**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 called ‘Bass-ic Records’**

Visit the website here:

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

Visit the related GitHub repo here:

<https://github.com/ColumKavanagh/MusicLabelWebsite>

**Executive summary**

We built a website for a fictional Irish music label called ‘Bass-ic Records’.

Initially, Daniel and Colum decided they would do a website for a fictional music label. They were both interested in music and the idea would allow for a couple of interesting tools to be built and used on the website (the ‘Recommendations’ and ‘Gigs’ tools our case.) When Ciara joined the team thereafter during Week One, she was happy to move forward with the ‘music label’ idea as she has experience working in the music industry.

We wanted to create an informative website that could promote the artists that were signed to our label, ‘Bass-ic Records’, but we also wanted to do this in an interactive way so that the website was engaging for people to use.

**How our website was designed and how our team split the project work**

We initially discussed our overall approach to the website and used wireframes to mock-up some ideas. See the images below for our final wireframe design.

Then, after an initial skeleton of the four page website was built in html and the relevant repo set up on Colum’s 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; Daniel built the recommendations and gigs tools; and Colum built the homepage slideshow and helped Ciara with a pop-up to gather email addresses on our homepage. This allowed each member of the group to gain experience using HTML, CSS and JavaScript (along with Bootstrap and jQuery evidently) to contribute to the overall website.

Once the initial versions of our individually assigned sections were complete, the process became much more collaborative with regular team meetings and messaging via MS Teams enabling this process.

We also commented on the code we created throughout the process to ensure other team members knew what we were doing and to highlight which team member to ask if something needed to be explained about any particular aspect of the website.

**Wireframes**

See below for images of the wireframe designs for our ‘Home’, ‘Recommendations’, ‘Gigs’ and ‘Contact’ pages respectively. These wireframes were built using a collaborative, online UI design tool called ‘Figma’. (<https://www.figma.com/>)
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**Outline of schedule 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). Contact form. Slideshow on homepage (Bootstrap template edited with CSS and raw JavaScript).

**Week 3:** Pop-up on homepage. Final tweaks to all pages’ JavaScript/jQuery. Finalising CSS across the website.

**Week 4:** Deployment and speed/SEO testing and optimisation. Report writing.

HTML5 Form Elements Used

Contact Page - <input>, <label>, <form>, <option>, <textarea>, <select>

**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/> as opposed to say ‘www.bass-icrecords.ie’. Deploying the website on GitHub Pages also allowed us to remove the ‘index.html’ suffix from the hrefs which we used to link from page to page on our website. This is because the servers that GitHub pages uses are likely Linux based rather than Windows based (which would require the ‘index.html’ suffix to follow each href address).

**Testing**

HTML & CSS Validation:

- We used the HTML (<https://validator.w3.org/>) and CSS validators (<https://jigsaw.w3.org/css-validator/>) from W3C to proof our HTML and CSS files. Any errors shown by this validator were corrected so that now, no errors show for any of the HTML or SCC used on our website. Please see the validation documents in the ‘Supplementary’ folder of our website files proving that all pages were put through this process. Each member of the team validated their own HTML files for the pages they were initially responsible for and Ciara validated our CSS file. This ensured that we all gained experience using these tools and correcting errors.

Testing the speed of our website:

- We used Google’s Page Speed tool (<https://pagespeed.web.dev/>) to test the speed of our website pages. This led us to further optimising the ???

**Optimisation**

Some of the actions we undertook to optimise the **speed** of our website included:

Adjusting images:

- We resized any images used on the website so that they are as small as possible while still remaining of good quality.

Single JS and CSS files:

- We organised and collated all our JavaScript into one script.js file that all four page of the website then drew from. As each member of the team contributed some amount of JavaScript and/or jQuery, we used comment to help explain to each other what our JavaScript was doing and then structured the overall script.js file to make it more readable and easy to follow. We also put all of our CSS into the one style.css file for the website and further optimised this by minifying this CSS file.

Use of CDNs:

- For both of the libraries that we used (Bootstrap to improve the responsiveness and layout of our website) and jQuery (to improve user’s experience of using the interactive aspects of our website) we used Content Delivery Networks (CDN) to import these into our website. This kept the overall size of the files need to run our website smaller than if we had say downloaded the jQuery library ourselves and loaded that alongside our other website files.

Some of the actions we undertook to increase the **Search Engine Optimisation (SEO)** of our website included:

- Using different meta descriptions and meta keywords in ‘head’ section of each of our four separate webpages.

- Using relevant music-industry related keywords in the paragraph content of our different pages (i.e. the content that went in between the <p>“”</p> tags on our pages).

- Using h1 and h2 tags on our webpages where relevant to help Google understand the structure of the pages as it ‘crawls’ and indexes them.

- Sitemap?? (XML document)

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. | | | | | |