CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2012

Assignment 1101 Feedback

Joe Crawley, Terran Moore, Andy Won, & Haley Young

A little preface to give you a context for the assigned proficiencies below: Your particular assignment involved a lot of "copy and adapt" work, which happens with some frequency in software development. It acknowledges that you are basing your own work on prewritten code, but does require that you understand this prior code sufficiently enough to get your own stuff done. Overall, you did this job quite well, for a significant amount of functionality.

The main trick with "copy and adapt" is to make sure that your adaptation is complete: no overlooked new/ different functionality, no leftover comments, holdover names (variables, functions), etc. Also, as "copy and adapt" occurs, the chance of unnecessary code repetition grows, so it is also good to review the overall code base as it evolves, in order to consolidate emerging repetitions. Doing this latter part well does require some experience, but it is hoped that you started getting some initial exposure with this assignment.

3a — You have definitely shown collective knowledge of user interface construction, particularly in the grant creation page. There are some functionality gaps, but in my opinion this is mitigated by the large scope of this particular assignment. (**+**)

3b — You took the prior event handling code and generally adapted it well to the new functionalities. (**+**)

3c — Your code shows good understanding of MVC. It was based on pre-existing code, yes, but you knew enough not to break *its* MVC separation **:)** (**+**)

4a — Incomplete UI functionality aside, you implemented what you do have quite well, with successful Ajax use as well. You implemented, with general success: a couple of preset lists and grant creation. There are some gaps; the most evident ones are missing search (*grant-search.js* does not even exist, heh); insufficient clearing of the grant creation page whenever a grant is saved; and missing individual grant viewing and editing (I suspect that including the needed grant ID was what tripped you up here). In light of what was accomplished though, I see these gaps as taking this proficiency down by just one notch instead of two (which is what I did for other groups that had less overall to tackle). (**|**)

4b — Your MVC separation is clean, preserving the prior MVC separation well. (**+**)

4c — Overall, your code is clear and readable. Comments, indentation, and spacing all contribute to this clarity and readability. The one issue I spotted was some holdover (i.e., unadjusted) comments due to the "copy and adapt" origin of the work. But overall, looks generally good. (**+**)

4d — Your relatively successful implementation, UI gaps aside, shows effective use of available resources and documentation. (**+**)

4e — Excellent commit rate and messages. (**+**)

4f — Submitted on time. (**+**)