

CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2015

Assignment I020 (due I022) Feedback

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

Josh Kuroda

jkealii / jkealii@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.
- The *Typical Appearance* section certainly says it like it is, though an illustration, as simple as it might have been, would still be useful. (2a)
- In the state diagram, I think one edge might be misplaced: there is a *press* transition from *Unchecked* to *Checked (held)*. I suspect that this transition should actually start at *Checked*. (2a)
- A rare state, though worth mentioning, would be the *indeterminate* state. Textbook example for this would be if an interface used checkboxes for text characteristics like Bold or Italic. Then, if the user selected a region that isn't entirely Bold or entirely Italic, that checkbox is best shown as this "indeterminate" state to show that its value cannot uniformly apply to the current text selection. (1a, 2a)
- The *Component in Action* is fun, but might not be deemed appropriate by some readers (if it is made public). I'll have to think about that...
- Under *Variants*, the distinction from a radio button isn't quite there. The true difference, which is mutual-exclusive choice, is sort of captured by the last sentence, but still not precisely. (1a)
- Now the switch button is definitely an interesting, valid variant. Although I would still disagree that it is its own component—I mean, semantically, isn't it still really a checkbox? The difference is purely visual, I would say; this, in my mind, keeps it as a variant of a checkbox still, and not a brand new type of component. (1a)
- Ah, *now* the language is better in *When to Use What Widgets*. You should have cross-referenced this with the text in *Variants*. As is, the two sections are slightly divergent. (2a)
- The *Key Characteristics* section makes good use of guidelines from Microsoft and Google, but conversely is a little short on the use of principles—this is slightly exacerbated for this particular component because, as you say yourself, these things are extremely ubiquitous. Thus, heavier use of non-platform-specific principles is called for. (1b, 2b)
- The OS X portion of *Platform-Specific Instances* actually makes better use of generic principles than the *Key Characteristics* section, even if those principles are cherry-picked by Apple (see what I did there?). Ideally, the principles that are genuinely platform-independent should be pulled out into *Key Characteristics*, with ideas that are more specific to a platform remaining in this latter section. For example, "Aesthetic Integrity" is probably for Apple-ish than others. Admittedly though, the example shown, from the Reminders app, actually sends a red flag—aesthetic integrity is good, yes, but at the expense of consistency? Those reminder checks look an awful lot like radio buttons... (1b, 2b)
- For a component as basic as a checkbox, that's a good bunch of references :) However I would have liked to see more general references, such as Nielsen and Shneiderman (you're invoking the metrics after all!), plus localized citations so that the reader can tell which reference is being used when. (4d)

1a — + ...Really, not much to miss here, as the entry itself says!

1b — + ...Guidelines and other sources are referenced heavily, which is good.

CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2015

Assignment I020 (due I022) Feedback

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

2a — + ...This is executed very well overall. There *are* points of improvement (as noted in the bullets), but together I did not think they constituted deal breakers.

2b — | ...This is where I'd want a little more general-level reasoning. Mainly this is where the relatively off-balance *Key Characteristics* section comes to roost. This section should look more like the OS X El Capitan section in terms of outline and discussion, but on a non-platform-specific level.

4d — + ...Good use of external sources, with points of improvement that aren't too severe.

4e — In collaboration with Lauren, you successfully issued a pull request. You've paced your work really well, with decent descriptions (and the occasional entertaaaaaaaining one). But you started just the day before...? By just creating the folder...? I'm tended to bring the proficiency down a notch, but I will apply some consideration to how the two of you collaborated effectively. (+)

4f — Submitted on time (with 51 seconds to go!). (+) (there was a small typo fix applied later, but no need to count that against the overall work)