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### 1. **Introduction**

1.1 Purpose of This Document

The purpose of this document is to outline the coding standards for the project and contain all notes regarding the testing of the product during its creation, including defects, modules tested, and test results.

* 1. References
* W3Schools – [www.w3schools.com](http://www.w3schools.com/) – Used as a resource for learning HTML and CSS code for the development team
* Google HTML/CSS Style Guide – <https://google.github.io/styleguide/htmlcssguide.xml> – Used as a resource to define a consistent style convention for the code of the project
* System Requirements Document – Outlines the system requirements that the code must be built around
* System Design Document – Outlines the design requirements that this code must fufill
  1. Coding and Commenting Conventions

Coding conventions for the HTML and CSS portions of the product were defined by Google's Official Style Guide; wherever possible we tried to adhere to this standard.

* 1. Defect Checklist
* Commenting is not complete
* Insecure Coding Methods
* Use of the Style Guide is inconsistent
* Broken links
* Database Errors
* Webpage Display Errors
* Mishandled User Errors

2. **Code Inspection Process**

* 1. Description

The code inspection process of the group consists of several criteria. We check the code to make sure it adheres to the Google Style Guide, check for adequate code comments and write them in where necessary, and most importantly, make sure that the code does what it is supposed to do in a secure, efficient way.

2.2 Impressions of the process

Our code inspection process has mostly been up to the individual coders to make sure their additions adhere to standards. We have had a very good line of communication, and this results in the team informing the group regarding every change. Once a change is a posted, all team members look through for logical and syntax errors.

3. **Modules Inspected**

* Login Module
  + - Allows the user to login to the website and access its services.
    - This should be the first page the user accesses after the home page.
* Register Module
  + - Allows the user to create an account in order to access the login feature
    - This should be the first page that the user accesses if they have not already created an account
* Job Searching Module
  + - User should be able to search for available jobs
    - Should be a link to this page in the banner for a logged in user
* Job Creation Module
  + - User should be able to make a job with a custom address and job information
    - Should be a link to this page in the banner for a logged in user
* Home Page Module
  + - Displays job information about jobs the user has open, or completed jobs the user has participated in
    - Should also allow user to mark jobs as completed
    - Should be a link to this page via the logo for a logged in user

### 4. **Defects**

1. Login Module

* Description of the defect
  + Code does not currently adhere to the Google Style Guide
  + Missing comments

1. Registration Module

* Description of the defect:
  + All components are present, but the error checking is insufficient. There is no valid checking of entry types such as whether or not phone number is a valid 10 digit number

1. Job Creation Module

* Description of Defect:
  + Does not validate any of the fields

1. Home Page Module

* Description of Defect:
  + Does not display completed jobs until refreshed
  + However, the database is properly updated
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