

CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2012

Assignment I I20 Feedback

Britain Southwick

1e — The main affordance decisions you had to make here involve resizing and deletion, and overall you could have done better. Although you were indeed allowed to decide how to implement resizing, the choice you made is somewhat atypical (if you were to do one-corner resizing, wouldn't the lower-right corner have been more recognizable?). Also, resize handles in other drawing programs tend to be square and solid (or, lately in some, 3D-ish to emphasize that they are "grabbable"). These hamper the "message" that your resize handle sends to its users. In addition, a little feedback on box deletion would help. I knew it would happen, but other users may not. (/)

3a — You advanced your user interface knowledge a tad with this assignment, this time in the area of how direct manipulation interfaces are constructed. However, the unfinished resize-drag functionality does not quite demonstrate sufficient understanding yet. (/)

3b — Your work shows a little more advancement in event-driven programming, specifically with regard to handling a rapid succession of events, typical of the direct manipulation interaction style. Your data/state management that needs improvement though (as seen by the unfinished resize functionality). (|)

3c — Your understanding of MVC is clearly demonstrated in this assignment. (+)

3d — You are partially successful in breaking down high-level user actions into lower-level events. Deletion is the main success, although it is the simpler task of the two. Doing better with resizing is really what you need to demonstrate this proficiency in this assignment. (/)

4a — Deletion works, but not resizing, and the resizing issue comes at a very early stage (disconnect between resize initiation and tracking of the resize). This represents a significant functionality gap that needs to be filled in order to improve upon this proficiency in this assignment. (/)

4b — Your code demonstrates proper separation of concerns. (+)

4c — Your code is somewhat readable and understandable, but some formatting hiccups prove to be distracting. Better commenting can express your intent more clearly in the code that you added, and spacing is notably inconsistent for this stage in the semester (and your general level as a late-fall computer science junior). (/)

4d — Your work generally shows good resource use, including known questions sent my way :) However it seems that these did not get you over the resizing hump sufficiently. (|)

4e — Your commit pattern shows decent phasing and messages. (+)

4f — Submitted on time (albeit buggy). (+)