

Web Development Coursework

for the end of term:

final website assignment

This assignment consists of two parts – a website and a report on the website design and production. These are marked as one assignment

Brief

Website

Your brief is to **design and build a responsive website** of a local voluntary organisation or charity. This should be a real organisation.

Your web site should have 5 pages with different types of material and media, including video and sound clips if relevant.

In addition to the web site, you will include a report as a file called **report.html** with associated images etc. in your site's base directory. This will explain what you have learned in the process of building your site, where you found your information, and how you have adapted any resources (if applicable). The structure of the report is described in the next section.

You should **avoid** using primarily server side or pre-compiled frameworks such as **React** or WebPack and, if you use CSS templates, for example with **Bootstrap**, make sure you customise it enough to get credit for your own work – and **make clear which parts of the code are yours** and which parts come from the template library.

Report

Your report.html should contain the following (in this order):

- Your name
- **Introduction:** What is the essential story being told by your site and what type of structure did you choose to implement?
- **Inspiration:** State **3** things that have inspired you when creating your website (e.g. guest speakers, websites, artists, blogs).
- **Accessibility:** State **3** ways in which your site is accessible.
- **Usability:** State **3** ways in which you considered the usability of your site.
- **Learning:** State **3** things you had to learn or find out to create your site. How did you achieve that?
- **Evaluation I:** What aspects of your work do you think were particularly successful? Why?
- **Evaluation II:** What aspects of your work could be improved? How might you do things differently another time?
- **Resources:** What resources did you use in your work? List any sources of information, libraries, plugins, code or tools (you should also indicate inclusions from other sources within your code using comments)
- **Appendices:** Site map (if useful), wireframes and mock-ups

Preferred citation formats

Format for citing code:

[1] Author Initial, Author Surname, 'Title of program/source code' (), Year Published. [Type]. Web address or publisher.

Example:

[1] P. Korponaić, 'Meteor Kitchen examples' (commit oabcf1c), 2016. [Source code].
<https://github.com/perak/kitchen-examples/tree/master/example-minimal>

Format for citing online resource:

[1] Author Initial. Author Surname, 'Title', Year Published. [Online]. Available: <http://Website URL>. [Accessed: 10- Oct- 2013].

Example:

[1] Handlebarsjs.com, 'Handlebars Reference', 2016. [Online]. Available: <http://handlebarsjs.com/reference.html>. [Accessed: 20- Sep- 2016].

Materials from the web

You can use almost anything you like that you can find on the Web, but you should avoid anything that is not open or out of copyright (e.g. that costs money or requires login or registration). Being able to build on other people's ideas is an important skill.

It is essential that, on your report page (and, wherever possible, in your code) you describe what you have taken, where you took it from, and what you have done to it.

If you copy-and-paste something almost without change, you must say that you have done it, it must conform to the standards, and you shouldn't expect many marks for it. You will get credit for making imported code fit in with and enhance your own design, for understanding and using complex libraries, or for altering and enhancing material that you have used. Showing you can adapt existing code is particularly valuable. In order to be clear which material you have written and which you have used from elsewhere you will be expected to provide comprehensive comments within your HTML, CSS and Javascript files indicating code you have used, code you have adopted and edited and code that you have written.

Marking Criteria

Marking criteria fall under the five broad categories below. In addition, extra discretionary credit may be given by markers for exceptional or imaginative work that is otherwise not rewarded by the marking scheme. The marking criteria for this project are as follows (each criterion has an equal weighting of 4%):

- Site (4 criteria = 16%):
 - Navigable 5-page site with working URLs for the site hosted on the static web page system
 - Tidy directory structure and clear file naming
 - Site is accessible
 - Site has good content
- HTML (3 criteria = 12%)
 - HTML is valid and well formed
 - HTML elements are well chosen, with semantic elements and attributes used where possible
 - Rich commenting of HTML
- CSS (5 criteria = 20%)
 - Use of external stylesheets
 - CSS is used to make an appropriate, aesthetic design
 - Layout is appropriate and interesting
 - Website is responsive, with **explicit** responsive behaviour in stylesheets
 - Rich commenting of CSS
- JS (4 criteria = 16%)
 - JavaScript is successfully called and interacts with the DOM
 - JavaScript has an essential role in some aspects of the website
 - Advanced use is made of JavaScript, or JS library is used in a sophisticated way
 - JS is comprehensively commented
- Report (4 criteria = 16%)
 - Wireframes are comprehensive and representative. Mockups (and, where relevant, wireframes) reflect the responsive aspects of the site
 - Accessible design
 - Design and planning is good (focus on Introduction, Inspiration, Usability and Learning sections)
 - Reflection on work shows critical awareness
- Discretionary extra credit (20%)

SITE. Core functionality of the web site as a whole				16 marks
Site 1 Navigable 5-page site with working URLs for the site hosted on the static web page system	No link provided or URL fails. Site has fewer than 5 pages 0 marks	URL works, but dead links are present or some resources fail to load; or navigation is confusing. 2 marks	URL works and all but a few very minor links and resources work. Navigation is intuitive. 3 marks	URL and all links and resources load without error. Navigation is intuitive. 4 marks
Site 2 Tidy directory structure and clear file naming	All files in the same directory, directory structure confusing, or file naming confusing 0 marks	Subdirectories for media or CSS files but not both. Or directory structure good, but file naming confusing 2 marks	Subdirectories cleanly separate file type, file names would be clear to a competent newcomer 4 marks	
Site 3 Site is accessible	No evidence of accessible code, or accessibility rules incorrectly applied (e.g. <code></code>) 0 marks	Some evidence of accessible code (e.g. alt attributes) 1 marks	Broadly accessible code, but with clear flaws 2 marks	Accessible code 4 marks
Site 4 Site has good content – using media where relevant. Content is integrated to draw a rich, coherent and compelling picture.	Content is poor, minimal or mostly placeholders 0 marks	Content is appropriate in quantity and target (within the scope of a short project) 2 marks	Content is excellent and well-supported by media. It tells its story well 4 marks	
HTML. Building a web site HTML skeleton				12 marks
HTML 1 HTML is valid	HTML does not validate as HTML5 0 marks	HTML does not validate as HTML5, but there are very few issues – either previously valid syntax, minor typos or minor issues with external boilerplate code. 2 marks	HTML is valid 4 marks	

HTML 2 HTML elements are well chosen, with semantic elements and attributes used where possible	<p>HTML elements are sometimes incorrect or misunderstood (e.g. using table, center, hr or br for visual design)</p> <p>0 marks</p>	<p>HTML elements used appropriately, but limited range used (e.g. over-reliance on <div>)</p> <p>2 marks</p>	<p>Good range of different elements used appropriately.</p> <p>3 marks</p>	<p>Extensive, appropriate use of different elements, for media as well as text structuring. The site code is cleaner as a result.</p> <p>4 marks</p>
HTML 3 Rich commenting of HTML	<p>No comments, or comments are very sparse, unhelpful or just cancel code</p> <p>0 marks</p>	<p>Some comments are present, but they document HTML not the site (e.g. <!-- h1 here is a title -->)</p> <p>1 marks</p>	<p>Evidence of good commenting practice, but not enough for a newcomer to the code to orient themselves.</p> <p>3 marks</p>	<p>Number and quality of comments that a competent newcomer can easily understand the page structures and navigate around the code.</p> <p>4 marks</p>
CSS. Making an attractive, responsive website				20 marks
CSS 1 Use of external stylesheets	<p>No styling or only inline styles</p> <p>0 marks</p>	<p>Internal styling used exclusively, or internal and external are mixed, or no user-created external sheets are shared between pages (e.g. aboutus.css)</p> <p>2 marks</p>	<p>Only external stylesheets used for styling, with site wide rules</p> <p>4 marks</p>	
CSS 2 CSS is used to make an appropriate, aesthetic design	<p>No CSS or CSS clearly entirely generic (this includes uncustomised Bootstrap templates)</p> <p>0 marks</p>	<p>CSS is used and styles some of the content. Some content still uses browser defaults</p> <p>2 marks</p>	<p>CSS is used throughout to style the web site's appearance. It works well.</p> <p>3 marks</p>	<p>CSS is used to style the site's appearance. It looks good and is appropriate to the audience and subject matter</p> <p>4 marks</p>

CSS 3 Layout is appropriate and interesting	No layout CSS or layout poor 0 marks	Layout is fine, but fails to show advanced CSS and make good use of screen space 3 mark	Layout is excellent, and matches the subject and audience 4 marks	
CSS 4 Website is responsive, with explicit responsive behaviour	No responsive behaviour, or layout is poor despite responsive code 0 marks	Explicit responsive code, but flawed execution. Alternatively responsive behaviour is not explicit, but works (e.g. simple site layout flowing normally) 2 marks	Responsive code is explicit and successful. 4 marks	
CSS 5 Rich commenting of CSS	No comments, or comments are very sparse, unhelpful or just cancel code 0 marks	Some comments are present, but not helpful 1 marks	Evidence of good commenting practice, but not enough for a newcomer to the code to orient themselves. 3 marks	Number and quality of comments that a competent newcomer can easily understand the page structures and navigate around the code. 4 marks
JS. An interactive web site				16 marks
JS 1 JavaScript is successfully called and student-written code interacts with the DOM	JavaScript is not present or not successfully called 0 marks	JavaScript is called successfully 2 marks	JavaScript is called successfully and student-written, non-library code reads from and writes to the DOM 4 marks	
JS 2 JavaScript has an essential role in the function of some aspect of the website	No JavaScript, or JavaScript is irrelevant to the site 0 marks	JavaScript is a part of the site (but primarily decorative) 3 marks	JavaScript is designed into the site – the web pages would be poorer without it 4 marks	

JS 3 Advanced use is made of JavaScript; or a JS library is used in a sophisticated way	No 'advanced' JavaScript 0 marks	JS library is used in a limited way (e.g. code is as in library readme/tutorial); or non-library code is not that advanced; or advanced use is buggy 3 marks	Advanced JavaScript is used successfully and effectively. 4 marks	
JS 4 Rich commenting of JS	No comments, or comments are very sparse, unhelpful or just cancel code 0 marks	Some comments are present, but not helpful 2 marks	Evidence of good commenting practice, but not enough for a newcomer to the code to orient themselves. 3 marks	Number and quality of comments that a competent newcomer can easily understand the page structures and navigate around the code. 4 marks
REPORT. Describing and reflecting on the design and building process				16 marks
Report 1 Wireframes and mockups are comprehensive and representative. Mockups (and, where relevant, wireframes) reflect responsive design	No diagrams, diagrams are not readable or of limited value. Mockups may have been generated after the website was built. 0 marks	Diagrams are clear enough but wireframes lack structure or would be difficult to translate to HTML, or match with final outcome is poor. 2 marks	Clear diagrams, but flawed or missing key elements; or diagrams good, but separate from the report 3 marks	Excellent diagrams. Where responsive elements change design, diagrams show this. 4 marks
Report 2 Accessible design	Not mentioned, or 'accessible' misinterpreted. 0 marks	Accessibility addressed, but generic. No direct connection to specific site. 2 marks	At least 3 clear elements of accessible design mentioned, with direct relevance to site. 4 marks	

Report 3 Design and planning is good (Mostly Intro, Inspiration, Usability and Learning sections)	No report, report not in HTML format, or poor or irrelevant content. 0 marks	Content is ok, but quite generic. 2 marks	Evidence of research and analytical thought. 3 marks	Consistently high quality report. 4 marks
Report 4 Reflection on work shows critical awareness	No report, report not in HTML format, or no reflection. 0 marks	Reflection is limited. 2 marks	Evidence of critical, reflective thought. 3 marks	Excellent reflection. 4 marks