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**ASIA PACIFIC COLLEGE**

**3 Humabon Place, Magallanes Makati City**

**School of Computing and Information Technologies**

**Applied Projects (MCSPROJ)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APPLIED PROJECTS** | | |
| **Project:** | RAMS Corner: ITRO Ticketing Service System | |
| **Team Members:** | Cortez, Patrick | Nefalar, Vincent Allan |
|  | Morallos, Ruth | Ponce, Kieyl |
|  | Nacor, Vincent |  |
| **Presentation:** | MNTSDEV Midterm presentation | |
| **Term and School Year:** | 3rd trimester of 2nd year college | |
|  | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Panelists** | **Recommendation** | **Plan of Action** | **Remarks** |
| **Part I: Introduction** | | | | |
|  | **Sir Manuel L. Calimlim Jr**  **Sir Jayvee M. Cabardo** | 1. Problem statement needs to be more specific 2. Address office not the group (ref. to ITRG and ITRO)      1. Change the focus of the objective 2. Input problem that can be solved by the objectives | 1. Improve the General Problem and Specific Problem by making it more specific.  2. All sentences and paragraphs that contains different terms are all changed to addressing as “ITRO”  [ITRG is the group of people while ITRO is considered as a whole – the people and the process combined  3. Expound the idea and elaborate. Focused the main thought to the client rather than the customer of the client itself  4. SOP revolves mainly around the human errors(time management, workforce allocation) which can’t be solved by the the software. Added objectives that are aligned in solving the problem | Done  Done  Done  Done |
| **Part II: RRL** | | | | |
|  | N/A |  |  |  |
| **Part III: Technical Background** | | | | |
|  | **Sir Manuel L. Calimlim Jr.** | 1. Interview the client and know more about their workflow.  * Specifications of persons involved (personnel for lab, id, other concerns) * Ask the client how many staff there are in their office.  1. Next time to present, put the info from the documentation to the PowerPoint. | 1.The ITRO organizational chart was provided by the ITRO head for more information about their workflow (Specification of persons involved)  (How many staff are in the office)  2. PowerPoint slides will be updated and be more specific with a profound explanation of the sections. | Done  Done |
| **Part IV: Design and Methodology** | | | | |
|  | N/A |  |  |  |
| **Part V: Results and Discussion** | | | | |
|  | N/A |  |  |  |
| **Others** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APPLIED PROJECTS** | | |
| **Project:** | RAMS Corner: An Intuitive Ticketing Service for ITRO Queries and Schedule Management  in lieu of Electronic Mailing  and Traditional Methods and Traditional Methods | |
| **Team Members:** | Cortez, Patrick | Nefalar, Vincent Allan |
|  | Morallos, Ruth | Ponce, Kieyl |
|  | Nacor, Vincent |  |
| **Presentation:** | MNTSDEV Final presentation | |
| **Term and School Year:** | 3rd trimester of 2nd year college | |
|  | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Panelists** | **Recommendation** | **Plan of Action** | **Remarks** |
| **Part I: Introduction** | | | | |
|  | **Sir Manuel L. Calimlim Jr** | 1. Start with the problem before the cause on SOP | SOP are expounded, and specified problems are at the first sentences followed by the cause and its result. | Done |
| **Part 2: RRL** | | | | |
|  | **Sir Manuel L. Calimlim Jr**  **Ms. Rhea-luz**  **R. Valbuena** | 1. RRL: Research more about related systems used by other school both local and foreign 2. Be clear on IT-related requests on the whole paper 3. Put the example of the issues handled by ITRO in the Scope and Limitation 4. Change objectives into a statement that will be more measurable and specific | 1. Research regarding Related systems, six (6) related system were added, namely Live Chat, Hiver, Live Agent, Zendesk, Help Scout, and SolarWinds together with their highlight features, logo, and sample interface.  2. The parts of the paper that needs a specific issue covered by ITRO are all expounded and is regarded to as “ITRO-related requests” instead of just “IT-related requests” to give a context that what the ticketing system does is to handle only the ***“ITRO Department”*** tasks and not the tasks regarded to other APC Offices.  3. Asked Information's about the ITRO scope of work to our client  4. We change the specific objectives and emphasize it in a more measurable way  (Specific Objects 1,2,3,4) | Done  Done  Done  Done |
| **Part III: Technical Background** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part IV: Design and Methodology** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part V: Results and Discussion** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Others** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APPLIED PROJECTS** | | |
| **Project:** | RAMS Corner: An Intuitive Ticketing Service for ITRO Queries and Schedule Management  in lieu of Electronic Mailing  and Traditional Methods and Traditional Methods | |
| **Team Members:** | Cortez,Patrick | Nefalar, Vincent Allan |
|  | Morallos, Ruth | Ponce,Kieyl |
|  | Nacor, Vincent |  |
| **Presentation:** | MSYADD1 Midterm presentation | |
| **Term and School Year:** | 1st trimester of 3rd year college | |
|  | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Panelists** | **Recommendation** | **Plan of Action** | **Remarks** |
| **Part I: Introduction** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part II: RRL** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part III: Technical Background** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part IV: Design and Methodology** | | | | |
|  | **Ms. Rhea luz**  **R. Valbuena** | 1. Be consistent with the users. Don’t use admin/staff if they are different entities because this will become another entity.  2. Introduce what is KBL first, not just the acronym   1. Spell check (ex. The “hompage”) in use case description 2. Be ready for user acceptance test by revising the user stories according to the latest diagrams 3. “There should be an exception scenario for when the ticket cannot be solved in the given time. There should be a way for us to be able to see the update in case the ticket can’t be resolved yet”, so as to create a system that can handle exceptions” 4. Associative entity between user and KBL Content 5. DFD attributes shown in ERD 6. Be consistent of data stores   Only use synchronization joint if there are parallel process | 1. All inconsistent user naming was changed and made it more consistent namely (ITRO admin, ITRO Staff, Client)  2. Complete meaning of KB is now introduced which you can found at definition of terms  3. Spellings and grammar are thoroughly checked  4. User acceptance has been revised aligned together with the updated diagrams.  5. Added a reply feature to notify the user that his/her ticket is yet to be resolved.  6. New entity has been corrected and added the new symbol  7. A note was added on the DFD to make sure that the inputs and details were correlated to the details mentioned in the ERD  8. Data Stores were changed into ITRO ticketing System Database  Synchronization  Joint is removed. | Done  Done  Done  Done  Done  Done  Done  Done |
| **Part V: Results and Discussion** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Others** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APPLIED PROJECTS** | | |
| **Project:** | RAMS Corner: An Intuitive Ticketing Service for ITRO Queries and Schedule Management  in lieu of Electronic Mailing  and Traditional Methods and Traditional Methods | |
| **Team Members:** | Cortez,Patrick | Nefalar, Vincent Allan |
|  | Morallos, Ruth | Ponce,Kieyl |
|  | Nacor, Vincent |  |
| **Presentation:** | MSYADD Finals presentation | |
| **Term and School Year:** | 1st trimester of 3rd year college | |
|  | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Panelists** | **Recommendation** | **Plan of Action** | **Remarks** |
| **Part I: Introduction** | | | | |
|  |  | 1. Specific Objectives are too long “Ang hirap I measure nito”. Objective part of the Paper is too long, particularly 1,2,3,4 of the specific objective. First objective in the specific objective was rumbled “tatlong objectives ang nasa loob ng isang specific objective”  2. There is no problem with two emails used by ITRO  3. All processes and feature should be connected to each other, it should answer the objectives, and the objective should answer the problem | 1. General Objectives was revised together with the specific objectives to make it more measurable.  2. General Objectives was revised together with the specific objectives to make it more measurable  3. We clarified that general objective and specific objectives (1,2,3,4) were answered correspondingly by our system. | Done  Done  Done |
| **Part II: RRL** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part III: Technical Background** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part IV: Design and Methodology** | | | | |
|  | **Mr. Manuel L. Calimlim Jr.** | 1. “Wants” Terminology in the event table should be reviewed 2. The Numbering of the process in the events   Table did not match in the numbering processes in the data flow diagram.   1. Log in Process also is not mentioned in the event table but is mentioned in the use case diagram 2. Use Case Diagram has “search KBL”, hindi tugma sa nasa DFD 3. KBL table attributes, title, content, should be reviewed if that is the right attributes. 4. Check ERD table, if the tables are only ticket and ticket history, you might want to add pending ticket, resolved ticket, unresolve ticket tables. Because, if there are too many tickets, it will go to a one table only and that should not be happening. | 1. All the events in the event table were simplified.  2. The sequence of the processes is parallel between the Event Table and DFD  3. Login is removed from the use case diagram as it is not considered as a use case because it is not a user goal level, thus we only included which use cases are the most important. Also, we just considered the view of the system as “the users have already logged in”.  4. The “View KBL” in DFD is changed to “Search KB” for uniformity  5. “KBL” title changed into “KB” and added new attributes  6. All the tables were retained, and no new table were added. Reason is that adding more tables for each ticket status will cause data redundancy. | Done  Done  Done  Done  Done  Done |
| **Part V: Results and Discussion** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Others** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APPLIED PROJECTS** | | |
| **Project:** | RAMS Corner: An Intuitive Ticketing Service for ITRO Queries and Schedule Management  in lieu of Electronic Mailing  and Traditional Methods | |
| **Team Members:** | Cortez,Patrick | Nefalar, Vincent Allan |
|  | Morallos, Ruth | Ponce,Kieyl |
|  | Nacor, Vincent |  |
| **Presentation:** | MCSPROJ Midterm presentation | |
| **Term and School Year:** | 2nd trimester of 3rd year college | |
|  | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Panelists** | **Recommendation** | **Plan of Action** | **Remarks** |
| **Part I: Introduction** | | | | |
|  | **Mr. Manuel L. Calimlim Jr.**  **Ms. Rhea-Luz R. Valbuena** | 1. The way the statement of the problem is created was focusing on the email as the problem rather than the real problem of ITRO is on the way they handle or identify the issue if it’s a problem, inquiry, etc. it’s better to rewrite the problem statement.   2. Reword the whole problem statement. The client problem is not dedicated system but rather the inability of the ITRO to easily identify problem or issues sent to them in the form of email. | 1. We rewrite the problem statement according to what the panelist suggests, since the problem was not the ITRO email after all.   2. We rewrite the problem statement according to what the panelist suggests, since the problem was not the ITRO email after all. | Done  Done |
| **Part II: RRL** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part III: Technical Background** | | | | |
|  | **Ms. Rhea-Luz R. Valbuena** | 1. Be careful of the word you put on the paper. You should clarify the system requirement to use (e.g., Desktop, Laptop, Mobile etc.) 2. Fix the prototype it doesn’t match with the system | 1. We updated the system compatibility to clarify the system’s accessibility through various devices in the Solutions and Objectives Section of the paper. 2. Design was fixed in the system to match with the prototype in the pater. | Done    Done |
| **Part IV: Design and Methodology** | | | | |
|  | **Ms. Rhea-Luz R. Valbuena** | 1. Review your design, some diagrams are different from the design of the system particularly (KB as an option or priority when user logged in) figure it out and adjustments in diagrams will be needed if so. | 1. We adjusted the diagrams accordingly to match it with the design in the system. | Done |
| **Others** | | | | |
| **Comments and recommendation In the System** | **Mr. Manuel L. Calimlim Jr.**  **Ms. Rhea-Luz R. Valbuena** | 1. In the part of the ticket creation the user uses email instead of username which eliminate the purpose of ticketing service 2. It might not be necessary for the user to decide if his/her ticket prioritization. 3. You might want to consider changing the terminologies of the status (pending, ongoing, resolved) to what RRL uses or suggests. Might be vague to users on what terminologies mean, consider meeting halfway on what user and you client understands.   4. Figure out how the infrastructure and software side will receive tickets that are aligned to their scope of work. Will there be another sortation window, or will the system automatically decide. Figure out where the ticket will  land.  5. Dashboard Download PDF content shows wrong content when downloaded remove it and figure out the right content. | 1. We removed the input email on the ticket creation and changed it with name instead. 2. We removed the ability of the user to select his/her ticket prioritization when creating a ticket, it will only be determined based on the impact and urgency which will further be examined by the ITRO office 3. Nothing has changed since the or project beneficiary(client) and project adviser insisted on retaining the said terminologies as they were all agreed since PBL 1 began. the only status the is renamed is the Pending -> Resource Pending.   4. We developed a new window on the system wherein the infrastructure and software side can be selected to sort out tickets appropriately to specific work field of ITRO Office.  5. It was removed in the new system since the downloadable content is incorrect | Done  Done  Done  Done  Done |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APPLIED PROJECTS** | | |
| **Project:** | RAMS Corner: An Intuitive Ticketing Service for ITRO Queries and Schedule Management  in lieu of Electronic Mailing  and Traditional Methods | |
| **Team Members:** | Cortez,Patrick | Nefalar, Vincent Allan |
|  | Morallos, Ruth | Ponce,Kieyl |
|  | Nacor, Vincent |  |
| **Presentation:** | MCSPROJ Finals presentation | |
| **Term and School Year:** | 3nd trimester of 3rd year college | |
|  | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Panelists** | **Recommendation** | **Plan of Action** | **Remarks** |
| **Part I: Introduction** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part II: RRL** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part III: Technical Background** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part IV: Design and Methodology** | | | | |
| **Part V: Results and Discussion** | | | | |
|  | **Ms. Rhea-Luz R. Valbuena**  **Mr. Manuel L. Calimlim Jr.** | 1. Check all the spellings written in the system (infrastracture) 2. Change the most viewed ticket to most reported issue in Admin Dashboard      1. Apply tooltip so that users can have further understanding. 2. Apply data types on ERD and make data dictionary. 3. In ERD, change t\_content to t\_description. 4. Add notification to avoid missing out tickets 5. New tickets are supposed to appear on top 6. Visibility of the status 7. Terminologies doesn’t match the overall functionality. 8. Some of the terminologies are hard to understand for non-technical people. | 1. All spellings are ensured to be spelled correctly. 2. Title has been changed to fit the function even better. 3. Tooltips are added to the system. 4. Data types and data dictionary are made. ERD has been updated and changed accordingly. 5. The t\_content is changed to t\_description 6. Notification is added. 7. Tickets ascending and descending order have been changed accordingly. 8. Visibility of the status are added. 9. Terminologies are fixed accordingly. 10. Terminologies are adjusted to layman’s term. | Done  Done  Done  Done  Done  Done  Done  Done  Done  Done |
| **Others** | | | | |
|  | **Mr. Manuel Sebastian S. Sanchez** | 1. Change KB approved and disapproved to view and approved only | 1. System has been changed accordingly | Done |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APPLIED PROJECTS** | | |
| **Project:** | RAMS Corner: An Intuitive Ticketing Service for ITRO Queries and Schedule Management  in lieu of Electronic Mailing  and Traditional Methods | |
| **Team Members:** | Cortez,Patrick | Nefalar, Vincent Allan |
|  | Morallos, Ruth | Ponce,Kieyl |
|  | Nacor, Vincent |  |
| **Presentation:** | MCSPROJ Finals presentation [REDEFENSE] | |
| **Term and School Year:** | 3nd trimester of 3rd year college | |
|  | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Panelists** | **Recommendation** | **Plan of Action** | **Remarks** |
| **Part I: Introduction** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part II: RRL** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part III: Technical Background** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part IV: Design and Methodology** | | | | |
| **Part V: Results and Discussion** | | | | |
|  | **Ms. Rhea-Luz R. Valbuena** | 1. Change the data type of t\_description. 2. Add date to day filter to filter data on how many ticket’s were received on the specific day 3. Add liberty to the users to escalate their own ticket. 4. The system should automatically notify of tickets that needs to be escalated. 5. Adjust escalated due time from 0-4 hours from 0-30 mins | 1. Data type of t\_description has been updated. 2. Filter is added to have reference for that data that is worked on that day 3. Users have now the capability to escalate their ticket by “Request to Escalate” button. 4. The system can now automatically send notification to escalate ticket. 5. Due time have been adjusted | Done  Done  Done  Done  Done |
| **Others** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |