

CMSI 370-01

INTERACTION DESIGN

Fall 2015

Assignment I020 (due I022) Feedback

All applicable outcomes can now reach maximum proficiency values with this assignment.

Chris Franco

cf7 / spe861@gmail.com

Notes while reading:

- I guess there was some confusion in my instructions. I used blockquote to indicate my commentary. It was not meant to carry over into your work.
- “1 to around 25 items” eh—that’s mighty precise; got a source for that? (4d)
- Nice gallery of menu shots there. Largely OS-level menus, but not a bad start. +(2a)
- Lots of good content through the first two main sections. +(1a, 1b, 2b)
- The one thing I miss is inline citations, so that I can immediately tell where a particular factoid might have come from. There are some context clues, but traditional citation style is still more explicit and thus effective. (4d)
- The *Priority Metrics* section has what feels like a bit of a non-sequitur, with the mention of “file Directories” (capitalization intentional?). I’m not clear on why that’s there. (2a)
- The state diagram is on the simplistic side, missing what happens while a user is *navigating* a menu. Items get highlighted and unhighlighted; sub-menus open and close. I appreciate that these may not be states in the traditional sense, but omitting them from the diagram does oversimplify the “life cycle” of a [pull-down/drop-down/popup] menu. (2a)
- Use code markup for programming symbols in the *Events* section. (2a)
- The *Component in Action* animation itself is OK, but it could use some text commentary. (2a)
- Good initial picks for variants, with decent commentary—of course for menus there will ultimately be tons, but this is a good start. +(1a, 2a)
- Also some good observations in *Platform-Specific Instances*, though I wish there was a clearer label of for the platform (imagine how this section will eventually look, with multiple platforms on display). (2a)
- Good set of references, both specific and general (Nielsen). +(4d)

1a — + ...True, menus are straightforward, but you do cover them well.

1b — + ...Lots of good, well-founded information, mainly from guidelines, but a good bit of them.

2a — | ...Generally good, but a few hiccups (state diagram, accumulated faux pas).

2b — | ...Content is primarily *descriptive*, which is not bad, but more grounded design thinking based on more principles would have been ideal (i.e., good menus; bad menus; more radical designs like the Dock).

4d — + ...Generally well-covered and -sourced, missing only inline citations (but not serious enough to become a proficiency spoiler).

4e — You successfully issued a pull request. Commit frequency and messages are good. Your first commit landed just one day before the due date...could be better :-\ (|)

4f — Submitted on time. (+)