CMSI 370-01

Interaction Design

Fall 2012

Assignment 1016 Feedback

Lisa Rosenbaum

3a — Your code shows a degree of understanding for how user interfaces are constructed. (+)

3c — Your code shows some understanding of MVC separation, although you did keep some JavaScript within the HTML page. Separate, but still in the page. (|)

4a — Your code does what it sets out to do, and the working clock is a nice touch! Your HTML needs considerable validation fixing though. First off, you missed the `<!doctype html>` declaration at the top. Plus the validator reports a few more errors; all fairly easy to fix. Finally, I only see the Nintendo DS facsimile, and none for a desktop operating system. So, technically, you were only able to do half of the assignment. (|)

4b — As mentioned in *3c*, web technologies enable separation of MVC concerns at the file level. You mostly followed this except for some straggler JavaScript at the bottom. We'll look the other way on that (for now) because JavaScript was not a required part of this assignment anyway. (+)

4c — Your code is generally understandable, but it shows a mix of spaces and tabs. You should standardize on spaces; they are less prone to inconsistent displays. The indentation probably looks fine in your editor, but this is not guaranteed (look at your code in Chrome, for example). (|)

4d — You showed good information seeking in putting together the Nintendo DS facsimile. More demonstration of this ability with your desktop facsimile would round this out. (|)

4e — Excellent commit pacing and messages—but for only one facsimile. (+)

4f — One facsimile submitted on time; the desktop one is late. (/)

Updated feedback based on commits up to 12/22/2012 (reevaluated proficiencies only):

3c — Your overall MVC separation is excellent, except for the aforementioned JavaScript in one of the websimiles. But that can be viewed as an outlier, with both pages now submitted; everything else is done quite well so we can disregard that little hiccup. (+)

4a — The primary knocks against your code, for both websimiles, are validation—fairly large number of errors on each one, most quite fixable—and optimization, i.e., you used more code than truly needed to accomplish the same result. The actual results, though, make for very decent facsimiles, so that part is well-done. However, given your current status as a computer science junior, I think it is fair to expect high code quality both externally *and* internally. (|)

4c — Your indentation and spacing generally reflects, correctly, the semantic structure of your code. You still have the occasional straggler tabs vs. spaces, and that results in occasional inconsistent amounts of spacing, but for whatever reason this seems to be less severe than before; enough of an improvement to bump up your proficiency. (+)

4d — With completed facsimiles, we can top off your proficiency for this outcome—overall, the visible results are generally very good, and we attribute this partly to excellent information seeking skills. (+)