CISY 8403

Peer Review Questions

**Site Identity and Purpose**

1. Whose software are you reviewing?
   1. Include the author(s), representative firm, etc.

Brandon of MasterBS ER.

1. The Needs Assessment
   1. Is it appropriate for the problem? Why or why not?

Yes, The problem asks that he design a site that is the equivalent of facebook in the terms of user permissions

* 1. Complaints and/or positives

I do like the organization between wants and needs inside the documentation – will long term borrow this

* 1. Suggestions for improvement

N/A

1. What is the goal(s) of this software?

The goal is to ensure that he gets experience using ruby on rails while also making sure that he can define user database permissions

* 1. How are these goals communicated?

These goals are primarily communicated through the needs assessment and the functionality

* 1. Are the design, navigation, security and functionality supporting the software’s goals?

The design is very minimal at this time, recommendations to come

Navigation fits the authentication heavy idea for this website

Functionality works as intended, I cannot easily see things that were not meant to be seen – have not tried to break anything yet, just as a normal user

* 1. Complaints and/or positives

Cannot give a zero star rating

No profanity filter

When I edit a review, my previous rating does not show up

* 1. Suggestions for improvement

See above

1. Who is the target audience?

As of right now, I would presume the audience is very wide due to the fact that it is intended for tech oriented restaurant goers

* 1. Discuss the stated or perceived audience’s demographics

See above, I came to this conclusion because older generations would be less likely to think of using online restaurant reviews as a tool

* 1. Do the design, navigation, security and functionality appeal to this audience?

The design is lacking in this because of the inconsistent design of the graphics (some are square, circle, etc…) and because the most important interface of such a demographic, mobile, is not very friendly due to the overwhelming white space

Navigation: is a little tight in mobile, would like to see more mobile friendly interface

Functionality is fine, though, given the audience, I would like to see more elements like hoverables and the like that show what is clickable as well as just less white space

* 1. Complaints and/or positives

Add padding between your images

Choose a shape for said images

Make sure that shape is definitive, like the applebee’s logo that has the same color as the background and would otherwise appear to not conform to a specific shape

* 1. Suggestions for improvement

See above

1. Does the software communicate the available tasks effectively?

For the most part, yes

On the main functionality I can see what I can interact with

In the nav, graphics, and (other than the fact they are buttons) buttons they do not have much in the way of user feedback to let know if they are clickable.

* 1. Are these elements functional?

Yes

* 1. As a whole, do these elements work together?

Yes

* 1. Complaints and/or positives

As stated before, more user feedback would go a long way

* 1. Suggestions for improvement

See above

**Interactions, Content Delivery and Accessibility**

1. How does the software deliver its content? Is the content delivered accessible to a variety of users?

The software delivers its content in both a mobile and desktop way, making it accessible to all users who would look for it

* 1. Does the software provide multiple ways to deliver its material? What are these ways?

Yes, there is the option of a category filter

* 1. Does the software effectively deliver material in an accessible manner?

No, purely because the mobile version looks broken because of the off center nature of the images and how much extra whitespace there is

* 1. Complaints and/or positives

It is really close, just honestly needs a touch of css fairy magic

* 1. Suggestions for improvement

See above

1. Does thesoftware display and/or deliver its information regarding content, interactions and use effectively?

No, see previous arguments

1. Do the software’s functional elements work well?

Yes, they act as intended

Though, trying to be more malicious, if I enter edit in the url I can edit other people’s entries as long as I am logged in as a user, was able to do the same with reviews

* 1. Do the software’s functional elements “work”? Are these features timely?

The timely-ness of the functionality is good, though more security will be required

* 1. Are instructions included or is the software intuitive?

Fairly intuitive, would like to see more user feedback

* 1. Complaints and/or positives

The pages with forms could use some improvement with the log in button css

Forms will straight up break if anything is blank as opposed to telling the user something is wrong

* 1. Suggestions for improvement

Fix security by adding user check and add error handling

**User Interface and User Experience**

1. Is the software interface appropriate for the software’s intended uses and audience?

No, see above

1. Are the design layout guidelines being used appropriate to the software’s problem solving approach?

Yes, the needs assessment is more focused on the functionality and making sure that works-the interface is fairly intuitive for the functionality

**Software Security**

1. Does the software follow industry specifications regarding the implementation of security practices?
   1. See content delivery section
2. Is the software appropriately secure based on its needs, users and intended purposes?

No, see above

**Peer Review Pointers**

Overall, everything did what it was supposed to do.

I would like to see more in the way of neatening up the website and making it more user friendly and adding more user feedback.

The security flaws pointed out above are extremely important due to the nature of this project and should definitely be addressed.

Otherwise, I did like the graphics used, especially the stars that were a graphical interpretation of the rating.

I also liked the changes from the original project which I also worked with, and thought were designed inappropriately (ex. The elements of the nav bar)

This review courtesy of Brian Kelly of Apples for Flood Victims TM