

Software Engineering Proposal Document

READERS HUB

Software Engineering

Project Proposal by

Menaal Malik 261935148

Zainab G. Khan 261941006

Minahil Shahid 231496647

Department of Computer Science
Forman Christian College University
Lahore, Pakistan
(2024)

ABSTRACT

The Reader's Hub Site aims to establish an online platform catering to passionate readers globally. By fostering a vibrant community and offering personalized book recommendations, the platform seeks to become a leading destination for book enthusiasts. This project proposal outlines the problem statement, literature review, project overview, methodology, milestones, work division, costing, and references.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Reader's Hub Site endeavors to establish an online platform dedicated to serving the needs of passionate readers worldwide. It seeks to cultivate a dynamic community where book enthusiasts can connect, exchange ideas, and explore new literary treasures. Through a blend of interactive features and engaging content, the platform aims to become the go-to destination for individuals who revel in the world of books.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

The unmet need lies in providing a centralized platform for book enthusiasts to connect, exchange ideas, and access personalized book recommendations. The significance of this problem is evident from the growing demand for such platforms globally.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Existing platforms catering to book enthusiasts highlight the growing demand for online communities centered around reading. Studies suggest that personalized book recommendations and interactive features significantly contribute to user engagement and satisfaction within such platforms. Additionally, integration with online bookstores has shown us to streamline the book purchasing process for users.

4. PROJECT OVERVIEW/GOAL

The project aims to develop a user-friendly online platform with interactive features, personalized recommendations, and seamless integration with online bookstores. The value proposition lies in offering a comprehensive solution that enhances user experience and fosters community engagement.

5. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT METHODOLOGY / ARCHITECTURE

- Develop a web-based platform with responsive design to accommodate users across different devices.
- Implement features such as book rating, reviewing, and discussion forums to encourage user engagement.
- Utilize recommendation algorithms to offer personalized book suggestions to users.
- Collaborate with online bookstores for seamless integration and book purchasing options.
- Create author spotlights, reading challenges, and community forums to enhance user interaction and participation.

6. PROJECT MILESTONES AND DELIVERABLES

- Establishment of a thriving online community of passionate readers.
- Enhanced user satisfaction through personalized book recommendations and engaging content.
- Increased book sales through affiliate marketing partnerships with online bookstores.
- Recognition as a reputable source for literary discussions and recommendations.

7. WORK DIVISION

Work will be divided equally among group members.

8. COSTING

No Cost

REFERENCES

- [Mobile Library and Outdoor Readers Hub Project](#)
- [Reader's Digest Proposal](#)
- [How to Write a Business Proposal](#)
- [Proposal for a "Class room corner Reading Room \(Library\)"](#)

SProj Proposal Defense Evaluation Form and Rubrics

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
R1 Subject Knowledge	Student has no knowledge of both problem and solution. Cannot answer basic questions.	Student has no or very less knowledge of both problem and solution. Cannot answer questions.	Student is uncomfortable with information. Seems novice and can answer basic questions only.	Student has competent knowledge and is at ease with information. Can answer questions but without rationalization and explanation.	Student has presented full knowledge of both problem and solution. Answers to questions are strengthened by rationalization and explanation
R2 Organization and Content of Presentation	Student is clueless about the content of his presentation.	Information is arranged in confused and unstructured way. Key points are not covered. The contents are hard to understand and interpret.	Information articulated clearly but it is difficult to follow the presentation. All key points are covered but no use of charts, graphs, figures etc., to explain salient points.	Information articulated clearly and the flow is reasonable All key points are covered but limited use of charts, graphs, figures etc., to explain salient points.	Information articulated clearly and is organized in a structured way with logical flow between parts. All key points are covered. Enhances presentation and keeps interest by effective use of charts, graphs, figures etc., to explain salient points.
R3 Problem Statement	Problem statement is not stated at all or vaguely stated Description of <u>unmet need</u> or problem is missing	Problem statement is stated but not entirely clear. Seems novice and can answer basic questions only.	Problem statement is stated but lacks necessary justification in light of the literature review.	Problem statement is stated and covers necessary justification with reference to the literature review. Details of the unmet need or problem the FYP is aiming to solve are clear	Problem statement is stated and covers sufficient justification. New reader can clearly understand its value and context. Details of <u>unmet needs</u> are there. <u>Potential customers</u> have been identified
R4 Literature Review	Literature Review is not written or written in a vague Form	Literature Review is written in an ordinary way. The review material i.e. research papers or web material is not at all clear to a reader who is unfamiliar.	Literature review provides a reasonable description of the project background and its significance but can be improved. Number of research papers/ web material needs to be added more	The review provides a good background and details of the literature. However, it is not written in scientific writing standards for review.	Literature review is excellently written according to the scientific writing standards and covers maximum of the research papers/web material related to project
R5 Project Overview,	The approach that will be taken to solve	Some aspects of the solution are discussed	The methods, approaches, tools, techniques,	The methods, approaches, tools, techniques,	The methods, approaches, tools, techniques, algorithms, or other

Methodology	the problem is not discussed.	briefly but much of the description is left out.	algorithms, or other aspects of the solution are discussed but not in a convincing manner. Much is left to the readers' imagination.	algorithms, or other aspects of the solution are sufficiently discussed.	aspects of the solution are sufficiently discussed with sufficient details and supporting figures. Work division between group members is clearly defined
R6 Language and Grammar	A lot of spelling and grammatical mistakes in the report Writing is not understandable.	Frequent spellings and grammatical errors that impede the reading flow. Writing is in need of significant editing and improvement	Occasional spellings and grammatical errors Writing is acceptable but not entirely clear.	Occasional spellings and grammatical errors that have only minor impact on flow of reading. Writing is overall clear. Organization is good. Content is supported by good number of figures and tables.	Almost no spelling or grammatical mistake. Writing is easy to read. Excellent organization. Writing is concise yet all necessary content is included. Figures and tables support content.
R7 Delivery & Presentation Skills	Presentation was not clear at all. Language was not appropriate	Presenter occasionally spoke clearly. Holds little to no eye contact.	Presenter spoke clearly. Language was generally clear but mostly reading from notes.	Presenter spoke very clearly. Language was generally clear and delivery was fluent. Consistent use of direct eye contact with audience.	Presenter spoke clearly and at a good pace to ensure audience comprehension. Language was used effectively and delivery was fluent and expressive.
R8 Work Division	Work division among group members is not shown	Work Division among group members is not appropriate.	Work division is shown but more clarity is needed	Work division is shown.	Clear work division among group members is shown.

