Edge Hill University

The Department of Computer Science

CIS1705
Accessible Web Design and Development

Level 4

Coursework

2025/2026

Module Leader: Dr. David Walsh

Telephone: 01695 65 7648

Email: david.walsh@edgehill.ac.uk

Administrators: 01695 65 7603

Coursework One - Portfolio (LO1)

Weighting: **20%**
Deadline for final documentation: **For all hand-in dates and times, please see the appropriate VLE Dropbox**

1.1 Introduction

This assignment is a major part of the formal assessment for CIS1705 and is, therefore, compulsory. You will be required to work individually, so time management is of the essence.

The aim of this assessment is to give you the opportunity to construct a portfolio of work which will demonstrate your skills in a number of areas of web development. During the semester, you will be given a total of three tasks to complete and submit individually, which will showcase the skills you have learnt in this module. Read this document carefully and make sure that you are clear about what you have to do and what you have to hand in before you attempt the assignment.

1.2 Tasks

There will be three portfolio tasks issued over the course of the module. They will be small tasks and you will have a week to complete them. Each portfolio task will be posted on the Web Teaching Environment (WTE) when that week's seminar material is released. The task will be talked through in the lecture/seminar on the week it is released. There will also be time for any questions you have to be asked during this time. You should make use of this opportunity in the sessions to speak to your module leader or seminar tutor about the assignment tasks! Alternatively, you can ask your Module leader your questions or clarifications via email.

1.3 CW1 Assessment Criteria

Your individual tasks and questions will be marked on two elements, 1) how seriously the task was attempted and 2) the accuracy of the code/content submitted. For each task, you will receive written generic feedback via BB and in the seminar session nearest to the return of the results, you will receive verbal one-to-one detailed, actionable feedback on the quality, accuracy, and issues of the code/content submitted (**so your attendance to classes is essential**).

1.4 Guidelines for Submissions

The following table shows when each task should be submitted:

Task	Week handed out	Week due
Task 1	Week 3	Week 4
Task 2	Week 6	Week 7
Task 3	Week 9	week 10

Table 1: Task submissions

The solutions to each task must be submitted to the appropriate Dropbox on the VLE by the deadlines listed on each Dropbox. Details on how each of the tasks should be submitted will be included in the task descriptions. All tasks should be submitted following these details **exactly**, or it may result in a **0** mark being awarded. *Paying attention to detail is an essential Computer Science and employability skill, hence the strictness of following the submission guidelines.*
If you have any questions/queries, please contact your module leader via email with the following as the subject line:

CIS1705: CW1 Question

1.5 POINTS TO CONSIDER

It is **important** that you attempt **all** of the tasks and **all** of their questions, as doing the tasks provides important practice for the work in coursework 2. If you attempt all the tasks, then you will find coursework two significantly easier.

Coursework Two - Web-Site (LO1, LO2, LO3)

Weighting: **80%**
Deadline for submission of final application: **For all hand-in dates and times, please see the appropriate VLE Dropbox**

Introduction

This assignment is a major part of the formal assessment for CIS1705 and is, therefore, compulsory. You will be required to work individually, so time management is of the essence. Read this document carefully and make sure that you are clear about what you have to do, and what you have to hand in before you attempt the assignment.

The aim of this assessment is to give you the opportunity to construct a website for a specific purpose and also be able to explain clearly how you tested the site. You must select the appropriate tools to use in order to achieve this and communicate your ideas clearly and concisely.

Task

You are required to develop an accessible website using HTML, CSS, and JavaScript based on a set of designs that are published on the VLE.

In addition to the website build, you are required to produce a report that documents the testing that you performed and evidence of how your site conforms to accessibility guidelines and tests.

4.1 Required Content

The website that you develop must:

- Implement the following features:
    1. A landing page with the filename `index.html` using the design provided on the VLE.
    2. A page with the filename `product.html` using the design provided on the VLE.
    3. Two CSS files with the filenames `grid.css` (containing the grid structure using CSS-Grid for design layout and Flexbox for component layout) and `style.css` (for general styling of the two pages).
    4. A JavaScript file `reviews.js` that loads the review comments from the api into the `product.html` page.
    5. Accessible content for both pages.

- Have cleanly structured, accessible code.
- Document code throughout.

The accompanying report must include:

- Test Documentation - This must describe the testing you undertook, including browser testing, validation testing, and user testing. **(Note:: This report should not be a report on how you built the site!)**
- Accessibility conformity - here, you will describe how you have made the content of the pages accessible and also how you have tested that your site is accessible. This would include ensuring your content follows a logical hierarchy; that your code is tagged correctly using semantic tags and is structured logically, ensuring all images have meaningful Alt texts, providing transcripts for video and audio files, the site is keyboard accessible, colour and contrast meet guidelines, and all forms are correctly labelled, navigation items are clear, consistent and accessible.

4.2 Initial Planning

Before you start work on your website, you need to think about/plan a few things before you start building something! To help you with this, consider the following design process/workflow:

1. Coursework Assigned - Document/clarify your understanding of the assignment, ask questions for clarification, and take notes.
2. Research and Brainstorming/Concept Development - Revisit the module's tutorials to ensure you remember all the techniques you have been taught.
3. Implementation - Based on the designs provided on the VLE implement the website. Also, make sure you take into account the style guide. (Note: you may need to amend colours if they fail accessibility requirements - use the closest colour you can that conforms)
4. Testing and Accessibility - Test the resulting implementation for functionality, usability, validation and accessibility.

4.3 What will be assessed

- Your website (visual accuracy to the given designs, interaction of features and accessibility, correct choice and use of assets, naming of files and folders including file paths).
- All HTML, CSS, and JavaScript source code (quality, comments, succinctness, accuracy, use of current standards compliant code, logical and accessible structure of code and content).
- The testing and accessibility documentation (detailed narrative with relevant imagery/charts/results, written in the third person, underpinned by academic sources where possible).

4.4 CW2 Assessment Criteria

- Website features implemented
- Accessibility conformity
- Code Quality

- Code Documentation
- Testing and Accessibility Documentation

4.5 Guidelines for Submission

When completed, you will need to upload a copy of your website source code and the testing report to the relevant drop box on the VLE.

To submit CW2 create a folder on your computer using the following format:
`LastName_FirstInitial_StudentNumber_CW2`
e.g. `Walsh_D_12345678_CW2`
Within this folder, add the following:

- A folder named `website`, which contains all of your files, folders and assets for the application to work correctly (including any images, etc)
- The testing and accessibility report

Once you have added the content to the folder, you should then ZIP the folder using the ZIP format and submit this file to the relevant VLE Dropbox by the specified deadline. Make sure that all the required files are included in the ZIP folder before you submit. **It is your responsibility to check this. You could lose marks if they are missing and affect how your site looks or functions!**

If you have any questions/queries, please contact your module leader via email with the following as the subject line:

CIS1705: CW2 Question

4.6 Points to consider

It is important that you not only develop the website but also document the code using comments and test it. The documentation represents a major aspect of the overall mark for the work and should not be left to the end but created as you develop your application.

4.7 Late Submissions

Your assignment is regarded as late if it is not submitted by midday (12:00) on the due date indicated on the Blackboard submission drop-box.

If you have missed a submission deadline for a written (individual) assessment, at the scheduled first sitting, the University will accept Late Submissions where the submission is received within five working days of the original deadline (aside from where PSRB requirements preclude this). [These] Late Submissions will be subject to the normal capped mark (maximum 40%) for reassessment. Work handed in late [after this five day period] without approval through a Deferral, Extension or authorised late submission (Academic Regulation H4.4) will be marked at zero.

Early submission is therefore recommended to avoid uploading issues.

4.8 Extensions

If you are unable to submit by the stated deadline, you should follow the extension application guidelines below Only in extreme cases will extensions be granted for coursework.

4.8.1 Student guidelines for applying for an extension

- All applications for extensions should be submitted to the Department Administrator. (Forms are available on Blackboard / Organisation area)
- Any application for an extension of a deadline should normally be made at least twenty-four hours before the due deadline for the assessment. In exceptional circumstances outside of this time scale students are permitted to submit an extension form without supporting evidence. The supporting evidence must be submitted within 7 working days or the extension request will not be approved.
- All applications for an extension should be accompanied by verified independent documentary evidence.
- Extensions may be granted for a period that extends up to two weeks before a Module Assessment Board. If a period longer than this is required the student should be advised to apply for consideration under exceptional mitigating circumstances.
- The timing of student feedback against published deadlines will be affected if an extension is granted.

4.9 Personal Circumstances

If you are affected by more serious, long-term problems that are likely to prevent you from completing work with a short-term extension, then you may apply for Personal Circumstances using the online form `https://www.edgehill.ac.uk/departments/support/registry/assessments-and-awards/personal-circumstances-form/`. If approved, your deadline will be the next assessment point and your work will be marked without penalty.

Academic Malpractice

It is a serious academic offence to use or attempt to use unfair means to enhance your performance or influence the standard of award obtained. 'Unfair' includes all forms of cheating, including plagiarism, collusion and impersonation.

When researching and writing-up your coursework you must ensure that you fully reference any elements within it that are not written or conceived by yourself. In doing so you will respect the intellectual property of other writers, and acknowledge the importance of their work in your area of research. If you fail to attribute a source for the work of other people and present it as your own, you are stealing their work. **Academic malpractice** of this kind ('**plagiarism**') is seen as the most serious offence in academia, and if you are found guilty of such activities it **may lead to the termination of your course of study or the non-conferral of your degree**.

As such, you should ensure that you are familiar with the appropriate ways in which to avoid academic malpractice, using the appropriate referencing system. The department of Computer science, like many departments at Edge Hill University, use the **Harvard referencing system (2014)** `https://eshare.edgehill.ac.uk/5337/5/HarvardReferencing2014v2.7.4.pdf`.

5.1 Avoiding malpractice when using electronic research mechanisms

You will be encouraged to use a range of electronic and online resources such as electronic journals, online database and the Internet, which, collectively are a ubiquitous resource. However, students need to be cautious when using these research tools, as whilst they streamline the process of research/information gathering, they simultaneously generate a depth of materials that need to be filtered and **read**.

In addition, caution is needed as the use of these electronic research tools often generates materials for your scope of study which are not relevant. Consequently, you should ensure that you search within the relevant parameters of investigation as framed by the recommended reading and research materials indicated in the module handbook of each module.

Remember: you ***read*** for a degree - you cannot demonstrate that you understand academic theory in an appropriate manner if you have not **read and understood relevant** resources.

If you have any concerns please check with your tutor or Learning Services (`https://www.edgehill.ac.uk/ls/uni-skills/referencing/`)

Remember, it is as easy for the department to uncover any information taken from the internet and attempted to be passed off as your own work, as it is for you to find it!

Marking Criteria

Details regarding the Learning Outcomes, which assessments will be used to assess and the mapping of the ***QAA FHEQ*** outcome classification descriptions are presented in Table 2 below. The detailed marking criteria for assessments one and two are defined throughout Section: 6.1 and Section 6.2, respectively.

Learning Outcomes	Assessment	Outcome Classification Descriptor
LO1: Demonstrate an understanding of HTML, JavaScript, and CSS.	1, 2	Cognitive and Practical skills
LO2: Plan and implement website solutions for small-scale real-world problems.	2	Knowledge and understanding, Cognitive skills and Practical skills.
LO3: Demonstrate an ability to communicate complex ideas in written form.	2	Knowledge and understanding and transferable skills

Table 2: Learning Outcomes alignment with QAA FHEQ outcome classification descriptions

6.1 COURSEWORK 1

Table 3: CW1 Marking Scheme

Criteria	Element	Fail (0-29%)	Narrow Fail (30-39%)	Pass (40-49%)	Good (50-59%)	Very Good (60-69%)	Excellent (70-84%)	Outstanding (85-100%)
LO1 Plan, design and implement a series of usability tests.	Portfolio Completion	Less than 30% (0-5) of the task questions are seriously attempted, or there is either no submission or only empty files submitted.	Between 30% and 39% (5 - 6 questions) of the task questions seriously attempted, or there is either no submission or only empty files submitted.	Between 40% and 54% (6-8 questions) of the task questions were seriously attempted.	Between 55% and 74% (9-11 questions) of the task questions seriously attempted.	All three tasks and most (75%-83%) task questions (12-13 questions) were seriously attempted.	All three tasks and most task (84%-93%) questions (13-14 questions) were seriously attempted.	All three tasks and all task questions (15 questions) were seriously attempted.
	Code Validation / Content accuracy	Less than 30% (0-5) of the task questions submitted, and content/code is extremely rudimentary.	There is a significant amount of content/code in the files, but the content/code is not relevant to the question.	Content/code is relevant to the task, but the code does not validate with more than three errors, or the non-code content shows a very basic understanding of the subject.	Either code submitted questions do not validate with only two or three errors, or the non-code content shows a good understanding of the subject, and there is little evidence of further self-learning (1 or 2 references).	All questions requiring code do not validate, failing with only one error. Non-code content shows a full understanding of the topic with good evidence of further learning (over 5 relevant sources referenced).	Task questions requiring code mostly validate, with only one or two questions having minor validation errors. Non-code questions demonstrate an excellent understanding of the topic, supported with a mix of academic peer-reviewed and non-academic references.	Task questions requiring code are submitted and have no validation issues in any question. All non-code question content shows a complete understanding of the topic is presented in an academic manner and is fully supported with academic peer-reviewed references.

6.2 COURSEWORK 2

Table 4: Assessment Marking Criteria Grid

Criteria	Fail (0-29%)	Narrow Fail (30-39%)	Pass (40-49%)	Good (50-59%)	Very Good (60-69%)	Excellent (70-84%)	Outstanding (85-100%)
LO1: Demonstrate an understanding of HTML, JavaScript, and CSS.	Nothing submitted, rudimentary work, or substantially plagiarised.	A basic visual page structure exists but does not resemble the given designs, and no features are attempted. The code is completely unstructured. The code is not documented. No evidence of accessibility being considered.	One feature was attempted. Code is partially structured and/or lacks the use of HTML5 and/or CSS-Grid. Text alternatives for image accessibility are present but either not accurate or short or not meaningful. The code has been occasionally commented.	Two features were attempted. The code is consistently structured throughout. Navigation menus are clear, consistent, and accessible. Text alternatives for image accessibility are meaningful. Most of the features have been code-commented.	Three features were attempted. The code uses appropriate semantic HTML tags and a logical structure. CSS properties are appropriate. Colours and contrast meet accessibility guidelines. The code has been commented on throughout.	Four features were attempted. Variable and class names are appropriate and understandable. Keyboard accessibility is implemented correctly. All code comments are detailed and meaningful.	Five features were attempted. The amount of duplicate code is minimised, and the site is fully accessible. Code comments document how the individual parts work and link together.
LO2: Plan and implement website solutions for small-scale real-world problems.	Nothing submitted, rudimentary work, or substantially plagiarised.	Nothing is visible when the site is loaded in browsers.	The site is visible in browsers but does not resemble the given designs. Significant issues make interaction with it impossible.	The site is visible and resembles the given designs, but significant issues make interaction impossible.	The site is visible and closely matches the given designs, but small issues mean some features do not work as specified.	The site is visible and is an exact match (or as close as can be) to the given designs. All features work as expected.	All features work as specified, and the site is fully accessible with clearly documented user testing conducted.
LO3: Demonstrate an ability to communicate complex ideas in written form.	Either no testing report has been submitted, contains only rudimentary work or is substantially plagiarised.	Basic test documentation exists, but no testing has been conducted. Accessibility is described but no evidence of how it has been applied in the build.	The testing report contains an overview of the code testing conducted, but no details are provided of the processes, the results or the actions taken. Accessibility has been described either on how it has been applied to the site content or the code but not both, and no or limited evidence has been provided.	The manual code testing is documented but does not follow any pre-defined plan. validation testing has taken place and evidence provided. Accessibility has been described on how it has been applied to the content and the code, with good evidence of testing provided for some parts.	Code testing is documented and follows a documented, pre-defined plan. Repeated validation testing is evident. Accessibility is discussed, and evidence of testing is presented for all parts.	Test documentation is detailed for both code testing and accessibility.	Test documentation is conducted in a logical order, and all testing has been conducted and documented in detail, including user usability testing.
Spelling, Grammar, Punctuation (academic writing and language) (5%)	No sentence structure, many errors in spelling, grammar and vocabulary which severely affects the meaning and understanding of the discussion.	Unclear communication of ideas. Frequent significant errors in spelling, punctuation, and grammar, affecting the meaning and understanding of the discussion.	Clear communication of ideas but some significant errors in spelling, punctuation, and grammar. Sentence structures are incorrect and affect the understanding of the discussion.	Written in generally correct English (UK), contains minor reoccurring spelling and grammatical errors. Sentence structures are partially correct and contain some relevant vocabulary, aiding the understanding of the discussion.	Written in correct English (UK), contains minor errors that do not affect the meaning and understanding of the discussion and are not recurring. Sentences structured correctly and contain appropriate and relevant vocabulary, which includes some technical terminology, used to support the communication and development of ideas.	Fluent writing style, written in correct English (UK). No abbreviations evident. Effective and accurate use of a variety of appropriate vocabulary, incorporating detailed technical terminology. A strong indication of a developing academic writing style, with each paragraph attempting to follow the SEED structure.	Fluent writing style, written in correct English (UK). No abbreviations evident. Highly effective and accurate use of a wide variety of appropriate vocabulary, incorporating detailed technical terminology. Adopts a professional and academic writing style and conventions, with each paragraph following the SEED structure.