Peer Review Report

Development Team: 15

Student number	Team member
08621497	Aden Dall'Osto
09440488	Tom Deakin
09312692	Joey Fan
09455477	Samuel Henry
09154507	Megan Hunter
08886229	Maxwell McLeod
09162259	Jesse Stanger

Client Team: 12

Project under development: Community Organisation

Introduction

14/09/2016

Dear Team 15,

The purpose of this letter is to thank you for your continued support in developing a viable solution for our proposed project, to address any issues believed to be present in the current product, and how to correct these issues. It will also discuss which procedures and components of the product which will be delivered and the expected level of expertise required for this product.

Discussion of Demonstration

Preparedness

As a development team, the presentation was well prepared with all but one of the team members present and the product at its current state was able to be showcased in a great level of detail.

The only member who was not present for the presentation was Jesse who was unfortunately unavailable as he was in Japan. However, even with his absence, the team was well prepared to deliver a presentation of a high level.

Expectations

The majority of the agreed upon user stories were delivered with one or two missing due to overestimation of the time required for completion of the first sprint. Of the completed user stories, the acceptance criteria was mostly achieved with great accuracy, with a few of the lesser priority acceptance criteria lacking. This wasn't a large issue as they were not essential for the core product, but they were missing nonetheless. Adding to this, none of the criteria were falsely claimed as being completed which adds confidence in the group regarding the honesty of the team.

The team was confident that the majority of the criteria would pass, with a few exceptions, as you stated that the amount of time required to complete sprint one was overestimated. Due to this, the project was partially incomplete but the majority of the core components were completed to a high level of detail. However, the team was able to elaborate on which components were completed and which were not and explain why.

There were no deviations from the proposed sprint plans which meant that there was no need to communicate any potential changes to the development prior to the presentation. Due to some segments of the sprint plan not being completed, the product struggles to deliver business value because it currently allows users to create accounts and filter through a list of events which is useful, but it is not a potentially shippable product.

Technical

The presentation was made at the right level for the stakeholders, with the frameworks and databases being suitable for the product being delivered, and there were no unexpected technical difficulties during the presentation. As the developing team, the presentation went into great depth about the chosen system architecture, but not specifically the rationale for choosing it. There was an error in the 'Update Details' function where if the user entered the incorrect user information, it would display an SQL error instead of providing a warning to the user. This is due to the fact that the the team was focused on only having the chosen user stories being completed and the error was present due to some relevant user stories only being allocated development time in sprint 2 or beyond.

Professionalism of the Presentation

The presentation was clear and coherent as the speakers were able to clearly articulate most of the rationale behind the current prototype. The demonstration was performed somewhat confidently, as the team understood most of the processes and the purpose of the product. Max was able to explain the key aspects of the product and provide explanations as to why they were included.

The presentation appeared to be well prepared in advance, as Max was able to elaborate on the product and answer questions confidently. However, Max was not able to prepare for all questions that were asked but they were handled professionally and confidently and he clearly has a deep understanding of the product.

The only problem encountered was the aforementioned SQL error but Max was able to explain that the error is present due to it only being sprint 1 and some user stories related to the bug fix have not been implemented yet. All questions were confidently answered with a clear and deep understanding of the product and its architecture.

Despite this, it appeared that most of the members had a low level of contribution to the project, with some contributing more, such as Max, as he had a greater depth of knowledge to their product than some of the other members. This can be greatly improved with more efficient time management and allocating tasks for each member to complete for future sprints with ample time to complete them.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we are happy with the current progress of the project and the components which have been completed thus far. For the upcoming sprint, it is expected that any components that were excluded from the past sprint be included as well as any of the components from the upcoming sprint itself. Further effort and time management may need to be employed in order to effectively bring the project back on track but we are confident that this can be accomplished to provide a sufficient end product that meets all business needs. We look forward to witnessing the next presentation and have high confidence and expectations on the progress.

Kind regards,

Team 12