

CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2015

Assignment 1211 Feedback—Direct Manipulation Widget

Mondo Yamaguchi

myamagu1 / mondo.yamaguchi@gmail.com

Notes while running (asterisks indicate major observations):

- **** Not really “while running,” because...there is nothing to run! No standalone demo page found, and that was explicitly required. (4a, 4b)
- OK, so now I see it on your front end...and, no, sorry, aside from the images this is pretty much the same plugin that I demonstrated in class, carrying both its functionality and its loose ends. (4a, 4b)

Code review (asterisks indicate major observations):

1. Tabs in both CSS and JavaScript files. (4c)
2. The code itself is largely mine, so it wouldn't really be useful to you for me to review my own code :) Although admittedly, I would have had my code editor set up so that it did not insert tabs.
3. You did successfully integrate the plugin into your own front end. However, this integration is also largely identical to what was done in class, so not a lot of credit here. It's OK to *start* with this code, but I intentionally left a few things undone, plus the actual user interface is not great (mouse dragging can be better; feedback can be better; etc.). The expectation was for you to make it better. (3a, 3b, 4a, 4b)
4. **** The least you could have done here is made sure that the deletion code was not duplicated: factor out into a function, and have both the button and the plugin call that. Alas, not even that was accomplished, and now you have unnecessarily duplicated code. (4b)
5. **** The code is already copied, and yet it is incorrectly indented. (4c)

2b — / ...Overall design is not great (intentionally when I demonstrated this). Needs better feedback, mainly; plus, the drag code can use some coordinates refinement.

3a — / ...You correctly integrated the plugin into your front-end, but not much else. To drag this further down, the requested standalone demo page was not provided, either.

3b — / ...Not much credit here beyond replicating the class code successfully. And there was lots you could have done in terms of event handling: feedback improvement, drag-and-drop improvement, etc.

4a — / ...Self-explanatory, I presume.

4b — / ...No genuinely new code; not much to credit to begin with, plus code redundancy was introduced.

4c — / ...Same as above.

4d — | ...You at least used the course demonstration well; however, more was expected.

4e — / ...Repetitive messages, not enough work granularity.

4f — +