**Diploma in Software Development**

**CS101**
**UX Principles I**
(NZQF Level 5, 15 credits)

**Assessment 2**

# Website Design and Development

**Weighting within course 50%**

## Candidate's Assessment Instructions

- This assessment is an *open book activity*, you are allowed to refer to textbooks, slides, class notes or cheat sheets.
- You are expected to complete this assessment during the given period.
- All report work shall be properly referenced in the APA format.
- Submit your completed assessment online in the correct space provided.
- For the group work components, you will submit the same piece of work individually
- If you do not understand any of the instructions, *ask your assessor before* starting the assessment. You may also inform the assessor about any *special needs* that you may have before completing this assessment.
- Academic dishonesty and plagiarism are considered serious offences at Yoobee Colleges and significant penalties can be incurred, such as a reduction in the grade awarded for the assessment, failure of the course, and in some cases, suspension, or expulsion from the College. Please refer to the Student Handbook regarding assessment submission and plagiarism policy for detailed information. By completing and submitting this assessment you are authenticating that the work is original and does not violate plagiarism or copyright law.
- Marks and feedback will be returned within two weeks of the submission date.

## Submission/Deliverables of your Work

Submissions are accepted only via UpOnline and all files should be submitted in a single zip file including:
**Website**

- A folder containing all your folders and files needed to run your website.
- A *\*.pdf* file containing your user feedback/reviews and documented development process.

## Success Criteria

You need to achieve **50% or more** of the marks to pass this assessment.

- You are allowed a maximum of three attempts. The maximum percentage to be awarded on a second and third assessment attempts is 50%.

## Learning Outcomes

- LO1. Interpret and analyze key principles, techniques and tools used in the design of content and user experience for software products.
- LO2. Work autonomously, and in pairs, to produce creative design solutions to briefs.
- LO3. Interpret critique under supervision, to improve communication of UX designs, and contribute to the learning and performance of other students.
- LO4. Review individual learning practices and strategies as UX designers for software products.

## Objectives

This assignment aims to familiarize you with the development phase of the UX Design Process. You'll understand how Strategy, Research & Analysis & Design all feed into the Development phase and broaden your holistic understanding of the overall UX Design Process.

You'll be working in HTML, CSS & JavaScript. These are entry level languages that gently introduce you to programming with design in-mind. Knowledge gained from this assignment forms part of your design-thinking toolset for use when designing digital products for market.

## Tasks
Based on all stages so far in your walk through the UX Design Process (Strategy, Research, Analysis & Design), you as an individual, will take your design from assessment 1 into the development stage to produce a navigable, functioning website, meeting several requirements along the way. You'll also need to test your website with real people to get reviews/feedback. You'll write a small (1 page) report, discussing your process. Lastly, you'll briefly demonstrate your website to the class in a small presentation.

### Website (LO1, LO2)
The website should be based on your prototype from the previous assignment based on your group research, and should be responsive, displaying nicely on a range of devices (mobile phones, tablets & PCs).

The site must have the following features:
- A nav-bar.
- A beautiful landing/home section.
- A sign-up / login form.
- Either:
    - Products & a shopping cart.
    - Services & a booking System.
- An "about" section.
- Contact details.
- Responsive behaviour.

These features can be placed anywhere in your website as per your prototype, that's up to you. You can decide if everything should all be on one page, or across multiple pages. You don't need to complete your entire website redesign plan, only what is asked for in the above list. If you've finished everything, you can add extra features or improve your website's overall style.

Features that require a server back-end (login, shopping cart, booking, etc.) do not need to be fully operational, they just need to look like they are.
You'll be graded on feature-completion, aesthetic quality, code-quality, project organisation, user-testing & report-quality.

### Report (LO1, LO2, LO4)
Provide a *.pdf that discusses your development process. Offer a brief and general overview. Potential topics:
- Did the design help you with your result? If you had to change your design, why was that?
- Did you test it with anyone? What did they think?
- What problems did you have to solve when you made this site?

Include screenshots to show that your website is responsive, compatible with a range of browsers and passes a validation test.

### Presentation (LO3, LO4)
Prepare a small presentation that demonstrates your completed website along with the process involved. This is presented as an individual. Record your presentation, save it to OneDrive or similar and post the link to your presentation along with any slides in accordance with the submission instructions.

## Marking Rubrics

| CS101 – Website | Weighting | A (12-10) | | | B (9-7) | | | C (6-4) | | | D (3-0) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A+ | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | C- | D+ | D | D- |
| **Feature Completion (LO1, LO2)** | 15% | Features outlined in the task section (of this brief) have been implemented and works perfectly.<br><br>Media Queries or JavaScript have been used excellently to make the site responsive.<br><br>All links within the website and to other places on the web works perfectly. | | | Features outlined in the task section (of this brief) have been implemented and works.<br><br>Media Queries or JavaScript have been used appropriately to make the site responsive.<br><br>Most links within the website and to other places on the web works perfectly. | | | Features outlined in the task section (of this brief) have been implemented but difficult to use.<br><br>Media Queries or JavaScript have been used.<br><br>Some links within the website and to other places on the web works perfectly. | | | Features outlined in the task section (of this brief) have been implemented but user can become lost in navigating on or between pages.<br><br>Media Queries or JavaScript have been used poorly.<br><br>Very few links within the website and to other places on the web works perfectly. | | |
| **Layout & Aesthetic Quality (LO1, LO2)** | 10% | Layout is effective and extends the ideas and content. The site is readable, with a nice, clean, well-spaced layout.<br><br>Styles are applied tastefully to DOM elements (colour, rounded corners, shadows, borders, animations, etc.).<br><br>Appropriate and relevant imagery has been used.<br><br>Attention has been given towards typography (font types, styles, sizes & colours, etc.) and is consistent. | | | Layout is appropriate for the content.<br><br><br><br>It is easy to locate important elements.<br><br><br><br>Appropriate imagery has been used.<br><br>Typography is appropriate. | | | Layout is useable but may appear busy or boring.<br><br><br><br>It is easy to locate most of the important elements.<br><br><br><br>Minimal imagery has been used or does not support content.<br><br>Typography is not consistent. | | | Layout is confusing and does not reflect the content.<br><br><br><br>It is difficult to locate important elements.<br><br><br><br>Poor imagery has been used.<br><br>Website has poor colour scheme; more than 3 fonts are used and not consistent. | | |
| **Code Quality (LO2)** | 5% | HTML, CSS & JavaScript follow best-practice guidelines excellently. | | | HTML, CSS & JavaScript follow best-practice | | | HTML, CSS & JavaScript follow best-practice | | | HTML, CSS & JavaScript follow best-practice guidelines poorly. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | guidelines appropriately. | guidelines minimally. | | |
| | | Inline styles have been avoided completely with a preference towards use of stylesheets. CSS & JavaScript names follow a consistent style. | Inline styles have been avoided with a preference towards use of stylesheets. CSS & JavaScript names follow a consistent style. | Inline styles have been used with a preference towards use of stylesheets. | Inline styles have been used and poor preference towards use of stylesheets. |
| | | Code is clearly organised into well-named functions. | Code is organised into well-named functions. | Code is minimally organised into well-named functions. | Code is poorly organised into well-named functions. |
| | | The web console shows no errors & relevant validators have been used. | The web console shows few errors & relevant validators have been used. | The web console shows some errors & relevant validators have been used. | The web console shows many errors & relevant validators have not been used. |
| **Project Organisation (LO1, LO2)** | 5% | Project files are neatly organised within labelled folders with standard naming conventions. | Project files are organised within labelled folders with standard naming conventions. | Project files are organised within irrelevant folders with some standard naming conventions. | Project files are poorly organised within folders with poor standard naming conventions. |
| **Report (LO1, LO2, LO4)** | 10% | A PDF has been provided, clearly detailing a report of the web-development process. An excellent comparison is made between the original design and the finished piece. Problems faced & overcome are clearly documented.<br><br>The website has been tested with 5 real users; their feedback is clearly presented in the document.<br><br>Screenshots show that the website is responsive and compatible with a range of browsers and lastly that validators have been used. | A PDF has been provided, detailing a report of the web-development process sufficiently. A good comparison is made between the original design and the finished piece. Problems faced & overcome are nicely documented.<br><br>The website has been tested with at least 3 real users; their feedback is nicely presented in the document. Screenshots show that the website is responsive and compatible with a few of browsers and lastly that validators have been used. | A PDF has been provided, detailing a report of the web-development process minimally. A minimal comparison is made between the original design and the finished piece. Problems faced & overcome are basically documented.<br><br>The website has been tested with at least 2-3 real users; their feedback is presented in the document. Screenshots show that the website is responsive and compatible with a few of browsers and lastly that validators have been used. | A PDF has been provided, detailing a report of the web-development process poorly. A poor comparison is made between the original design and the finished piece. Problems faced & overcome are poorly documented.<br><br>The website has been tested with real users, but their feedback is poorly presented in the document. Screenshots show that the website is responsive and compatible with a couple of browsers, but the validators may have not been used. |

| Presenta-tion (LO3, LO4) | 5% | Fully functional website was presented. | A working website was presented. | Partially working website was presented. | Website presented was not up to date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Presenter was passionate about the topic, energetic, relaxed, and confident, with a clear delivery. | Delivery was clear. | Communication of the idea was broken. | Communication of the main idea was broken and hard to follow. |
| | | Voice, eye contact and pacing held the attention of the audience. | Voice projection was good. Good eye contact was made. | Voice projection was low. Eye contact was infrequent. | Presenter struggled in the presentation with poor voice projection, no eye contact with the audience, and no introduction |
| **Total** | **50%** | | | | |