**Drab! but not Bad!**

Initially when this assignment was given to me I was reluctant to find a website that was fun or loud rather, for the fact that they usually tend to be easier to design. By that, what I mean to say is that when there is an abundance of fun information/content or the product or service has visual appeal. The target market, clientele or viewership is more easily readily thrilled.

During an exercise we did in class, where the objective was to analyze different websites for how conventional they were and whether or not they accomplished their goal or intended purpose, my group felt at odds. Before the exercise however, everyone instinctively chose to reach for their devices to gauge or assess their most visited sites. Sadly, for me and where I’m at in my life at the moment that meant the sites relating to law or legalities or government sites for social services. In this case, <https://albertacourts.ca/> was my most recently visited site.

Welcome to the most boring site in the world. That’s a challenge by the way. Let’s be honest, there’s no way to disagree with the boring statement but that doesn’t mean the website doesn’t have exactly what the client paid for or rather what the user needs or wants, or better yet what the client intended for their target market to require from the site. In fact my disagreement with the members of my group originated when this very illusion was instantly seen. Dislike for the site was almost immediate as well as dramatic for some reason. Does a legal website not take away its credibility or professionalism when it designs it’s website with excitement? In addition, does drab or boring necessarily mean badly designed?

No. No it doesn’t. Let’s take a look at why for a moment seeing as how it’s completely understandable when a website creator’s work is assessed in such a rudimentary way that it receives this level of acceptance or in this case, a lack thereof. Firstly, the website lacks many luxurious tools that most would be concerned not to see being that we’re socially conditioned, such as…

* A logo that returns you to the homepage
* A search-bar
* Navigation bars
* A fold
* Headings
* Drop-down menus
* Hamburger menus
* Toggle buttons
* Floating action buttons
* Icons

At the same time, this is done so by necessity not choice and we therefore can’t take away from the original objective of the client to its users, which was simply to give information. What would a government website require all these attributes and features for if it was only for the pure distribution of content. In any stretch of the imagination this becomes a strong case for a debate which never even took place amongst my peers on whether or not the information architecture was planned efficiently, and as the law requires accurately, as well as whether or not the content strategy was delivered in a manner that brought meaning to the user’s experience?

Secondly, the website lacks almost all the amenities that make a site even remotely socially acceptable at first glance such as…

* Contact info
* Security or malware info
* Tags
* Descriptions
* Blogs or comments
* Reviews
* An introduction
* Q and A section

Also omitted for the presumed lack of professionalism a site such as this would bring with these features. What I mean to say is there are no posters in a courtroom for a reason.

To conclude, the website is beautiful and professional. Just as the law wants it. What I mean to say by that is that the legal world holds with it a certain cultural aspect that cannot be ignored. A minimalist, quiet, classy, and monotone look, feel or atmosphere better yet. This website portrays the minimalism and class by having a delivery that requires only a title, privacy policy and logos as a description and information architecture division. The owners of the website benefit from having a small target market that already knows the requirements of such a database are minimal. And the backround picture of the mountains asserts the locality of the website’s pertinence being in Alberta. As for its usability and accessibility it scores very high considering the sites simplicity and ease of use. As for the website’s information architecture it seems it was done as well as possible considering there are over 45 links and three divisions without ever having a menu or drop-down or for that matter any confusion of any kind. As for grading the content of this page, I feel this department won in all categories as well considering the difficulty that comes with making legal information anything but drab. When I land on this legal site I feel relieved and refreshed as opposed to overwhelmed as the presumed feeling of impending stress originally expected or conditioned by other sites, such as the favorite of the day amongst my peers, amazon. Which is simply a huge source of questions to ask yourself if you ever even buy a thing. But who knows, the site has too much already and maybe amazon’s users demand it?

In retrospect, the only features of the <https://albertacourts.ca/> site are two hovering features such as button color and pointer changes. In all honesty, had I done the site myself I would have removed these simply to keep with the theme of minimalism, rather than attempt to conform to socially accepted practices for the sake of comfort. That said, there’s not enough on this site to list anything that’s bad.

I don’t even have to click twice to get to where I need from this website and at no point am I asking myself any questions.

Need I say more?