Step 1: Reflection

* *Which existing websites most inspired your site design thus far?*

There wasn’t a site I had in mind so much as a general aesthetic that both naturally appeals to me and is trendy as all get out right now—dark, lush natural palettes paired with geometric shapes and clean text—but a site I’ve found that embodies those things beautifully is for a restaurant in Oslo called Maaemo, found here: <http://maaemo.no/>

* *Which parts of the design are you most proud of?*\

Getting my transparent, minimal nav link moons arranged on the page attractively at different screen sizes.

* *What struggles did you encounter in your design process?*

I still haven’t been able to get hover text and color over said moon links, which I want for desktop navigation; for smaller screens the moons will already have text on the labeling what they are.

* *Which struggles did you encounter during page development?*

I’m not entirely sure how that’s different from the above question, but I will say that it sometimes escapes me when certain things need divs or other containers, and how certain kinds of labels in CSS react (or don’t react) to properties and values attributed to them.

* *What did you learn from making your project responsive?*

I learned that I far prefer thinking in percentages when designing over pixels! Envisioning percentages seems like a **much** more intuitive way of thinking about how elements on a page should be spaced.

Step 2: Reviews

*Business of Fashion*

* Layout—When I first pulled up the site, I thought I’d have no qualms about the layout—eye-catching slides, good use of white space hamburger menu for additional content. Then I realized I was only looking at a fraction of the homepage, which keeps going for a \*while.\* It feels like, though there are pages besides the home page, that the site is trying to contain everything on the home page. Seems like cutting all of that material from the homepage, which is linked to in the hamburger menu, would make for a sleeker, more professional site
* Typography—First, I think the serif font being used for most of this site is beautiful and well-suited to the site aesthetic. But that said, I think that this particular serif font is best suited to this site’s headlines. It loses its impact when it’s also used for smaller text, and smaller text content would likely be easier on the eyes in a simple sans-serif font. A simple sans-serif is used for a few things, but seems under-utilized—it’s being used in so few places it seems almost accidental, or like an afterthought, and not a conscious aesthetic decision.
* Navigation—Excepting the clutter of the homepage, navigation is fairly straightforward—the hamburger menu gives the user various pages, and the slideshow highlights new, relevant content. I will say that the page names within the hamburger menu are a little vague—what’s different about content in News and Analysis vs. Daily Digest?—so clarifying what kind of content is located where seems like a solid idea.
* Overall flow—Although the individual elements making up this site are beautiful—great photography, elegant fonts, a pleasing amount of white space—as I said previously, there’s so much content on the home page that as a user, I get overwhelmed and lose a natural sense of flow after a couple seconds of scrolling down the page.

*Space Jam site*

First, thank \*everything\* you made my favorite thing on the whole internet a critique option. God bless this site. Anyway, down to business.

* Layout—Well okay first, let’s be real about the fact I’m critiquing a site from 1996. This site is from the 1996! So many things here are what they are and I appreciate them in all their earnest glory.

That said, the layout here \*could be worse\*--while a lot of the nav categories are vague (though make me smile a \*lot\*) they’re easy to locate. But while the whole solar system idea here is adorable, my eye feels the lack of a gridded structure influencing the placement of elements here.

Also, to state the obvious, the aesthetic screams 1996 and not in a Sonic Youth t-shirt way. That tiled star background plus the plethora of cartoon-y colors and patterns overwhelms the eye.

* Typography—the Times New Roman on all of these pages seems unnecessarily large and not placed within a grid or in relation to other elements on the page in a way that’s aesthetically pleasing. Sometimes a red font is used, sometimes yellow, and it’s not clear to me why the change. Also, the aforementioned starry tile going on here makes it \*pretty hard\* to read.
* Navigation—Okay, again, \*could be worse\*--but uh, I do need to point out the fact that this site has a site map which is \*so adorable\* but also for objective critique, is not a thing a site should need. It should be fairly clear to what kind of content your nav links are going to take a reader.
* Overall flow—The idea of “flow” is pretty absent from this site to be honest, ha—and again, I think this primarily has to do with this being a site from the mid-90s before conventions for site design had been more well-established. Clunky, cluttered, and without a visual hierarchy to guide a user’s eye through content.