

Evaluation of Project 1
CIS 443/543 User Interfaces - 2019
By Anthony Hornof - November 10, 2019

Student: Mamtaj Akter

In the Points columns, x / y indicates that x points were earned out of a maximum possible y .

Criteria for Evaluation, Points, and Comments

1. Code Submitted. Does the system work? Does the code run without bugs? Is it modular in a useful manner?

Points: 25 / 30

The long nested if-then statements could have been more modularized, such as with an object-oriented menu design, making the code easier to extend.

Some values (such as 62) were hard-coded whereas a constant could have been used.

2. Functionality. Does the system support a minimal set of tasks for interacting with a book, including letting the user know what they are interacting with, the current state of the object, and how to interact with it? Is there any advanced functionality? Is "help" provided?

Points: 12 / 15

Overall good.

Some keypresses resulted in no response, such as pressing a non-semi-colon after pressing the first semi-colon to quit.

It is good to have the functionality to scroll through book titles. But sample data is needed to see it work.

3. Usability. Is the system easy to use? Does it help the user to understand how to accomplish a task, and whether progress is being made towards a goal? If sound files have been added, are they of high quality?

Points: 10 / 15

The biggest strength here is that *lots* of audio feedback is provided to let the user know how he or she is moving through the menus and modes.

The opening announcement is excellent, informing the user immediately of the control options. I did find the announcement difficult to understand in particular with the use of pauses, but this is somewhat minor, like critiquing visual design but not the interaction design. Okay, now I think figured it out, after listening to it 20 times. The first statement of "select book" is the current mode. Okay, this announcement could be more clear.

The functionality of <L> is also stated initially, but not with subsequent presses.

Excellent guidance, such as to press semi-colon and J to select another chapter.

"Continue to read" was a little muffled, and could have been recorded a little better.

The warning before quitting was very good.

4. Description of User Interactions. Is the description of the user interaction complete, well-written, useful, and clear?

Points: 17 / 20

Overall good. It is clear that thought went into this.

It could have been easier to read, such as by using labels to connect arrows. But I suspect that it might be hard-to-follow in part because the different states are somewhat ad hoc, and not clearly hierarchical.

It is not always clear what state the system is put into, such as after stating that a chapter is not available.

5. Programmer's Documentation. Would this documentation help another programmer understand how to modify the code? Is the source code well-written and well-commented?

Points: 7 / 10

The documentation includes good and appropriate information, but could be structured better. See the examples of Programmer's Documentation on the course website.

Please review the section on "Good Writing" in the syllabus, in particular the paragraph that starts with "Write good paragraphs."

In general, programmer's documentation should not dive right into the detailed logic of how variables get checked and changed, and the detailed low-level logic of the program. Again, please see the examples.

Excellent comments in the code. Some could have been explained a little better, such as *why* the "book number cant be more than 1", rather than just stating exactly what the code does algorithmically.

6. Initial Submission. Was an initial submission turned in on time?

Points: 10 / 10

Total Points: 81 / 100

Class criterion for this assignment: 86 (The "criterion" policy is discussed in the course syllabus.)

Numerical score after applying criterion: 94 <== This is your score for this project.