



## Information Technology Generalist

---

### 1. Assignment Details

- **Course Code:** WEBD 3100 – Web Design Fundamentals
  - **Assignment Title:** MP1A – Website Evaluation Report
  - **Type:** Mini-Project 1A (Individual)
  - **Weight:** See Brightspace
  - **Estimated Time:** 2–4 hours
  - **Due Date:** See Brightspace
  - **Submission Format:** Written Report (Text, MD or Word) submitted via LMS
- 

### 2. Overview / Purpose / Objectives

This first mini-project introduces students to **evaluating website design quality** using **established design and accessibility principles**.

By critically assessing a real website, students will begin to recognize what makes digital interfaces usable, engaging, and inclusive. This assignment builds the foundation for later design and implementation work.

**Purpose:** To develop analytical and evaluative skills in identifying good and poor design practices in existing websites.

**Objectives:**

- Apply **core design principles** to assess content presentation and layout.
  - Identify **accessibility concerns** that impact usability and inclusion.
  - Communicate findings through a clear, structured written report.
- 

### 3. Learning Outcomes Addressed

Learning Outcome	Description
LO1	Apply design principles to web design fundamentals in terms of content presentation.

---

### 4. Assignment Description / Use Case

You will select a **real-world website** (e.g., a community organization, small business, educational site, or government portal) that **you believe could be improved** in terms of layout, readability, or accessibility.

You will **evaluate the site** using the **core web design principles** and **basic accessibility guidelines** introduced in class. Your evaluation should be evidence-based and demonstrate understanding of what makes effective, user-friendly, and accessible design.

## 5. Tasks / Instructions

### Step 1 – Website Selection

- Choose one publicly accessible website.
- Preferably select a small-to-medium site (not overly complex or highly polished).
- Confirm with your instructor if you’re uncertain about your choice.

### Step 2 – Design Principles Evaluation

Evaluate your chosen site using the **six core design principles** covered in class:

Design Principle	Pragmatic Definition (for Course Use)
Contrast	Ensures text and key elements are visually distinct from backgrounds to improve readability and focus.
Alignment	Visual elements are intentionally placed to create logical structure and flow.
Repetition	Consistent use of colors, fonts, and patterns to reinforce identity and cohesion.
Proximity	Related elements are grouped to enhance clarity and association.
Balance	Visual equilibrium achieved between text, imagery, and white space.
White Space (Negative Space)	Empty areas that give the design breathing room and improve readability.

Provide **specific examples** (e.g., screenshots or observations) illustrating how these principles are applied—or violated—on the chosen site.

### Step 3 – Accessibility Evaluation

Use the following **introductory accessibility principles** (based on WCAG guidelines, adapted for early learners):

Accessibility Principle	Definition
Perceivable	All users can perceive content (e.g., alt text for images, clear contrast, readable text).
Operable	Navigation and interactions are usable by keyboard and mouse.
Understandable	Content and layout are consistent, predictable, and easy to follow.

Accessibility Principle	Definition
Robust	The site works across browsers, devices, and assistive technologies.

Step 4 – Reflection and Recommendations

- Reflect on what worked well and what didn't.
- Suggest 2–3 improvements (e.g., fix contrast, reorganize layout, add alt text).
- Explain **why** each recommendation improves the user experience.

Step 5 – Report Formatting

Your report should include:

1. Title page (name, student number, course, date, and website URL)
2. Brief site overview (1 paragraph)
3. Design principle evaluation (approx. 2–3 pages)
4. Accessibility evaluation (approx. 1–2 pages)
5. Reflection and recommendations (1 page)
6. References (if applicable)

6. Deliverables

- A written **Website Evaluation Report (PDF or Word, 3–5 pages)**
- Optional supporting screenshots to illustrate examples
- Submit to LMS under **MP1A – Website Evaluation Report**

7. Reflection Questions

- Which design principles did you find easiest or hardest to identify?
- How did accessibility testing influence your view of what makes a good website?
- What surprised you most about your chosen site’s usability or structure?

8. Assessment & Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (A)	Proficient (B)	Developing (C)	Needs Improvement (D/F)
Application of Design Principles (40%)	Thorough, insightful application of all six design principles with clear evidence and examples.	Applies most principles with solid examples and analysis.	Partial application; limited or generalized examples.	Minimal understanding; missing key principles.

Criteria	Excellent (A)	Proficient (B)	Developing (C)	Needs Improvement (D/F)
<b>Accessibility Evaluation (30%)</b>	Comprehensive and accurate analysis using accessibility principles; demonstrates strong awareness.	Identifies key issues; reasonable accuracy.	Basic observations; lacks depth or clarity.	Superficial or incorrect understanding of accessibility.
<b>Recommendations &amp; Reflection (20%)</b>	Recommendations are creative, feasible, and well-justified. Strong personal insight in reflection.	Sound recommendations and thoughtful reflection.	Limited or vague recommendations and reflection.	Minimal reflection; missing recommendations.
<b>Structure &amp; Presentation (10%)</b>	Clear, professional formatting, excellent grammar, and organized layout.	Mostly clear and organized.	Some issues with clarity or structure.	Disorganized or unclear submission.

## 9. Submission Guidelines

- Submit via the LMS before the due date.
- File name format: `student_number_WEBD3100_MP1A.pdf`
- Late submissions follow standard academic policy (see below).

## 10. Resources / Equipment

- Course slides and notes on design and accessibility principles.
- WebAIM Contrast Checker: <https://webaim.org/resources/contrastchecker/>
- WAVE Evaluation Tool: <https://wave.webaim.org/>
- Any web browser and screenshot capture tool.

## 11. Academic Policies

All submissions must comply with institutional academic integrity policies. Collaboration may occur during discussions, but written work must be individual.

## 12. Copyright Notice

© 2025 NSCC. This material is provided for educational purposes only and may not be reproduced or distributed without permission.