

UU-MWD-500-ZM: Design for Web Content

Assignment 1 – 50%

Project Goal:

Project Goal:

To come up with a website functional and non-functional specification document for a financial institution like a Bank. Assume you are hired as a consultant by a bank in your country to design a website specification document.

Project Directions:

- Introduce yourself or Company
- Start with the objectives
- Key audiences
- Provisional site structure
- Technical specifications
- Non-functional requirements
- Budget
- Timeline

Submission details:

Assignment 1 must be submitted via VLE on the indicated due date at Sunday 11:59pm / 23:59 UTC time.

Turnitin

Your work will need to be submitted through the Turnitin System. Please follow the guidelines below prior to submitting your work. You are advised to submit your work as a draft and check the Turnitin Index before the final submission deadline to prevent and detect plagiarism within your work.

Marking Guide

Assignment 1 - Marking Criteria

1. Following project directions [40 marks]

- Introduce the company
- Describe the objectives of the project
- Describe the key audiences
- Provide a provisional site structure (as a diagram or illustration)
- Document the technical specifications
- Document the non-functional requirements
- Budget
- Timeline

2. Aesthetic appeal [5 marks]

- Look of website
- Use of color scheme
- Formatting of text/images
- Website layout

3. Navigation [5 marks]

- Working navigation with easy access to all areas of the website from homepage

4. Creativity and Originality [5 marks]

- Demonstration of creativity in design and implementation of website

5. Functionality [15 marks]

- Website works as intended
- Accessibility (accessible design)
- Responsiveness (responsive design)

6. Code [30 marks]

- Legibility of HTML and CSS code
- Use of modern coding standards in HTML and CSS
- Effective use of other web tools (e.g. JavaScript, CSS frameworks ...etc.)
- Effective use of CSS for styling and website layout (e.g. color schemes, Flexbox, CSS Grid)
- Sufficient in-line comments on website code

Total = 100 marks

Level 7 Marking

Grade	Coherent and detailed knowledge and understanding of the subject area	Cognitive and intellectual skills	Reading and referencing	Presentation, style and structure Work that significantly exceeds the specified word limit may be penalized
90 - 100%	Exemplary in-depth and advanced understanding of the current state of knowledge in the field of study, including strong systematic, theoretical, and conceptual understanding, and a highly sophisticated grasp of the subject matter.	Outstanding ability to critically evaluate current problems and contemporary issues in the field, with an awareness of new insights or perspectives. The ability to synthesize current research and advanced scholarship in a unique and innovative manner, showcasing exceptional creativity.	A deep and selective engagement with a wide range of relevant and current academic, research, policy, and practice-related literature, demonstrating initiative and highly accurate referencing. This engagement is characterized by a very high level of critical thinking and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the material.	Exemplary presentation of work that is fluent and flawless throughout.
80-89%	Excellent systematic, theoretical and conceptual understanding of knowledge at or informed by the forefront of the field of study and showing sophisticated depth, breadth, detail and clarity	A highly sophisticated ability to critically evaluate current problems and contemporary issues in the field, drawing on new insights or perspectives. The work demonstrates a very high level of originality and creativity in the approaches taken to synthesize current research and advanced scholarship within the subject area. This demonstrates a deep understanding of the material and the ability to think critically about it.	A deep and extensive engagement with a wide range of relevant and current academic, research, policy, and practice-related literature, demonstrating initiative and highly accurate referencing. This engagement is characterized by a very high level of critical thinking and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the material.	Highly effective presentation of work that is coherently structured and clearly expressed throughout.

Grade	Coherent and detailed knowledge and understanding of the subject area	Cognitive and intellectual skills	Reading and referencing	Presentation, style and structure Work that significantly exceeds the specified word limit may be penalized
70-79% Pass Mark	A sufficient but limited level of systematic, theoretical and conceptual understanding of knowledge at times at or informed by the forefront of the field of study but showing adequate depth, breadth, detail and clarity	A sufficient but limited level of critical evaluation and awareness of current problems and contemporary issues and debates, with some reference to new insights or perspectives within the field. Limited evidence of originality and creativity in synthesising current research and scholarship within the subject area	Sufficient critical engagement with a reasonable range of relevant and current academic, research, policy- and practice-related literature demonstrating mainly appropriate reading but limited initiative and/or some minor inconsistencies and inaccuracies in referencing	Generally good presentation of work that is sufficiently logical and coherent in structure with a discernible central argument. May present limited originality and lack some clarity of expression, but an identifiable conclusion reasonably communicated to specialist and non-specialist audiences
60-69% Marginal Fail	A lack of understanding of the subject matter in the field of study, with knowledge that is incomplete, uninformed, or lacking sufficient depth, breadth, detail, or clarity.	A limited or lacking ability to critically evaluate current problems and contemporary issues in the field, with insufficient reference made to new insights or perspectives. There is also a lack of evidence of originality and creativity in synthesizing current research and scholarship within the subject area. This may indicate a need for further development of critical thinking skills and a deeper engagement with the material.	Insufficient critical engagement with relevant and current academic, research, policy- and practice-related literature. Lack of evidence of wider reading or a lack of initiative or inconsistent and inaccurate referencing	Presentation of work shows insufficient organisation or central argument, and is lacking in logical and coherent structure. Poor clarity of expression weakly communicating to specialist or non-specialist audiences
50-59% Fail	Limited knowledge and understanding of the subject matter shown. Work is not sufficiently informed by scholarship within the field of study and is insufficient in depth, breadth, detail or clarity	Insufficient evidence of critical evaluation and awareness of current problems and contemporary issues and debates. Insufficient reference to new insights or perspectives within the field and lacking in originality and creativity in synthesising current research and scholarship	Little evidence of critical engagement with relevant and current literature. Poor use of appropriate sources and/or inconsistent and inaccurate referencing inconsistencies.	Work that is poorly presented, disorganized, and lacks a logical and coherent structure. The central argument may be poorly formed.

Grade	Coherent and detailed knowledge and understanding of the subject area	Cognitive and intellectual skills	Reading and referencing	Presentation, style and structure Work that significantly exceeds the specified word limit may be penalized
		within the subject area of evaluation.		
40-49% Fail	Weak work showing limited but fragmentary knowledge and understanding of the subject matter, for example through inaccuracies, inclusion of irrelevant material and/or absence of appropriate information. No awareness of the latest research and/or advanced scholarship within the discipline evident.	Largely descriptive work, with weak and superficial use of critical evaluation skills to develop judgements and arguments and/or solve problems. Information accepted uncritically, with weak use of evidence resulting in unsubstantiated opinions. No evidence of originality or creativity.	Poor engagement with essential texts and no evidence of wider reading. Heavily reliant on taught elements. Inconsistent and weak use of referencing.	Work is loosely, and at times incoherently, structured, with information and ideas often poorly expressed.
< 40% Fail	Inadequate and limited knowledge and understanding of the subject matter shown. Work is not informed by scholarship within the field of study and significantly lacks depth, breadth, detail or clarity	Descriptive work with little or no evidence of critical evaluation and awareness of current problems and contemporary issues and debates. No evidence of awareness of new insights or perspectives within the field. Little or no synthesis of current research and scholarship within the subject area	No evidence of critical engagement with relevant and current literature. Lack of use of appropriate sources and inconsistent and inaccurate referencing	Poorly presented and disorganised work that lacks a logical and coherent structure, lacks a well-formed central argument and shows a significant lack of clarity of expression with very weak or irrelevant conclusions, that may be incoherent to specialist or non-specialist audiences