**Web Design & Client-side Scripting**

Lecturer: Sam Cogan

**- Group Project -**

**Group Members:**

Colum Kavanagh (Student No. 21121851)

Daniel Morrissey (Student No. 21118701)

Ciara O’Malley (Student No. 20215827)

Business:

**A Music Label**

**(TWO PAGES OF TEXT IN TOTAL WILL SUFFICE!!!)**

**Executive summary**

**Why did you decide on this idea, what problem are you solving, what is the market size etc?**

We decided to do a website for a music label….???

**How did your team split the project work?**

After an initial skeleton of the four page website was built in html and the relevant repo set up on GitHub with other team members assigned as ‘contributors’, each member of the team took responsibility for a different section of the site. Ciara built the contact page, and pop-up (with Colum); Daniel built the recommendations and gigs tools; and Colum built the homepage slider.

While working with separate CSS and JS files throughout the process, we decided to combine these into single files to aid our speed optimisation. We discussed the overall style of the website as a group and finalised our CSS based on this.

**Show work packages with milestones and deliverables**

Week 1: Skeleton of website and repo on GitHub. Design using Wireframes.

Week 2: ‘Recommendations’ tool (built with jQuery). ‘Gigs’ tool (built with jQuery).

Week 3: Contact form. Slideshow on homepage (Bootstrap template edited with CSS and raw Javascript).

Week 4: Pop-up on homepage. Final tweaks to all pages’ javascript. Finalising CSS across the website.

Week 5: Deployment and speed and SEO testing and optimisation.

**How was your site designed?**

- Regular team meetings and messaging via MS Teams.

- Figma wireframes:

See below for images of the wireframe designs for our ‘Home’, ‘Recommendations’, ‘Gigs’ and ‘Contact’ pages respectively. These wireframes were built using an online UI design tool called ‘Figma’.
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Show wireframes for each web page and reference at least **one design pattern** (What’s this????) **per wireframe**

**Deployment**

Our website is deployed using GitHub’s Pages feature. This allows the website to be viewable by the public. As this is a college project, the URL for the public website is:

https://columkavanagh.github.io/MusicLabelWebsite/

**Testing**

- HTML5 Validator - https://en.rakko.tools/tools/58/

- Google Page Speed

**Optimisation**

Speed:

- adjust images

- single JS and CSS files

- In real life we would minify the code

SEO:

- Different meta description and meta keywords in head of each page.

- Use h1, h2 etc

This project will be graded as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 80+ | 70-79 | 60-69 | 50-59 | 40-49 | 0-39 |
| Responsive (15%) | Website is responsive with no visual errors using a responsive framework with extensive customisation. | Website is responsive with no visual errors using a responsive framework with some customisation. | Website is responsive with no visual errors using a responsive framework with no customisation. | Website is responsive but with some visual errors. | Website is responsive but with many visual errors. | Website is not responsive. |
| Use of framework (jQuery, Bootstrap etc) (10%) | Framework implementation is extensively customised and adds major value to the site | Framework implementation is customised and adds major value to the site | Framework implementation is customised and adds some value to the site | Framework implementation is simple but adds some value to the site | Framework implementation is simple and adds no value to the site | No framework used |
| Form validation (10%) | Form with validation using JavaScript and HTML5. Visually appealing and clear to users. Unsuccessful validations should be thoroughly explained to users | Form with validation using JavaScript and HTML5 which is visually appealing | Form with some basic validation using JavaScript and HTML5. | Form with some basic validation using HTML 5. | Form with little or no validation. | No form. |
| JavaScript implementation (25%) | Extensive functionality outside of the scope of what was covered in class. Visually appealing and easy to use. | Functionality outside of the scope of what was covered in class. Visually appealing and easy to use. | Some basic functionality or without errors. | Some basic functionality or functionality with errors. | Minimal JavaScript. | No JavaScript. |
| Deployment (10%) | Website is deployed online with excellent file structure and pathnames. | Website is deployed online with good file structure and pathnames. | Website is deployed online however has a poor file structure OR pathnames. | Website is deployed online however has a poor file structure AND pathnames. | Website is deployed online however has some deployment related errors (404, images not showing etc). | Website is not deployed online. |
| Testing and optimisation (10%) | Website tested with the HTML and CSS validator with excellent result. Optimised via Google Page Speed rankings – excellent result. | Website tested with the HTML and CSS validator with good result. Optimised via Google Page Speed rankings – good result. | Website tested with the HTML and CSS validator with adequate result. Optimised via Google Page Speed rankings – adequate result. | Website tested with the HTML and CSS validator with poor result. Optimised via Google Page Speed rankings – poor result. | Website shows little evidence of testing or optimisation. | Website shows no evidence of testing or optimisation. |
| Planning, formatting, wireframes, commenting of code (10%) | Excellent evidence of planning, requirements, wireframing, formatting and commenting of code. | Good evidence of planning, requirements, wireframing, formatting and commenting of code. | evidence of planning, requirements, wireframing, formatting and commenting of code. | Adequate evidence of planning, requirements, wireframing, formatting and commenting of code. | Very poor effort of planning, minimal formatting and commenting. | None. |
| Effort (10%) | This final section is based on the examiner’s discretion. Learners who score well here will have gone beyond the scope of the project document, will discuss testing and design decisions, and will have presented their video overview excellently. | | | | | |