COMP9323: **eEnterprise Project**

Phases 3, 4 and 5 – Project Presentation, Peer Review and Final Demonstration

Guidelines and submission instructions

1. Summary

Overall Aim: In these phases of this course, you will be required to make a class-wide presentation of your project (Week 11); review and provide feedback to other students' work (End of Week 11); as well as submit and publish the final implementation of your project (Week 13).
In particular, this ultimate phase can be organised in the following parts:

- ***Phase 3. Project presentation (Week 11).*** Presentation shall be within time (15 for presentation + 5 minutes for questions). Each group is expected to provide a presentation of your project:

    - To summarise the main objective of the project
    - To summarise the significance and innovation of the project
    - To summarise and illustrate the main features of the implemented system
    - To summarise the system architecture (system components, their interactions, used technologies)
    - To summarise your experience undertaking your project: what you feel you have learnt during the course of your project? What suggestions could you propose for improving this?
    - Expect to answer questions related to your project in general by your peers, mentors.
    - We encourage all students to attend presentations by peer group and contribute to feedbacks

- ***Phase 4.*** **Peer-Review of another Group Project (End of Week11).** Each student will be required to provide a written critical review of another group's work based on presentation given by groups on Week 11. The review is a 1-page or 2-pages document that addresses the following review criteria:

    - It is expected that the reviewer student attends the presentation of the reviewed group
    - Critique of the presentation, considering both positive and negative perspectives with accompanying explanations and arguments;

    - Critique of of the API and/or UI of the system features, considering both positive and negative perspectives with accompanying explanations and arguments (e.g., state the innovative and well designed features, features that require improvements, missing features, etc)

The feedback will be assessed based on the "*usefulness* of the review". The review process imparts great benefit: Both, to the reviewed group providing useful feedback; while to the reviewer it provides a meaningful learning experience in understanding how to thoroughly probe, test and appropriately critique a presentation.

- ***Phase 5.*** **Final Demo (Week 13).** Finally, Submission of the project artefacts (e.g., code, documentation) and a demonstration of your working project is required. Demonstration shall be within time (30 minutes including questions/answers). In essence, we would expect you to outline the following during your demo:

    - To describe the main objective of the project, and demo it's main features;
    - Provide a detailed but concise description of your final implemented tool, showcasing its main implemented features preferably via use of an example;
    - Expect to answer questions related to features and it's implementation;
    - Additionally, we look at quality of the system in general and clarity of code (e.g. comments, readability, lightweight code docs, such as JavaDoc or Swagger documentation of API provided); and
    - Quality of deployment instructions.

2. Marking Scheme

PART	Excellent	Satisfactory	Poor
Phase 3 - Presentation ***[15%]***	• Clearly describes the underlying problem that the project sought to tackle; • Explains the proposed solutions and main outcomes of the project; this also includes outlining the main features of your system and how they work; • Describes and illustrates of the system architecture. This may also include a discussion of: Any external APIs used; 3rd-party Libraries; UI frameworks, etc. • Finally, reflects on your experience while conducting the project. This includes: identifying your main challenges; discussion about what you have learnt; as well as any comments and feedback for potential improvements. • Appropriately and adequately answers questions related to your project in general	The presentation presents the underlying the problems of the project, however lacks clarity the proposed solution, including a presentation of the main "features" of the project. Reasonable but not sufficiently clear presentation of the system architecture. Minimal mention of supporting 3rd-party libraries, APIs, frameworks, etc.	Does not adequately describe the underlying problem of the project. Poorly presented or missing information about the proposed solution, and or insufficient discussion about the main features of the system. Very brief of no mention about supporting libraries, 3rd-party libraries, APIs, frameworks. Does not or very briefly reflects on experience. Information is not useful.

Phase 4. Review of another group ***[15%]***	Comments provided are suitable. This means, for a given presentation, the reviewer is required to deliberate and formulate constructive feedback. Both positive and/or negative with concise justification.	Feedback is provided but no thoroughly explained. In particular, constructive criticism should be accompanied a brief yet detailed justification and feedback for improvement.	No or very little feedback is provided. And/or comments are relatively vague does not justify the points of potential improvements.
Phase 5 - Final Demonstration and Artefacts submission (Week13) ***[70%]***	• Good quality demonstration, showcasing the main features of the implemented project. • Clarity of code (e.g. comments, readability, lightweight code docs, such as JavaDoc or Swagger provided). • Quality of deployment instructions. • Appropriately and adequately answers questions related to features and it's implementation.	Reasonable demonstration is provided, but lacking depth and/or some missing or broken features. Code and/or deployment instructions lacks clarity. Students are only barely able to answer questions related to the project features and/or its implementation.	Poorly presented demonstration; many broken and/or missing features; large no. of bugs. Poorly presented code and/or deployment documentation. Students are incapable of providing satisfying answers to questions.

3. Submission guidelines for Phase 4 (peer review) :

Submission of this phase will be directly onto Piazza. Please follow the guidelines as in all previous phases. This means, make a post with the title **"Phase-4 Peer Review of GroupX"** –X being the reviewed group number. Ensure to only submit to **"Instructors",** and tag with "**Phase 4**"**.** Submissions are required in PDF format.

4. Submission guidelines for Phase 5 (project artefacts before demonstration) :

You are provided with the following two options to package your source code and submit it:

If your system is package-ready:
This implies your system package can be downloaded, such as a .war file, deploy in his local application server (eg. Apache Tomcat) and execute from within a web browser of a REST client (eg. cURL):

- Submit a **deployable** system package (eg: .war file); and
- Submit a README file that includes:
    1) How to deploy your system package in a local application server.
    2) A set of instructions to try out the main features of your system (eg. sample cURL commands or step-by-step instructions).

If your system is still not package-ready:

- Submit the source code as a zip archive; and
- Submit and a README file that includes:
    1) How to view your source code in an editor like Eclipse, IntellijIDEA
    2) What are the main classes (eg. servlet classes or the classes where the REST operations are described).

Note: You may also upload your source code to GitHub, DropBox or Google Drive and grant access to Boualem Bentallah (b.benatallah@cse.unsw.edu.au), Mortada Al-Banna (mortadaa@cse.unsw.edu.au) and Shayan Zamani (shayane.zamani@gmail.com). For further assistance with uploading your code to GitHub, please contact Mortada Al-Banna.

5. Submission Deadlines:

Class Presentation – Phase 3 (Week 11): Monday, 9th of October 2017 6-9PM
Peer review Phase 2 (Week 11): Friday, 13th of October 2017 23:59
Final Code Submission (Week 13): Sunday, 22nd of October 2017 23:59
Final Demos (Week13): Monday, 23rd of October 2017 6:00-9:00 PM

Usual late penalties apply for late submissions; albeit please ensure **not to be late**, and abide by the dates above. This is important in order to facilitate the smooth running and coordination of the review process. Otherwise, please feel free to contact your mentors, in order to discuss any further details.