

CMSI 370-01

INTERACTION DESIGN

Fall 2015

Assignment I020 (due I022) Feedback

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

Mondo Yamaguchi

myamagu1 / mondo.yamaguchi@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.
- As mentioned on the pull request review, you forgot to include images in your commit. I thought you might have pushed these by now, but so far not yet. Please read these feedback sheets—there is useful information in them! (4e)
- The *Typical Appearance* section sounds about right, but it does need those images for support. (2a)
- Same with the *Typical Behavior* section—decent text, but images are necessary. Fortunately, you do have citations for the state diagram and component in action, so I got an idea of what you had in mind. (2a)
- The *Component in Action* section probably could do with some additional commentary, even if I don't yet see the image you had in mind (I visited the cited web page but didn't spot an obvious candidate). (2a)
- The *Variants* section is spot-on, listing exactly what I expected to see as variants of a search component. Again, having the images would really nail this well. (2a)
- The *Priority Metrics* section is generally right also, in terms of content, although I think it becomes more understandable if the structure were inverted: start by mentioning the metric, then explain why that has the level of priority that you give it. Thus, you would start by saying that learnability is the most important metric for a search component, then explain why. Then go into efficiency. Finally, mention how the remaining metrics aren't as important (to show that you didn't just forget about them). (2a)
- I would certainly agree that consistency is a key characteristic of a reusable search component, but is it really the only one? How about “speak the user's language” (i.e., when a user enters search terms, are those terms counted in the way that the user expects)? How about “feedback” (i.e., should search results appear immediately, or should they wait for the user to hit a search button)? And a host of others. I think you can afford to mention at least 1-2 more things here. (1b, 2b)
- Your *Platform-Specific Instances* section (Windows) looks to have decent content, once the images are there. However, do fix the `alt` attributes of your `img` elements—they are clearly copied from Lucas's section, and that is not appropriate. (2a)
- Finally, that's a good selection of references that you have. Generic references (e.g., Nielsen, Shneiderman) would be good, and in-place *citation* of those references (i.e., the way Wikipedia does it) would be good too. (4d)

1a — + ...Very thorough and comprehensive discussion of search functionality.

1b — + ...Good coverage with metrics and guidelines support, for two platforms.

2a — / ...Necessarily hit hard due to missing images; fortunately, easy to fix if it is fixed.

2b — | ...*Priority Metrics* can use some reorganization and *Key Characteristics* needs additional material.

4d — + ...Good reference support; last bullet has points of improvement but not critical.

4e — You successfully issued a pull request. However, your work only consists of two commits, of which the first is fairly minor and dated only one day before the due date. This work can be scheduled and paced

CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2015

Assignment I020 (due I022) Feedback

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

much better than that. In addition, your code includes references to images which were not committed. Make sure to be fully aware of the files you need and commit those completely. (/)

4f — Submitted on time. (+)