

Coursework 2. Web Site Submission

Large Coursework Brief

Your brief is to **design and build a responsive website** of a magazine or a newsletter. This may take the form of a topical or a news magazine or a newsletter for a club or society. If possible, this should represent a real situation. For example:

Your web site should have 5 pages with different types of news and articles. Wherever possible sample content should be representative of the material for that web site. It should have appropriate media, including video and sound clips if relevant.

In addition to the web site, you will include a **report.html** file with associated images etc. in your site's base directory. This will explain what you have learned in the process of building your site, where you found your information, and how you have adapted any resources (if applicable). Please refer to ***web_dev_report_spec.pdf*** for the outline template for the report.

The specific items you should include in the report are shown in the report template.

Report

Your report.html should contain the following (in this order):

- **Introduction:** What is the essential story being told by your site and what type of structure did you choose to implement?
- **Inspiration:** State **3** things that have inspired you when creating your website (e.g. guest speakers, websites, artists, blogs).
- **Accessibility:** State **3** ways in which your site is accessible to those with different abilities and needs (for example those with visual impairment)
- **Usability:** State **3** ways in which you considered the usability of your site.
- **Learning:** state **3** things you had to learn or find out to create your site. How did you achieve that?
- **Evaluation I:** What aspects of your work do you think were particularly successful? Why?
- **Evaluation II:** What aspects of your work could be improved? How might you do things differently another time?
- **Resources:** What resources did you use in your work? List any sources of information, libraries, plugins, code, or tools (you should also indicate inclusions from other sources within your code using comments)
- **Appendices:** Site map, wireframes, and mock-ups

Materials from the Web

You can use almost anything you like that you can find on the Web, but you should avoid anything that is not open or at least has a copyright (e.g., that costs money or requires login or registration). Being able to build on other people's ideas is an important skill.

It is essential that, on your report page (and, wherever possible, in your code) you describe what you have taken, where you took it from, and what you have done to it.

If you copy-and-paste something almost without change, you must say that you have done it, it must conform to the standards, and you should not expect many marks for it. You will get credit for making imported code fit in with and enhance your own design, for understanding and using complex libraries, or for altering and enhancing material that you have used. Showing you can adapt existing code is particularly valuable. To be clear which material, you have written and which you have used from elsewhere you will be expected to provide comprehensive comments within your HTML, CSS and JavaScript files indicating code you have used, code you have adopted and edited and code that you have written.

Rubric

Criteria 1: Site

Working URL for the site hosted on the static web page system.

- No URL or URL fails (0 points)
- URL works, but there are dead links within the pages or not all resources are present (1 point)
- URL works and all resources load properly (2 points)

5 pages web site structured with a clear (tree) structure and well-organised files.

- Not enough pages, structure impossible to navigate or files submitted do not match online version (0 points)
- Structure of file organisation or webpage is flawed (1 point)
- Files sit in appropriate directories; web site structure is clear and navigable. (2 points)

Site is accessible, with an explanation of strategies used in the report.

- No consideration is given for accessibility for diverse users. Alternatively, consideration is given, but it is incorrect (e.g., unhelpful alt text:) (0 points)
- Some evidence of accessible design. (Or excellent design, but poor reporting) (1 points)
- Excellent accessible design and executions, described clearly in the report. (2 points)

Site has good content – incorporating media (such as pictures, sound and video) where relevant. Content is integrated to draw a rich, coherent, and compelling picture.

- Content is poor or just consists of placeholders. (0 points)
- Content is appropriate in quantity and target (within the scope of a short project) (1 point)
- Content is excellent and well-supported by media. It tells its story well. (2 points)

Criteria 2: HTML

HTML is valid and well-formed HTML5.

- HTML does not validate as HTML5. Errors go beyond small typos or very minor issues. (0 point)
- HTML does not validate as HTML5, but there are very few issues, and they represent either previously valid syntax (e.g., <div/>), minor typos or minor issues with boilerplate (e.g. Google's own font loading code doesn't validate sometimes). (1 point)
- All pages validate without errors. (2 points)

HTML elements are well chosen and use structural elements and attributes where possible.

- HTML elements are sometimes incorrect or misunderstood (for example, tables being used for layout). (0 point)
- Some good choices of elements, maybe some structural elements used. (1 point)
- Structural elements are always used where possible, and every part of the page is contained in a structural element or has a clear role. (2 points)

HTML is comprehensively commented.

- No comments, comments are very sparse or unhelpful (for example, commented out code does not count) (0 point)
- Comments are present but not comprehensive and helpful (for example, main sections only are indicated, or comments would not help a competent coder find their way around) (1 point)
- Excellent use of comments (2 points)

Criteria 3: CSS

CSS is used to make an appropriate, aesthetic design.

- No CSS, or CSS clearly completely generic. (0 point)
- Appearance CSS is used to style the website. It works on the whole. (1 point)
- CSS is used to style the website's appearance. It looks good and is appropriate to the audience and the subject matter. (2 points)

Layout is appropriate and interesting.

- No layout CSS, or layout poor. (0 point)
- Layout is fine but fails to show advanced CSS and make good use of the screen space (1 point)
- Layout is excellent and matches the subject and audience. (2 points)

Website is responsive, with explicit responsive behaviour.

- No responsive behaviour, or elements clash together. (0 point)
- Some explicit responsive behaviour, but flawed execution (such as clashes at certain form factors or window sizes). Alternatively, responsive behaviour is not explicit, but works (for very simple site layouts, for example). (1 point)
- Explicitly, successfully responsive design (2 points)

CSS is comprehensively commented.

- No comments, comments are very sparse or unhelpful (for example, commented out code does not count) (0 point)
- Comments are present but not comprehensive and helpful (for example, main sections only are indicated or comments would not help a competent coder find their way around) (1 point)
- Excellent use of comments (2 points)

Criteria 4: JavaScript

JavaScript is successfully called, and student-written code interacts with the DOM.

- JavaScript is not present or not successfully called. (0 point)
- JavaScript is either flawed or does not interact with (i.e., read and write to) the DOM. (1 point)
- JS is called successfully (as designed) and interacts with the DOM. (2 points)

JavaScript has an essential role in the function of some aspect of the website (e.g., image carousel)

- JavaScript is at most decorative. (0 point)
- JavaScript is involved in the site but is obviously an add-on. (1 point)
- JavaScript use is designed into the site – the site would be poorer without it. (2 points)

Advanced use is made of JavaScript, or a JS library is used in a sophisticated way.

- No advanced JavaScript (0 point)
- JS library is used in a limited way (usually, this means it is called in exactly the sort of way that a readme or tutorial describes, giving little evidence of understanding). Non-library code is not that advanced. Alternatively, the use would be considered advanced, but has bugs or errors. (1 point)
- Impressive or flawless use of advanced JavaScript or library/libraries. (2 points)

JS has comprehensive comments throughout.

- No comments, comments are very sparse or unhelpful (for example, commented out code does not count) (0 point)
- Comments are present but not comprehensive and helpful (for example, main sections only are indicated, or comments would not help a competent coder find their way around) (1 point)
- Excellent use of comments (2 points)

Criteria 5: Report

Site map and wireframes are comprehensive and representative. Wireframes reflect responsive design.

- No diagrams, or diagrams are of limited value. (0 point)
- Diagrams are ok, but flawed or limited. Alternatively, diagrams are good, but not included directly in the report. (1 point)
- Diagrams are excellent. They also reflect some aspects of the responsive design where that would be relevant. (2 points)

Mockups are present and accurate.

- No mockups, or mockups inadequate (0 point)
- Mockups are present, but incomplete or inaccurate (1 point)
- Mockups are good (2 points)

Reflection on work shows critical and analytical awareness.

- No report, report not in html format, or no evidence of reflection. (0 point)
- Some reflection, but this is limited. (1 point)
- Good evaluation, with strong critical and analytical skills shown. (2 points)