

CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2012

Assignment 1101 Feedback

Carlos Agudo & Thomas Zachariah

A little preface to give you a context for the assigned proficiencies below: Your particular assignment involved a lot of “copy and adapt” work, which happens with some frequency in software development. It acknowledges that you are basing your own work on prewritten code, but does require that you understand this prior code sufficiently enough to get your own stuff done. Overall, you did this job quite well; the main trick with “copy and adapt” is to make sure that your adaptation is complete: no overlooked new/different functionality, no leftover comments, holdover names (variables, functions), etc. Also, as “copy and adapt” occurs, the chance of unnecessary code repetition grows, so it is also good to review the overall code base as it evolves, in order to consolidate emerging repetitions. Doing this latter part well does require some experience, but it is hoped that you started getting some initial exposure with this assignment.

3a — You certainly got a good dose of user interface construction experience here, and overall pulled it off decently. In the process of adaptation, though, you missed some key *differences* in the functionality you were implementing, particularly in terms of the new constraints that your area, grades, imposes: e.g., limited values for the semester/term, numeric constraints for the year and GPA. You thus did not take full advantage of what the menus/forms/dialogs interaction style can do in terms of usability. This is the aspect of the user interface construction area that can use improvement. (I)

3b — You took the prior event handling code and generally adapted it well to the new functionality. (+)

3c — Your code shows good MVC understanding. (+)

4a — UI design misses aside, you implemented what you do have quite well. One glitch was the emergence, with the addition of this functionality, with new potential for code consolidation. We did some of that in class, but it would be useful to continue keeping an eye out for this, especially if you plan to resubmit. (I)

4b — Your MVC separation is clean, preserving the prior MVC separation well. (+)

4c — Overall, your code is generally readable. It generally preserved the formatting of the prior code, which (in the opinion of the original programmer LOL), was already quite readable :) However, some new and modified code could use better spacing consistency. This is a fair expectation, given that you had a lot of pre-existing code to follow in terms of formatting. (I)

4d — Your successful implementation shows effective use of available resources and documentation. (+)

4e — Good commit rate and messages. (+)

4f — Submitted on time. (+)