementing the exact two from the sample code *and* hardly customizing the way it interacts with your user interface does not show proficiency in this area. (**/**)

4b — Concerns remain well-separated, although still minimal. At this point the separation is observed to be mainly from the way the sample code is separated, and not of your own design. This needs more evidence from you if this outcome is to get stronger. (**|**)

4c — Code readability remains at the same level as with the previous assignment. This is not surprising of course, because until this point you have not yet been called on it. But you are being called on it now, so you'll want to improve on this with future work and, if you choose, a resubmission of these assignments. (**/**)

4d — You certainly used the sample code from class to a degree, and integrated it into what you already had, but as already noted that level of integration could be much improved. Your use of the given resources could have been shown by, say, integrating a different Ajax call (or at least trying). Or, you could have customized the samples to adapt more closely to *your* user interface, instead of you adapting to the sample code. In any case, there was definitely some resource and documentation use here, but not as well-done as in the prior iteration (for Bootstrap). (**/**)

4e — Commit frequency is much improved from before, with messages remaining sufficiently descriptive— that's more like it! (**+**)

4f — Submitted to GitHub on time, but nothing seen in *my.cs.lmu.edu* site. (**/**)