## Mark’s MiTaL questions, responses from Megan

## 1/27/25

* [Example 3.2.9](https://mafitch.github.io/tech_math/section-graphing.html#example-read-graph-glide) Read the example and compare alt text and additional description (click on the i or info button beneath graph)
  + The i info is better than the alt text. Could improve alt text by saying “…altitude (y-axis) and glide distance (x-axis)”. The alt text doesn’t add much.
  + Dang, those graph lines are hard to read. Is there a way for the magnifying glass is make the enlarged version larger?
* [Example 3.2.14](https://mafitch.github.io/tech_math/section-graphing.html#example-read-graph-stature-percentiles) Read starting with the text and graph above this example through this example. Check how alt text and additional descriptions are used.
  + I think the alt text is clear. In the information part, I recommend deleting “request a manipulative to examine”.
* Contrast with [Figure 3.2.22](https://mafitch.github.io/tech_math/section-graphing.html#figure-read-graph-bar) where the graph is an alternate method of describing the data. The previous two are about reading (obtaining information from) something originally provided in visual form)
  + I’m noticing the alt text is shorter. I think that is appropriate because the data is right there. (Table 3.2.21 is readable for screen readers, right?)

Also check the following

* [Table 4.1.3](https://mafitch.github.io/tech_math/section-geometry2D.html#figure-parallelogram-properties) and example 4.1.4 beneath it: compare how alt and additional description in the table to how alt text is used in the example
  + I wish there was a brief way to indicate which side had which length. With the “i” section, the alt text seems redundant.
  + No “i” bits on the examples?
* [Example 4.1.31](https://mafitch.github.io/tech_math/section-geometry2D.html#example-geometry2d-floor-plan) what do you think here where there is no additional description, but detailed description of the image is in the example text
  + Detailed description in text is good enough, imo.
  + It seems odd to refer to the “height” of a living room and hallway in a floorplan. I’m assuming you did so to remain consistent with the formula, but calling it “length and width” still feels more appropriate. (Besides, audience needs to be accustomed of calling some things by different names dependent on circumstances, or tossing in “height” in the volume formulae gets even more confusing.)
* [Example 6.2.1](https://mafitch.github.io/tech_math/section-exponential-graph.html#example-graph-exponential-continous) is another example of this
  + This one I really like the alt text and info section. Nicely done.
* [Example 6.2.5: Translate an Exponential](https://mafitch.github.io/tech_math/section-exponential-graph.html#example-exponential-transform-translate) uses additional description as well as text in the example: too much? okay?
  + Too much. The alt text is fine, the additional information is too detailed, at least in my opinion.

Other notes:

* Section 3.2:
  + might be nice to copy the table of stall speeds/bank angles (lots of scrolling for one table)
  + Example 3.2.7: why set up as a percentage? Isn’t it more intuitive to describe as a ratio? (Yes, I know they are the same thing.)
  + Example 3.2.9: when first referencing “nautical miles” could you add the abbreviation? That is, please write “nautical miles (nm)”. Later in the problem you just write “nm”. Also, that graph is hard to read!
  + Checkpoint 3.2.11, also hard to read.
* ~~Overall: these sections are SO much better fleshed out. Unfortunately, that makes them long. What do you think about breaking them into smaller pieces? Maybe even put the exercises as a different section?~~
* Missing from interpret graph section: telling a story with the graph. Example (please don’t put this one in the book; I need it for a test question) runner that turns