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| **WEBTECH Major Output: Web Application Prototype 1** | Instructor: Neil Patrick Del Gallego  neil.delgallego@dlsu.edu.ph |

**[100 pts] General Instructions:** You are to present your first version of your web application prototype that has already its basic functionality and backend requirements. You may use any backend frameworks for your web application.

**Minimum Specifications**

Your web application prototype 1 should meet the minimum specifications to get an ideal grade for this milestone.

* + - * Two features related to community interaction. During the project demo, you are to highlight the two features you think has innovative or complex functionality. The complexity of implementation has a bearing in your assessment.
* A straightforward accounts creation or registration feature.
* A login/logout feature
* An admin login feature or system dashboard that allows an admin to modify at least one of the viewable elements in your web application (i.e. an option to login as a moderator to modify images or add new products, for example)
* A document regarding your systems implementation, that highlights the back-end and front-end architecture. Make sure you highlight your community interaction implementation. See grading scheme for details.
* Cross-platform support for 1 mobile device, and 1 tablet.

**Demo Schedule**

* A demo schedule is to be set on class-time, **Nov 21 (T),** with an additional schedule reserved on Nov 24 (F), 9:00am – 12nn. All groups need to reserve the Friday schedule in case their original demo schedule was not followed due to demo extensions.
* An appointment scheduler is available in Canvas for you to schedule your class demo. 1 representative of the group should sign-up for their preferred time slot.
* The team-work policy takes effect during the demo schedule. All groups should be present within the first 5 minutes of their demo time. Otherwise, the group won’t be graded.
* The demo time slot will be STRICTLY FOLLOWED. Please be prepared for your demonstration 5 minutes before your time.

**Submission Instructions**

1. Upload your source code in Github and in a master branch. Include the URL link when submitting to the canvas page.
2. Submit your source code in a .ZIP file and upload this via Canvas. Only 1 member is required to submit this milestone.
3. Include a README file that indicates how to run/install your web application, together with your team name and the name of your team members.

**Grading Scheme**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Navigation and Completeness** | | | | |
| 0 points | 4 points | 7 points | 10 points |  |
| The web application presented do not have any navigation at all. Web pages are presented manually and are disconnected. | The web application only has 1 to 3 pages linked together. It is difficult to navigate from 1 page to another without using any workaround. | The web application can be navigated but some pages lead to a dead end or some pages are not accessible directly. | The web application has complete navigation. The pages presented are linked together. The user can easily go from 1 page to another, then go back to the home page as well. |  |
| **Community Interaction 1** | | | | |
| 0 points | 4 – 7 points | 8 – 11 points | 12 – 17 points | 18 – 20 points |
| No community interaction feature was evident, or does not work 90% of the time. | The community interaction feature is vague or does not really contribute to the overall web application prototype.  Major bugs or blockers were encountered, causing the feature to simply stop working. | The community interaction feature presented does not have any novelty or the implementation seems to be basic.  Complex or not, the feature has major bugs that impact the user experience. Error handling is poor or the feature does not inform users of such errors. It only works on selected use case scenarios. | The community interaction feature presented does not have any novelty or the implementation seems to be basic.  The feature appears to be polished and only minor bugs exist, which does not impact the overall user experience. | The community interaction feature presented shows signs of novelty and complexity.  The feature appears to be polished and only minor bugs exist, which does not impact the overall user experience. |
| **Community Interaction 1 in Backend Implementation Document** | | | | |
| 0 points | 4 points | 7 points | 10 points |  |
| It was not discussed in the document at all. | Regarding the community interaction 1, the implementation is poorly thought or difficult to understand. The discussion appears incomplete. | Regarding the community interaction 1, the implementation has some missing sections that was not discussed properly. | Regarding the community interaction 1, the implementation was well discussed and easy to understand how it was coded. |  |
| **Community Interaction 2** | | | | |
| 0 points | 4 – 7 points | 8 – 11 points | 12 – 17 points | 18 – 20 points |
| No community interaction feature was evident, or does not work 90% of the time. | The community interaction feature is vague or does not really contribute to the overall web application prototype.  Major bugs or blockers were encountered, causing the feature to simply stop working. | The community interaction feature presented does not have any novelty or the implementation seems to be basic.  Complex or not, the feature has major bugs that impact the user experience. Error handling is poor or the feature does not inform users of such errors. It only works on selected use case scenarios. | The community interaction feature presented does not have any novelty or the implementation seems to be basic.  The feature appears to be polished and only minor bugs exist, which does not impact the overall user experience. | The community interaction feature presented shows signs of novelty and complexity.  The feature appears to be polished and only minor bugs exist, which does not impact the overall user experience. |
| **Community Interaction 2 in Backend Implementation Document** | | | | |
| 0 points | 4 points | 7 points | 10 points |  |
| It was not discussed in the document at all. | Regarding the community interaction 1, the implementation is poorly thought or difficult to understand. The discussion appears incomplete. | Regarding the community interaction 1, the implementation has some missing sections that was not discussed properly. | Regarding the community interaction 1, the implementation was well discussed and easy to understand how it was coded. |  |
| **Accounts Functionality** | | | | |
| 0 points | 4 points | 7 points | 10 points |  |
| The web application does not have any means for accounts registration.  A dummy account is provided for login/logout. | The web application has 1 major component missing, related to accounts functionality.  Major bugs were encountered or error-checking mechanisms were not implemented, such as detecting of duplicate accounts, mismatched passwords, non-existing accounts, etc. | The web application has a complete flow of login, logout, and accounts registration.  Minor bugs were encountered during testing or the accounts module has some error-checking mechanisms not implemented, but does not affect the overall flow. | The web application has a complete flow of login, logout, and accounts registration.  No evidence of bugs was encountered during testing. The accounts module also has error-checking mechanisms in place. |  |
| **System Dashboard** | | | | |
| 0 points | 4 points | 7 points | 10 points |  |
| No dashboard was implemented. | The system dashboard is implemented but does not really contribute much to managing or maintaining contents in the web application prototype.  Major bugs were encountered during testing. | The system dashboard is implemented, but clear improvements can be made to make it more effective in moderating content.  Evidence of bugs were found, although minor and does not affect the performance. | The system dashboard is implemented and effective for moderating contents in the web application prototype.  No evidence of bugs was encountered. |  |
| **Cross-Platform Support** | | | | |
| 0 points | 4 points | 7 points | 10 points |  |
| No cross-platform support. Layout does not adjust according to screen size. | Cross platform support only available on 1 mobile device, either phone or tablet. | Cross-platform support is available for 1 mobile device (6-inch screen size or below), and 1 tablet (7 inch and above).  One of the supported devices only supports 1 type of orientation. | Cross-platform support is available for 1 mobile device (6-inch screen size or below), and 1 tablet (7 inch and above).  Supports portrait and landscape orientation. |  |