Friday, 14 October 2016

Mr Kaelan Reece

On behalf of Team 83

Via email: kaelen.reece@connect.qut.edu.au

Dear Mr Reece,

Please find the peer review completed by Team 83 following the group presentation on Wednesday. There were clear improvements from the previous presentation which are noted below. On the whole, Team 83 was well prepared and presented in a professional manner. They managed to adapt well to university wide technical issues that arose during the presentation and met most expectations. Team 83 consists of Eliot Wilson (N9175504), J-Mar Zeman (N9439919), Kaelan Reece (N8880778), Oliver Johnson (N9168079), Sebastian Sherry (N9168079) and William Minazzo (N9173439).

## Preparedness

Team 83 presented first and, compared to their first presentation, they were considerably more organised. Their demonstration of the project was well prepared and presented logically with an informative and insightful explanation for particular aspects. Prior to asking us to venture to their computer, the website was visible on the large communal screen. This was a positive alteration as it enabled all members from both teams to view the project and consequently discuss it.

## Expectations

In previous weeks, Team 84 had expressed concerns with Team 83’s notifications and the unrealistic nature of their current examples. We highlighted that a notification for a building fire is ineffective and unsuitable. Due to this we expected that Team 83 would make appropriate changes. At the presentation it was clear that no changes were made, and we reiterated our concerns.

Additionally, we have previously discussed that there was considerable white space throughout the website. Team 83 changed this by including multiple pictures as backgrounds throughout each page. This is a solid design decision and makes the project more appealing.

Team 83 nearly completed all of the scheduled user stories, however, they decided to move one user story to the next sprint to ensure that they were not pushed for time. We accept that this was a sensible change and ensured that they completed the other user stories to a high standard. We note that Team 83 did not inform us that there would be potential deviations. Team 83 were confident that their acceptance criteria would pass for all the stories and it is evident that all the acceptance criteria was met. Team 83 also seemed happy with the way usability and intuitive use of the product is continuing to improve. The in-development product delivers clear business value as it targets many areas that are currently lacking in terms of functionality.

## Technical

The presentation was made at the correct level for the stakeholders being Team 84. The system architecture has not changed since the previous peer review as the type is suitable for the project and both teams previously agreed. It was determined that the reasoning for choosing the specific system architecture has been further reinforced throughout the development of the project.

There were minimal technical difficulties during the project demonstration. There was a slight issue with the internet dropping out at one stage; however, Team 84 recognises that this was uncontrollable and was promptly fixed. Team 83 adapted to the situation and discussed other features of the project whilst some team members attempted to fix the issue.

Team 84 would like to commend Team 83 on their efforts up to this stage. We were impressed by the searching capabilities that the team has implemented and understand their reasoning as to why they included the additional feature. Additionally, the inclusion of drop downs for extensive information on some pages is a positive inclusion. It significantly contributes to the appearance and usability of the website which has been noted as an important aspect of the final project.

There were no major defects detected in the project; however, there a few small items to be discussed. We have verbally identified these to Team 83 meaning this is for formality purposes. We noted that the navigation pane is quite small and the user’s eyes are drawn to the bottom navigation bar due to the use of colour. We suggested that the top navigation bar’s text be enlarged in the future.

## Professionalism

The presentation was clear and coherent. Each of the explanations about additional features and changes were well explained. Kaelan ran the presentation with input, as required or prompted, by the majority of the other team members. William did not provide any input throughout the presentation. Additionally, William did not appear to be engaged by the presentation as he was typing on his computer which did not appear related to the presentation.

The presentation remained ad hoc but this format is suitable due to the familiarity between the teams. The presentation was confidently presented by the team members and all questions were answered confidently. We felt that the team became slightly defensive when we asked for further explanations. As the client team, we should feel comfortable to express our concerns and believe that this is an important part of professionalism. Additionally, we felt that Team 83 did not fully listen to some of our ideas and were prompt to explain why they would not be changing particular aspects. Despite this, Team 83 maintained a high level of professionalism throughout the presentation.

We commend Team 83 for the presentation they conducted in Week 11. We gained a strong understanding of the current stage of the project and the reasoning for particular implementations and changes.

If you have any further queries or would like some general feedback, please do not hesitate to contact Team 84 further.

Kind Regards,

Team 84 - Isobelle Martin (n9185861), Elinor Blom (n9184902), Michael O’Brien (n9408363), Pak Ning Luk (n9498362), Tze Fung Ng (n9322078) and Hugo He (n9359796)