

VIA University College

# **Project Description**

## **Semester Project 3**

### **Group 3**

#### **Students**

Guillermo Sanchez Martinez (355442)  
Piotr Wiktor Junosz (355502)  
Halil Ibrahim Aygun (355770)  
Alexandru Savin (354790)  
Eduard Fekete (355323)

#### **Supervisors**

Joseph Chukwudi Okika (JOOK)  
Jakob Trigger Knop (JKNR)

Character Count: 13623  
Word Count: 1839

Software Technology Engineering

3rd Semester

December 18, 2025

## Contents

<b>1 Problem Domain</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Education problem . . . . .	3
1.2 Current Situation . . . . .	3
1.3 Stakeholders . . . . .	3
<b>2 Problem Statement</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Main problem: . . . . .	3
2.2 Sub-questions: . . . . .	4
<b>3 Delimitation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4 Choice of Methods</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1 Knowledge and Data Collection . . . . .	5
4.2 Analysis and Modelling . . . . .	5
4.3 Design, Construction and Implementation . . . . .	5
4.4 Testing . . . . .	5
4.5 Planning and Management . . . . .	5
<b>5 Time Schedule</b>	<b>5</b>
5.1 Final Deadline . . . . .	5
<b>6 Project Timeline</b>	<b>6</b>
6.1 Milestones . . . . .	6
6.2 Expected Time Commitment Based on 10 ECTS . . . . .	6
6.2.1 Breakdown of Hours for 10 ECTS . . . . .	6
6.2.2 Total Hours Calculation for 10 ECTS . . . . .	6
<b>7 Risk Assessment</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>8 References</b>	<b>7</b>

## 1 Problem Domain

### 1.1 Education problem

Education is one of the most important aspects of life in civilized societies (NAICU - NAICU - Improves Quality of Life, 2025). Humans need knowledge in order to function in today's world — from simple communication to career growth. Knowledge can improve quality of life in many ways (Burke, 2023). "Nowadays around 40% of the global population does not have access to proper education in a language they understand" (PTI, 2025).

Many countries and communities struggle with gender inequality in educational opportunities, which ultimately results in educational disparities and economic inequality. Men and women should be able to choose their educational paths without being constrained by gender norms or stereotypes (Gender Equality in a Changing World, 2025).

In addition to unequal access, gender inequality is also visible in the socialization and education of boys and girls, even when both have equal formal opportunities. Gender norms and stereotypes at early stages influence the types of skills children are motivated to learn and the careers they are likely to pursue. For example, international test scores show that around age ten, girls read more effectively than boys, while boys perform better in mathematics and science (OECD, 2022). These patterns reflect not only differences in ability but also the effects of socialization, classroom processes, and cultural expectations about "appropriate" fields of study for each sex.

These inequalities are also shaped by intersecting variables, including socioeconomic status, physical ability, and social status (OECD, 2020).

### 1.2 Current Situation

Digital free-for-all educational platforms have been on the rise in recent years because they can provide knowledge to anyone with an internet connection and a device, thus minimizing educational inequalities (Duolingo, 2025).

However, many currently operating platforms focus on different aspects of education, such as language learning, coding, mathematics, or science (Singh et al., 2015). This leaves gaps and does not provide a consistent learning experience for users. Additionally, some platforms offer little free content, which can be a significant barrier for low-income users (World Bank Group, 2025).

Despite rapid advances in digital technologies, a major challenge persists: 2.6 billion people remain offline (Poggi, 2025). The digital divide is a major barrier to economic growth and sustainable development, with only 27% of the population in low-income countries having access to the internet, compared to 93% in high-income countries (Poggi, 2025).

### 1.3 Stakeholders

The primary stakeholders in the field of education include both learners and knowledge providers worldwide. Learners can be individuals of all ages, backgrounds, and locations who seek to acquire new skills or knowledge. Knowledge providers can include educational institutions, teachers, tutors, and online platforms that offer educational content and resources. Other stakeholders may include governments, non-profit organizations, and businesses interested in promoting education and improving access to learning opportunities.

---

## 2 Problem Statement

### 2.1 Main problem:

How to provide easily accessible learning platform?

## 2.2 Sub-questions:

- Is there any way to speed up the learning process?
  - How to make the learning process efficient and user friendly?
  - How to ensure that all genders can acquire proper knowledge?
  - What design principles can be used to make digital learning app more convenient?
  - How can accessibility features (e.g., screen readers, voice commands, adaptive interfaces) be integrated for users with disabilities?
  - How can trust in the system be established and maintained?
  - How can the correctness of knowledge be ensured?
  - How to provide and maintain security within the app?
- 

## 3 Delimitation

The project focuses on helping individuals who cannot access formal education. This may be due to income reasons or geographic constraints. Men and women will have equal opportunities on the digital platform, since everyone should be able to pursue education as they wish. To ensure high-quality, accurate content, courses will be reviewed by experts and AI.

The project is limited to the development of a simple digital distributed learning platform for students, teachers, and its administrators. Features such as high-scale performance, complete accessibility, AI-based learning, and enterprise-level security are not part of it.

### Delimitations Related to Sub-questions

Speeding up the learning process: The system will not be based on any researches evaluating optimal learning speeds. It will provide a basic platform where exercises can be accomplished and tracked.

Efficiency and friendliness of the learning process: Intuitive navigation and role-based design will be implemented. Deep UX testing, advanced personalization, or industry-level research of design is beyond the scope.

Gender neutrality in learning: The platform won't include gender-specific functionality. The platform will assume equal opportunity and neutrality for every user.

Principles of convenience design: The platform will use common UI design patterns suitable for desktop learning solutions. Research and comparison of other design philosophies (gamified vs. traditional layout) won't be conducted.

Accessibility features (screen readers, voice commands, adaptive interfaces): The application will provide only limited accessibility. Advanced adaptive interfaces won't be implemented.

Active pursuit of learning goals: The system will offer basic monitoring of progress. High-level motivational features (gamification, AI reminders) will not be part of it.

Trust in the system Trust will be addressed primarily by role-based access control and secure authentication. Broader features such as institutional certification or pedagogical authentication are out of scope.

Correctness of knowledge: Correctness of the course material will be assumed. The system will not include AI fact-checking, peer-review workflows, or third-party verification of material.

Security Security will be guaranteed on a low level (password hashing, simple role-based permissions). Advanced protection (multi-factor authentication) is beyond the project.

---

## 4 Choice of Methods

### 4.1 Knowledge and Data Collection

To identify the educational and technical issues of digital learning platforms, we will:

- Review existing platforms (e.g., Coursera, Duolingo, Udemy) to ascertain their strengths and weaknesses.
- Review academic reports and papers on the digital divide and language learning strategies.
- Identify user needs from informal questionnaires and discussions within the project team.

### 4.2 Analysis and Modelling

For distributed system planning and design, UML diagrams will be used to model system functionality and interactions.

- Architectural patterns such as client–server and REST-based architectures will be part of the design.
- Threat modelling will be conducted and potential security threats in authentication and data communication will be analysed.

### 4.3 Design, Construction and Implementation

The system will be developed using standard software development methods:

- Agile methodology with short iterations to ensure continuous progress and responsiveness.
- UI/UX prototyping with Figma for wireframing and user flows prior to coding.
- Backend services implemented in Java/C# with RESTful web services.
- Authentication and authorization mechanisms to ensure secure access.

### 4.4 Testing

The testing will be carried out continuously during the project to ensure robustness and functionality:

- Unit testing (Java: JUnit / C#: NUnit).
- Integration testing to check interactions between client and server.
- Manual testing of UI components and learning flows for usability and accessibility checks.
- Security testing with emphasis on authentication and authorization.

### 4.5 Planning and Management

To facilitate organized collaboration and progress monitoring:

- Git with GitHub for version control, feature branching, and code reviews.
- Task distribution and workload management will be done using a Kanban board (Figma/GitHub Projects).
- Regular meetings to check progress, resolve problems, and plan next steps.
- Documentation will be written in a formal academic style, with correct referencing and adherence to plagiarism standards.

---

## 5 Time Schedule

### 5.1 Final Deadline

Date: December 19, 2025

## 6 Project Timeline

Date / Period	Milestone / Activity	Details
Every Sunday	Weekly Reporting & Task Assignment	Submit progress report + assign new tasks
Weekly	Weekly Meeting	Checkpoint via Discord or at school
End of November 2025	Completion of Formal Project Part	Finish writing & documentation for review
December 19, 2025	Final Deadline	Submission of full project

### 6.1 Milestones

#### 1. Weekly Reporting and Task Assignment

When: Every Sunday

Details: Submit a weekly report on the project's progress and assign new tasks for the upcoming week to maintain continuous progress and team accountability.

#### 2. Weekly Meeting

When: Once per week

Platform: Meetings will be conducted either via Discord or at school.

Purpose: These meetings will act as checkpoints to discuss progress, address challenges, and adjust tasks as necessary.

#### 3. Completion of Formal Project Part

Target Date: End of November 2025

Details: Aim to complete the formal writing and documentation aspect by this date, allowing time for final revisions before the deadline.

### 6.2 Expected Time Commitment Based on 10 ECTS

Each student is expected to contribute a total of 275 hours to meet the 10 ECTS workload requirement, with increased hours in October and November to reduce the workload in December.

#### 6.2.1 Breakdown of Hours for 10 ECTS

- **October:**

- Weekly commitment: 16 hours per student
- Total for October:  $4 \times 16 = 64$  hours per student

- **November:**

- Weekly commitment: 16 hours per student
- Total for November:  $4 \times 16 = 64$  hours per student

- **December (up to December 20):**

- Remaining: 147 hours
- Weekly commitment:  $147 / 3 \approx 49$  hours per student
- Total for December:  $3 \times 49 = 147$  hours per student

#### 6.2.2 Total Hours Calculation for 10 ECTS

- Total Hours: 275 hours per student
- Calculation: Total hours =  $10 \times 27.5 = 275$  hours

## 7 Risk Assessment

Risk	Likelihood	Severity	Normalized	Preventive Actions
Data storage issues	3	3	2.0	Secure datasets early, create backups, use redundant storage
Local server failure	3	3	2.0	Regular backups, spare devices, monitor hardware health
Synchronization failures between distributed parts	2	3	1.5	Use messaging queues, retries, health checks, test synchronization

---

## 8 References

- References Burke, C. (2023, October 4). Why Is Education Important? The Power Of An Educated Society. Unity Environmental University; Unity Environmental University. <https://unity.edu/articles/why-education-is-important/>
- Duolingo. (2025). Company Strategy Overview | Duolingo, Inc. Duolingo, Inc. <https://investors.duolingo.com/company-strategy-overview-0>
- Gender gaps in educational attainment and outcomes remain: Gender Equality in a Changing World. (2025). OECD. [https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/gender-equality-in-a-changing-world\\_e808086f-en/full-report/gender-gaps-in-educational-attainment-and-outcomes-remain\\_33ea8a2f.html](https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/gender-equality-in-a-changing-world_e808086f-en/full-report/gender-gaps-in-educational-attainment-and-outcomes-remain_33ea8a2f.html)
- Lin, M.-H., Chen, H.-C., & Liu, K.-S. (2017). A Study of the Effects of Digital Learning on Learning Motivation and Learning Outcome. EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 13(7), 3553–3564. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2017.00744a>
- NAICU - NAICU - Improves Quality of Life. (2025). Naicu.edu. <https://www.naicu.edu/research/shaping-lives-and-anchoring-communities/improves-quality-of-life>
- OECD. (2024). Early Learning and Child Well-being. OECD. [https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/early-learning-and-child-well-being\\_3990407f-en.html](https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/early-learning-and-child-well-being_3990407f-en.html)
- Organisation For Economic Co-Operation And Development (OECD). (2020). PISA 2018 Results (Volume IV) : Are Students Smart about Money. Oecd.
- Poggi, A. (2025, April 4). The Digital Divide: A Barrier to Social, Economic and Political Equity | ISPI. ISPI. <https://www.ispionline.it/en/publication/the-digital-divide-a-barrier-to-social-economic-and-political-equity-204564>
- PTI. (2025, March 2). 40% global population doesn't have access to education in language they understand: UNESCO. Deccan Herald. <https://www.deccanherald.com/world/40-global-population-doesnt-have-access-to-education-in-language-they-understand-unesco-3428194>
- Singh, J., Fernando, Z. T., & Chawla, S. (2015). LearnWeb-OER: Improving Accessibility of Open Educational Resources. ArXiv.org. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1509.02739>
- World Bank Group. (2025, January 29). Digital Pathways for Education: Enabling Greater Impact for All. World Bank; World Bank Group. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/edutech/publication/digital-pathways-education-enabling-learning-impact>

VIA University College

# **Learnify - Process Report**

## **Semester Project 3**

### **Group 3**

#### **Students**

Guillermo Sanchez Martinez (355442)  
Piotr Wiktor Junosz (355502)  
Halil Ibrahim Aygun (355770)  
Alexandru Savin (354790)  
Eduard Fekete (355323)

#### **Supervisors**

Joseph Chukwudi Okika (JOOK)  
Jakob Trigger Knop (JKNR)

Character Count: 34283  
Word Count: 5552

Software Technology Engineering

3rd Semester

December 18, 2025

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Group Work</b>	<b>3</b>
2.0.1	Professional Collaboration . . . . .	4
<b>3</b>	<b>Project Initiation</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Choice and Alignment on Framework . . . . .	4
<b>4</b>	<b>Project Execution</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1	Before Project Period . . . . .	5
4.2	Project Period . . . . .	5
4.2.1	Week perspective . . . . .	5
4.2.2	Day perspective . . . . .	5
4.2.3	Feature perspective . . . . .	6
4.3	Adherence to the Framework . . . . .	6
<b>5</b>	<b>Choice of Tools and Methods</b>	<b>7</b>
5.1	Task Decision and the PO Role . . . . .	7
5.2	Tools . . . . .	8
<b>6</b>	<b>Personal Reflections</b>	<b>11</b>
6.1	Guillermo Sánchez Martínez . . . . .	11
6.2	Piotr Junosz . . . . .	12
6.3	Alexandru Savin . . . . .	12
6.4	Halil Ibrahim Aygun . . . . .	13
6.5	Eduard Fekete . . . . .	13
<b>7</b>	<b>Reflect on Supervision</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>References</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>15</b>
10.1	Appendix 1.1 GroupContract . . . . .	15
10.1.1	Group Contract . . . . .	15
10.2	Appendix 7.3: Other documents . . . . .	16
10.2.1	Project Guidelines . . . . .	16
10.3	Appendix 6.1 Personal Profiles . . . . .	16
10.3.1	Personal Profiles . . . . .	16
10.4	Appendix 12.1 Process Brainstorm . . . . .	16
10.4.1	Process Brainstorm . . . . .	16

## 1 Introduction

The project of a Learning Platform was initiated with the goal of creating an accessible and user-friendly online environment for learners. This project focused on developing a distributed system in a team environment, leveraging various distinct technologies and methodologies to ensure effective collaboration and successful delivery.

## 2 Group Work

Many of our group processes stemmed as a continuation from our previous project experience, because our current group consisted of the same five members. For this reason, we continued with improving our collaboration based on E-estimate personal profiles completed in the previous semester. Knowing the fact that our profiles consisted mostly of dominant red and blue working style and our last experiences we found a way of working really efficiently by creating clear todo lists and working mostly in smaller sub-groups. The high number of “Red” profiles unfortunately meant also that we were prone to conflict.



Figure 1: Personal Profiles (Appendix 6.1 Personal Profiles)

Our team was culturally diverse as we come from: Slovakia, Poland, Moldova, Spain and Turkey. The Southern European members of our team exhibited flexible relationship-based communication which proved to be a good balance for the structured task-oriented methods used by Central and Eastern European members. In addition, our earlier experiences together enabled us to handle cultural differences better because we understood each team member’s work habits which helped us predict problems and address personal challenges before they could harm the team’s performance. For example, knowing who preferred straightforward communication versus who tended to procrastinate with the set tasks allowed us to motivate each other effectively while maintaining a healthy working balance.

We based the group contract (Appendix 1.1 Group Contract) for the project on our previous contract with slight changes, for example to the point system. This group contract outlined our core values, purpose, expectations, conflict resolution strategies, and accountability measures in the team. While social loafing still occurred in the group, the team tried to handle it in a different way compared to having super strict contract with a lot of penalties in it. Unfortunately, this approach did not work well, thus many serious talks took place within the team, including warnings about the necessity of supervisor interventions if performance of the member did not improve.

### 2.0.1 Professional Collaboration

To document our ability to independently take part in professional collaboration, we adopted industry-standard practices such as using git. We used branching with Pull Requests to review code, ensuring no single person could break the main build. More details about use of version control can be found in the UseOfVersionControl (Appendix A: UseOfVersionControl.pdf). We communicated asynchronously via Discord/Teams to respect deep work time.

An important feature of the project's process was the role of a Product Owner (PO). The PO was responsible for managing the user stories, prioritizing the backlog, and ensuring that the team was aligned with the project goals. This role was crucial in maintaining a clear vision and direction for the project.

Contrary to our previous experience, this role was set to be more settled and less rotating among team members. This was done to ensure consistency and a clear point of contact for the team regarding project requirements and priorities. The role of the PO was assigned democratically at the start of the project.

---

## 3 Project Initiation

The initial ideas we worked with included a Health Assistant, Bank System, and the Learning Platform. These were chosen as relevant candidates from a brainstorming session based on their potential impact and feasibility. After discussing the vision and scope of each idea, we held a democratic vote to select the final project. The Learning Platform was chosen due to its clarity of purpose and alignment with our skills and interests.

The alignment on the actual vision was more complicated than the initial idea selection. We had to ensure that everyone in the team agreed on the project's goals, target audience, and key features. This involved several discussions and compromises to reach a consensus that satisfied everyone.

One of the problems we faced during the initiation phase was deciding on the actual scope of the project. We were all juggling between thinking about it as an actual ambitious product versus a simpler prototype suitable for the course requirements. This problem was resolved by agreeing on scalable and flexible solutions that allow for both simple approaches and potential complex upgrades.

Another challenge was approaching the problem in a data-driven manner. Considering our mostly European backgrounds, we had to ensure that the project's aims were relevant and applicable on a global scale by researching, and not relying solely on our personal experiences and assumptions. This also included exploring various perspectives and shifting some of the focus on minorities and underrepresented groups in education. This aligned with our mission to improve the education, rather than just having business goals focusing on making profit off of profitable majorities.

### 3.1 Choice and Alignment on Framework

Shortly after the group formation, a process brainstorm session was hosted, where most details of the desired framework were discussed and the Product Owner was selected. The full export of the session can be found as Appendix 12.1 Process Brainstorm.

---

## 4 Project Execution

The way of working in the project was a radical shift from our previous experiences. We adopted various aspects of Agile methodologies that fit our desired workflow. This included sprints, regular meetings, pair programming, Kanban but also our own adaptations to these practices.

Our main workflow was initially communicated and written down in the (Appendix A: Project Guidelines). This document served to outline our processes and roles but also aligned us on semantics and definitions of key concepts. Even though this document served as our aim and theoretical perfection we could aim for, perfect adherence was not always possible and advantageous.

One of crucial aspects of our work was embracing asynchronicity, which might contradict with our vision of pair programming but was seen collectively as the means to achieving better productivity and work-life balance. Asynchronicity was also implemented on a level of subgroups - fx. different feature groups would collaborate within the group in real time while asynchronously reviewing and agreeing with the rest of the team on other issues.

### 4.1 Before Project Period

Because of daily school and work commitments, we mostly worked asynchronously in this period. Our sprints were one week long, starting and ending on Wednesdays. Each sprint would start around lunchtime as we wanted to have time to end the previous sprint collaboratively. Each sprint would start with a planning meeting where we would discuss the goals and tasks for the sprint. At the end of each sprint, we would review all features and tasks, and discuss any blockers or challenges faced during the sprint.

### 4.2 Project Period

Our work during the project period looked as follows:

#### 4.2.1 Week perspective

We met every working day, weekends voluntary individually.

#### 4.2.2 Day perspective

We preferred to work remotely as this reduced commuting time, allowed for more flexible working hours, but also prepared us for future remote work.

Each day started at 8:20 with a daily standup meeting where we discussed for each: - What was done - What will be done - Any blockers

After the standup, we would plan the day's work, which we considered one sprint in this dense period. Based on our framework, the purpose and focus of a sprint is to merely label and agree on which aspects of the Kanban board we focus on during the sprint. Contrary to Scrum, not all focus was put on putting tasks from TODO to DONE, but rather on deciding how far to push each task (allowing reviews to be done in a different sprint and similar).

Depending on the approach of each sprint, we would either be in a group call or split into channels for pair programming. With more iterations, we realized that collective calls were more effective as they allowed for quicker communication and synchronization on key issues; often problems would reappear for multiple people and having everyone listen to the solution saved time in the future.

Each day the calls lasted until around 16:30 with breaks for lunch and short breaks in between. Depending on everyone's situation, some days the work would continue later into the evening/night for those who preferred that.

#### 4.2.3 Feature perspective

Working on a feature was usually for 1-3 people subgroups. The feature was started by discussing the definition of done, breaking down the tasks, and creating a branch for it. Each feature was practically a vertical slice of the product and the work was also often split into vertical slices (in order to reduce interpersonal dependencies). The aim of each feature team was to deliver a working feature compatible with main (which was evolving in parallel) by the end of the feature work. Each feature would have to be reviewed by someone least biased before merging to main.

Working with the team usually involved calling, sketching ideas, and drawing UML diagrams, while researching domain context and processing data from users. On a practical level, we used Visual Studio Code with Live Share for pair programming, GitHub for version control, Figma/FigJam for brainstorming and unrestricted diagramming, PlantUML inside VSCode for quick UML sketches, and Discord for screen sharing and communication.

### 4.3 Adherence to the Framework

It must be noted that the adherence was not perfect. One such example is periodical claiming of tasks that often happened with no reason, which resulted in a so-called “Code Ownership Trash Can” where labels were put from tasks that did not need to be reserved by anyone. This can be seen on the figure below:



Figure 2: Code Ownership Trash Can

Another important point is the splitting of the work and the adherence to Kanban in critical situations - like before deadlines. IN these situations we resorted to more chaotic working as can be seen on the figure below, depicting a cumulative clump of tasks that arised towards the end of the project:




Figure 3: Tasks Before The Deadline

## 5 Choice of Tools and Methods

### 5.1 Task Decision and the PO Role

One of the most often used techniques for determining the priority of tasks was utilizing a board with Impact and Effort axes. Despite a lack of public information about such usage - in time restricted situations, the

tasks were prioritized from left to right, and in periods with time to spare - top to bottom. Overall, this method proved to be an effective planning technique that allowed the PO to quickly and relatively with no bias to prioritize tasks. A snapshot of a usage of this graph can be seen below:




Figure 4: Impact Effort Snapshot

Creating concepts from sources like user stories, non-functional requirements and others also proved to be a powerful idea that arised from the project initiation period. This method allowed great flexibility while keeping the opinionated choices of prioritization - often arising from the data-driven nature of the project.

## 5.2 Tools

A powerful tool for this project compared to other semester projects proved to be Visual Studio Code by Microsoft. Through the power of extensions, actions, and powershell scripts, the whole team was able to work

collaboratively and effectively.

For documentation, a hybrid approach with markdown (Pandoc) and PlantUML was chosen. Markdown allowed for easy collaboration (both Live Share and Git) with not many conflicts while providing a powerful framework in which styling is not a concern during content creating. PlantUML allowed for quick diagramming and sketching of ideas without the need to open a separate application. This allowed for quick iterations and changes to diagrams as the project evolved.

PlantUML was also important for all UML purposes in general - text-based form of diagrams allowed for great collaborative experiences, simple exports and truly dynamic changes. The ease of use and its popularity also resulted in UML being used outside of pure engineering diagramming, for example as shown on the figure below depicting a quick guide we shared on our board in Figma:




Figure 5: UML Guide

Visual Studio Code also allowed for efficient work with the database - providing the ability to connect to the database and easily execute all queries from the same environment as everything else.

On top of hosting all these features, Visual Studio Code also allowed for automating terminal sessions for running all parts of the system (building documentation, running all systems, zipping everything) and because of the language server support, also provided one IDE for managing the whole project.

Despite that, a significant part of the collaboration still relied on Figma - including a part of documentation (diagrams, user story maps, ...) and general task/iteration management. Figma proved to be a superior tool for brainstorming, quick collaboration sessions, and truly free and easy alignment sessions.

---

## 6 Personal Reflections

### 6.1 Guillermo Sánchez Martínez

During this semester, we wanted to try a different agile framework since we do not know which one our future company will use and we want to find the most relevant one for us. For this project we decided to combine Kanban with the role of Product Owner. This allowed us to switch more easily from one task to another without needing to wait for the Scrum Master to assign another task after finishing the previous one. Furthermore, keeping the role of Product Owner helped maintain a unified vision of our system.

At the beginning of the project I thought this framewrok was the best for me, but now that we have finished the project I would not say so. Because of not having any tasks assigned, I felt less attached to the project, and in some cases that meant taking longer to finish a task because it did not feel like mine. I am still getting to know myself, and this project has for sure helped me with that. If I could reshape our agile framework I would have included a rule saying that a task must be taken by a specific person so I could feel more attached to it and therefore work more efficiently.

To continue discovering myself and how I perform in different methodologies, I am open to explore other agile frameworks in order to find the one that suits me the best during the next semester. Since once I join a company I will have to adapt to the framework they use, this exploration is essential for my future career.

In this project, there has been a clear difference between members who worked actively and members who worked passively. Some of us were taking tasks one after another, sacrificing personal time for the good of the project, while others spent less time and prioritized personal tasks. I personally think that this group is great, but after collaborating for two projects in a row, we might need a change. We already know how each of us reacts to different challenges, and given that we had no task ownership, we knew that if we didn't finish a task, someone else could just take over our work. Maybe expanding the group to 12 members next semester is the change we need.

Regarding next semester's project, I am excited to work with such a big team and approach the project as a job rather than just an assignment. Since it will probably be the last big project I do before landing an internship, it will be the last opportunity to know myself better before entering the real job market.

In conclusion, the Kanban framework has been useful to work with but I would change it in order to perform. I am happy with the final system we built, and I feel like this has been the first real project I have ever done, which is something i am proud of.

To continue discovering myself and how do I perform in different methododologies, I am open to explore other agile frameworks in order to find the one that suits best with me during the next semester. Since once I get into a company, I will have to adapt to the framework they use.

In this project there has been a clear difference between members that worked actively and members who worked passively. Meaning that some of us were taking tasks one after another, sacrificing their time for the great of the project, while others spent less time and priorized personal task. I personally think that this group is great, but after collaboratig for 2 projects in a row we might need a change, we already know how each of us reacts to different challenges and given that there was no task ownership, we knew that if we didn't finish a task someone could take over our work and continue from there. Maybe expanging the group to 12 members next semester is the change we need.

Regarding next semester project, I am excited to work with such a big team and take the project as a job and not at an assignment. Since it might be the last big project I am going to do before landing an internship, and therefore it will be the last opportunity to know myself better before getting into the real working market.

## 6.2 Piotr Junosz

This semester, our group decided to explore new methods and frameworks so that we can learn more about different types of software development processes. The idea was to maintain working in the iterative, agile approach, transiting from strictly using Scrum with Unified Process (UP) to Kanban workflow while retaining Product Owner role which was found useful in the previous semester. For me, the most significant aspect resulted from changing the way of working, more precisely planning and splitting the tasks within the group. We moved from a push-based planning model, in which the work is assigned upfront in the beginning of each sprint, to a pull-based system using our Kanban board. The efficiency of completing and splitting the tasks improved greatly due to the fact that after each group member finished their work, they could immediately pull next tasks from “To Do” column. Those experiences can be explained by comparing push and pull theories, which confirms the success of our Kanban approach. A Push System relies on predetermined scheduling, where “work items are scheduled based on deterministic planning” (Kanban University, 2022). In comparison, Kanban uses a Pull system, where the process is controlled by available capacity. The Kanban Guide explicitly states that in a pull system, “completed work is regarded as more valuable than starting new work” (Kanban University, 2022). Our new team rule - that everyone has to commit all changes before taking a break - was designed to support the flow and improve efficiency of completing the tasks even more. Because of this policy, unnecessary waiting for a group member to finish their assigned tasks was avoided and everyone could just take over the unfinished work. Having experienced the fluency of the pull system, I now realise that self-organized pulling work based on capacity is far more efficient than the push system in the Scrum + UP setup. This successful transition showed us that there are a lot of different frameworks and methodologies to try out in the future development work. Understanding each new process method while comparing to the ones already learned is essential when it comes to choosing your own best and most efficient approach. As a next step, I would like to know more about defining clear process rules as well as learning any new agile frameworks that can improve group work efficiency even further.

## 6.3 Alexandru Savin

My thinking about feasible SEP3 ideas and their implementation started long before the actual project. I and my group members shared a common idea that we should develop a product in sync with the current SDGs, and although it had to be scoped and narrowed down, it is good to know its core idea remains to promote free education possibilities and share human knowledge. During the project I brightened my understanding and got new competencies in Java, C#, and architectural patterns.

I think overall it was a correct and fair decision, that we chose kanban board as our main framework. Our app is of small scale and it was comfortable to keep track of where the current development progress was. We transferred the role of Project Owner of Scrum into our project and it played out well for the project, however for group members to feel more responsibility I can imagine we should have implemented the term based switch of the POs as we did in our previous semester.

Unfortunately, I did not make timesteps of our kanban board in order to analyze a cumulative flow infographic. Based on additions over time from our github inside statistics, we see, we've experienced some blockages and our workflow went not as steady as expected, nevertheless the easy pull of tasks mechanism allowed group members to overcome those obstacles. Each of our group members shared ownership of the project and could contribute anytime to adding or completing the tasks from the board.

Github version control and working on different branches felt much more useful compared to last semester. We developed a rule and stucked to it most of the time, claiming that each branch once ready, had to be peer tested locally, reviewed and only then merged into main, which also makes common sense.

I highly value the real feedback I received, because it did in fact once happen that, while one of my implementation methods pull request was being analyzed by the reviewer from security risks perspective,

it proved to be a threat, which was shortly mitigated shortly after and before completing the feature and deleting the branch.

The time spent on this project gives me another chance to dive in and retrospect my workflow over the past weeks, my knowledge, my abilities to contribute to a project as an independent individual, evaluating and completing tasks on one side of the hand and as a student, a team member, on the other hand, where to be a good student is to be predictable, someone who can either keep up with the tasks he chooses to solve and be transparent about the difficulties he encounters and just be a group member other peers could rely on. All in all, I'm looking forward to the next semester project and eager to learn and practice methods to help me work and acquire knowledge more efficiently.

#### **6.4 Halil Ibrahim Aygun**

During this project, I was involved in almost every stage of the system, working across different layers and at different points in time. I often handled features that needed to work end-to-end, meaning I had to understand and connect the database layer, backend logic, and client-side behavior. This gave me a much broader view of the system than focusing on a single isolated component, but it also came with challenges that required constant coordination with the rest of the team.

Our workflow was based on shared responsibility rather than strict code ownership. Multiple people could work on the same branch, and progress was discussed daily during meetings where we talked about what we had done, what we planned to do next, and how we could improve our approach. Having a shared Kanban board helped keep tasks visible and flexible, but it also meant that changes made by one person could quickly affect others. Because of this, I had to deal with merge conflicts several times, especially when my branch was waiting for review while other features were merged into main.

Handling these conflicts taught me how impactful even small changes can be in a shared codebase. I became much more aware that my decisions did not only affect my own work, but could slow down or complicate the work of others. This experience highlighted the importance of communication and timing, especially in a project where many features evolve in parallel.

At the beginning, working with a distributed system that combined multiple technologies and programming languages felt chaotic. However, by applying the principles and structure we learned during the semester, I gradually understood how the different parts fit together. This helped me move from seeing the system as many separate components to understanding it as one connected whole.

Through this project, I feel more confident working in larger teams and navigating complex systems with multiple branches and contributors. I learned how to collaborate in an environment where changes happen continuously and where coordination is just as important as writing code. If I were to work on a similar project again, I would focus even more on early communication about changes, discussing potential impacts beforehand, and supporting teammates more actively. Helping others and receiving help often led to learning new things myself, making collaboration a clear win-win.

#### **6.5 Eduard Fekete**

This semester brought the best and the worst of experiences. To start on the positive side, I believe that the way of our working was an extremely powerful blend of industry standards that was created after our team debates. I dreamt of something like this for a long time, every time listening to Uncle Bob, Kent Beck, Martin Fowler and other great guys, I just thought about how exactly it could work for me, how could I arrive at some satisfactory way of functioning that would be easy to get people into, that would not make VIA complain, and that would actually make sense.

And here it was, the nice chaos of XP with the structure of Kanban and benefits of Scrum. Although, not to idealize - many people absolutely avoided pair programming. Once when I suggested "let's do it together, can you share screen?", the answer was "Nah, it's super easy, I'll just do it and you check it afterwards". And yes, that defeats the purpose, this wasn't 100%. And it wasn't super easy.

It also really got me when someone would “review their own changes”, and in an attempt to redeem “refactored the code” and funny enough, all this without even running or contributing to the tests.

However, claiming that the process failed because of a lack of adherence and expertise puts us back to the waterfall times, where an argument of type “You should have thought about it in the Analysis phase” would be the way to justify why waterfall works rather than addressing its flaws.

And so the question arises - *what was it that failed and what was it that worked?*

In order to look why things worked, let’s look at what worked. We were able to efficiently and quickly deliver features, with not much bureaucracy and sweet sweet agility. Disputes of what and how to do were replaced with getting data, shared code ownership, and a bunch of refactoring.

What didn’t work? I believe that our bus factor was at most 2, if not 1. We absolutely lacked a shared understanding of crucial aspects despite tons of accessible documentation. And there it was - “tons” of documentation maybe failed us.

The group contract is another chapter of the story itself. Karaoke never happened and was not even a proper punishment to begin with. I never liked the idea of involving supervisors or any such external party in a position of authority in the SEP conflicts because it just felt like cheating to get conflicts resolved by someone else. Now I would not go into a project without signing something saying that if someone decides to not show up absolutely for anything, and if they lie about their work, they will have real consequences besides “singing karaoke”. I cannot believe my *naïvety* of thinking that easing the rules from last semester would just work like magic, I think that freedom is something more complicated than just removing rules.

And this connects to the bus factor again - this system worked better than the previous Scrum + UP one, but was it because we were more productive or because suddenly without any fairness/equality concerns of sprint planning, there was full power for a couple of people to do the work while the rest could ease? Did the lack of code ownership mean a lack of responsibility over the system? Is it in any way fair if someone has more responsibility over the system *purely* because they put more effort? And actually, did I bite myself on this because I predicted a lot of this in my head and thought that having no constraint of taking on the work would somehow only improve my efficiency without having a negative impact on the rest of the people?

To bridge the gap between speculative illusions of reality and the more refined reflection of it, let’s form some facts:

- the group contract was broken often, consequences were not enforced
- the methods were more of an inspiration rather than a strict framework
- promises were broken, assigned work was not done
- transparency and honesty were often lacking (e.g. AI usage)

And with a weak proof or rather subjective anecdotal evidence, if these facts hold true, then I claim that none of the previous/other processes would have worked. I believe that a team that does not have a good sense of responsibility, honesty, and transparency can not achieve good results with any normal process; with normal including nothing that would break the law, ethics, ideally common sense as well.

Nevertheless, I would not be able to claim that I am data-driven without proper objective measurements. Therefore, I propose that if the process of judgment is fair, then the grade should reflect the quality of my work on semester project, not my subjective talks in this report. And without such judgment, I could merely conclude and reflect that my contribution was not perfect but never expected to be perfect, though of high quality, consistent, and conducted in a professional and ethical manner.

And to reflect further, I would like to say that I haven’t felt such pride in a long time as when seeing some of the team members just crushing the whole SEP aspect of the project. Conducting an hour-long interview on a call because we needed data, studying how kanban works, speaking up on big issues, and even going to “prison” just to lock on a task because that’s what we agreed to do are in my opinion the moments that will shape this team into something more than regular Software Engineers. I hope that people who find themselves in this understand the transformation that happened during the semester in the same way I see it.

---

## 7 Reflect on Supervision

In the project team, we were often aligned on ideas and approaches, which made critical analysis and reflections on our work more challenging. The role of supervision thus became a crucial element of our project process. The supervisors often challenged our assumptions and decisions, ensuring that the project was kept improving based on proper processes and data, rather than just group consensus and momentum.

Each of our supervisor meetings had a clear agenda - acquiring external feedback and clarifying doubts. We did not focus on mere presenting of our progress but rather on seeking constructive criticism and guidance. This approach allowed us to identify potential pitfalls and areas for improvement that we might have overlooked without the supervisors.

Another aspect of the supervision was filling the technical gaps in our knowledge and project requirements. The supervisors always helped with long-term planning which could not have been done by the team alone due to the limited knowledge towards the beginning of the project.

The frequency of meetings was resulted mainly from the mandatory supervisor meetings and our own needs. Therefore, every time we were not sure about our decisions related to the project we communicated with one of the supervisor about the need to have a meeting with them. We communicated mainly through ItsLearning and e-mail.

---

## 8 Conclusion

The project showed how flexible structured team collaboration works through our transition from Scrum to Kanban pull-system workflow. The experience we gained helped us develop a list of best practices and common mistakes which will guide our future group projects.

The team needs open communication and respect as fundamental values together with a Product Owner who manages the vision to achieve successful teamwork. We should keep using standup meetings to exchange information while supervisors need to provide essential feedback and help with technical issues and code submissions must happen regularly to avoid creating bottlenecks.

It would be a good idea to avoid three main mistakes which include making decisions based on assumptions when data exists, enforcing processes that block work and splitting into groups that do not collaborate well with each other. The team should focus on achieving fundamental goals before attempting to tackle complex problems.

The team needs to keep their group contract active while using Kanban pull-based workflow management and feature decisions must be based on data. The team should seek outside feedback to confirm their project's direction.

---

## 9 References

Kanban University. (2022). The official guide to the Kanban method (Version 2). Mauvius Group Inc. [https://kanban.university/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/The-Official-Kanban-Guide\\_A4.pdf](https://kanban.university/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/The-Official-Kanban-Guide_A4.pdf)

## 10 Appendices

### 10.1 Appendix 1.1 GroupContract

#### 10.1.1 Group Contract

Can be found as GroupContract.pdf

## **10.2 Appendix 7.3: Other documents**

### **10.2.1 Project Guidelines**

Can be found as ProjectGuidelines.pdf

## **10.3 Appendix 6.1 Personal Profiles**

### **10.3.1 Personal Profiles**

Can be found as PersonalProfiles.png

## **10.4 Appendix 12.1 Process Brainstorm**

### **10.4.1 Process Brainstorm**

Can be found as ProcessBrainstorm.png

VIA University College

# **Learnify - Project Report**

## **Semester Project 3**

**Group 3**

### **Students**

Guillermo Sanchez Martinez (355442)  
Piotr Wiktor Junosz (355502)  
Halil Ibrahim Aygun (355770)  
Alexandru Savin (354790)  
Eduard Fekete (355323)

### **Supervisors**

Joseph Chukwudi Okika (JOOK)  
Jakob Trigger Knop (JKNR)

Character Count: 64982

Word Count: 8942

Software Technology Engineering

3rd Semester

December 18, 2025

# Contents

<b>1 Abstract</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2 Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3 Main Section</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 Analysis . . . . .	6
3.1.1 Actor Descriptions . . . . .	6
3.1.2 Requirements . . . . .	6
3.1.3 Use cases and their related requirements . . . . .	7
3.1.4 Use case diagram (UCD) . . . . .	8
3.1.5 Use case descriptions . . . . .	10
3.1.6 System sequence diagrams (SSD) . . . . .	11
3.1.7 Activity diagrams . . . . .	11
3.1.8 Test Cases . . . . .	14
3.1.9 Domain model . . . . .	14
3.1.10 Security Requirements . . . . .	16
3.2 Design . . . . .	16
3.2.1 System design . . . . .	16
3.2.2 Architectural overview . . . . .	17
3.2.3 Class diagram design . . . . .	18
3.2.4 Communication protocol design . . . . .	20
3.2.5 Security Design . . . . .	21
3.2.6 Database design . . . . .	22
3.3 Implementation . . . . .	27
3.3.1 Methods and tools . . . . .	28
3.3.2 Servers Implementation . . . . .	29
3.3.3 Integration Logic: . . . . .	29
3.3.4 Security Implementation . . . . .	35
3.3.5 Deployment . . . . .	35
3.4 Testing . . . . .	37
3.4.1 Testing Approach . . . . .	37
3.4.2 Tools and frameworks . . . . .	37
3.4.3 What was tested . . . . .	37
3.4.4 Method-level test case documentation . . . . .	38
3.4.5 Benefits and bug detection . . . . .	38
3.5 Result . . . . .	38
3.6 Final Product Showcase: Screenshots of the “Learnify” app UI or console logs showing successful data processing. . . . .	39
3.7 Ethical Considerations: . . . . .	39
<b>4 Discussion</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>5 Conclusion and Recommendations</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>6 References</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>7 Appendices</b>	<b>41</b>
7.1 Appendix 2.1 Requirements . . . . .	41
7.1.1 Requirements . . . . .	41
7.2 Appendix 2.2 Use Cases . . . . .	41
7.2.1 Use Case Diagram . . . . .	41
7.3 Appendix 2.3 Diagrams . . . . .	41
7.3.1 System Sequence Diagrams . . . . .	41

7.4	Appendix 2.4 Tests . . . . .	41
7.4.1	Test Cases . . . . .	41
7.5	Appendix 3.1 Source Code . . . . .	41
7.5.1	AuthController.cs . . . . .	41
7.6	Appendix 4.1 Relation Schema . . . . .	41
7.6.1	Relational Schema . . . . .	41
7.7	Appendix 7.1 Threat Model . . . . .	41
7.7.1	Threat model . . . . .	41
7.8	Appendix 7.2 Security Policy . . . . .	42
7.8.1	Security Policy . . . . .	42
7.9	Appendix 9.1 Wireframes . . . . .	42
7.9.1	All Courses Page Wireframe . . . . .	42
7.10	Appendix 10.1: Stakeholder Interviews . . . . .	42
7.10.1	Interview David . . . . .	42
7.11	Appendix 11.1 Architecture . . . . .	42
7.11.1	Architectural Overview . . . . .	42
7.12	Appendix 13.1 Deployment Diagram . . . . .	42
7.12.1	Deployment Diagram . . . . .	42

## 1 Abstract

This work addresses the requirement for scalable and adaptable digital educational infrastructures through the development of Learnify, a distributed software system designed to ensure seamless content delivery and learning experience.

The primary objective was the construction of a resilient, multi-server solution that leverages the distinct advantages of a polyglot microservices architecture to enhance availability, data integrity, and system responsiveness. The architectural design enforces strict interoperability between Java and C# components, utilizing gRPC for high-throughput intra-service communication and HTTP for external client accessibility.

Data persistence is managed via a PostgreSQL database, while security concerns inherent to distributed systems are mitigated through the implementation of JWT authentication and Argon2 salted password hashing.

The development process followed an iterative methodology, where functional requirements were derived from User Stories established through specialized analysis and stakeholder interviews. The resulting product successfully manages concurrent user sessions within a distributed environment.

Verification procedures confirmed that the system meets essential requirements, demonstrating successful component interoperability, and robust data protection. The project concludes with a fully deployable distributed system, validating the architecture as a secure and stable foundation for the future scalability of educational technology.

## 2 Introduction

The acquisition of new knowledge is an essential part of human life and evolution. Functioning in the society necessitates communication, which in turn requires a foundational level of knowledge (Habermas, 1984). Although mandatory education became a universal global standard during the late 20th and early 21st centuries (UNESCO, 2000), significant disparities remain - approximately 40% of the global population still lacks access to education in a language they understand (PTI, 2025).

The aim of this project is the development of a system which would be able to provide learning opportunities with a specific focus on accessibility, efficiency, and the optimization of learning processes. Beyond this, the system also aimed to ensure security, data integrity, and deployability of the solution among other things.

While the pursuit of knowledge has been a cornerstone of human development for millennia, the incorporation of digital technologies into education is in perpetual evolution (Siemens, 2005). A widely accepted model for learning with digital technologies has not been identified, mainly because the exponential increases in computing power and volumes of online information constantly redefine how users approach knowledge acquisition, processing, and retention (Haleem et al., 2022).

The approach of this project is to develop a distributed educational platform implemented using a polyglot architecture, utilizing a database for data persistence, and adapting a hybrid communication strategy that includes technologies such as gRPC and HTTP.

### 3 Main Section

The main section of this document is organized in the direction from the high-level analysis of the problem towards the specific implementation, testing and other relevant aspects of the solution created. This direction does not represent the chronological order of the project development and thus some aspects of the problem might not have a solution designed, implemented, tested, or deployed yet.

This overview represents merely a snapshot of the project development across each phase, and thus does not present a full solution or even analysis of the problem domain.

#### 3.1 Analysis

The fundamental domain knowledge was at first derived from the analyzed problem domain via literature review, and research. Because of the data-driven nature of this project, the analysis focused on stakeholder interactions since the beginning to ensure proper understanding and to test the assumptions made. With more progress made on the solution, the analysis was evolutionary refined to reflect the new understanding of the problem domain in the specificities of the solution space created by Learnify.

The most abstract and crucial aspect of the analysis was defining the system actors. The actors were defined to be:

- Learners
- Teachers
- Admins

The most questionable aspect of the definition was the relationship between the roles, and particularly how teachers and admins relate to it. It was established that teachers and admins are a type of a learner, and this was confirmed throughout the project most importantly because:

- both teachers and admins were expected to be skilled users of the platform (Appendix 10.1, Interview\_261125.pdf) and were supposed to be educated on it (Appendix 10.1, Interview\_121025.pdf)
- both teachers and admins were understood as learners within the leaderboard setting and were expected to be equal participants in it (Appendix 10.1, Interview\_121025.pdf)

##### 3.1.1 Actor Descriptions

**3.1.1.1 Learner** Learners strive for knowledge acquisition. They want to be motivated to learn and they should be allowed to have a structured way of learning new information. They want to be able to learn various different topics at their own pace. They are looking for a gamified experience.

**3.1.1.2 Teacher** Teachers are trusted Learners, who also want to share their knowledge with others. They want to be able to manage courses easily and have a structured way of doing it.

**3.1.1.3 Administrator (Admin)** Admins are trusted Learners, who have the right to manage the platform. They should be able to manage all learners, and platform settings.

##### 3.1.2 Requirements

**3.1.2.1 Functional requirements** The functional requirements are structured as user stories to better capture the perspective of the actor and to clarify permissions and intentions behind each requirement. This way the user stories served as the fundamental source of truth and a guideline for understanding the problem and being able to design a solution that would address the problem preserving the idea behind the intention of the actor.

---

###### ID User Story

USL1 As a Learner, I want to register for an account so that I can access the platform.

USL2 As a Learner, I want to log in so that I can access the platform from my account.

---

**ID User Story**


---

USL3 As a Learner, I want to see in which courses I am enrolled in, so that I can continue where I left off.  
 USL4 As a Learner, I want to continue learning where I left off, so that I don't have to start over every time.  
 USL5 As a Learner, I want to see all available courses, so that I can explore and choose what I want to learn.  
 USL6 As a Learner, I want to filter courses, so that I can find specific content quickly.  
 USL7 As a Learner, I want to unenroll from a course, so that I can stop learning a course I no longer want to finish.  
 USL8 As a Learner, I want to view the Leaderboard, so that I can compare my progress with other learners.  
 USL9 As a Learner, I want to view my Profile, so that I can see my personal account details.  
 USL10 As a Learner, I want to test my knowledge within the course, so that I know I understood the topic and I am not bored.  
 UST1 As a Teacher, I want to submit a course draft, so that I can find out if my course idea is relevant for the platform.  
 UST2 As a Teacher, I want to manage course content, so that I can correct or improve previous work.  
 UST3 As a Teacher, I want to edit course information, so that I can correct mistakes.  
 USA1 As an Admin, I want to see all drafts, so that I know what drafts are waiting for approval.  
 USA2 As an Admin, I want to approve course drafts, so that the teacher knows they can work on such course.  
 USA3 As an Admin, I want to add course categories and languages, so that the platform can easily adapt to new content.  
 USA4 As an Admin, I want to manage users' roles, so that I can manage what access is given to the platform and to what degree.  
 USA5 As an Admin, I want to disapprove course drafts, so that the teacher knows such course is not needed at the moment.

---

*Table 1: Functional Requirements (Appendix 2.1 Requirements)*

The user stories are sorted based on the actors to which they correspond, not according to the chronological order in which they were added/discovered. The chronological order is also not perfectly reflected on the IDs, as these were not always static for the same user story (when managing them, they would be adjusted)

### 3.1.2.2 Non-functional requirements

1. The system must be polyglot
2. User passwords must be securely stored at rest
3. The system must be deployable
4. The system must be color-blind friendly

### 3.1.3 Use cases and their related requirements

In order to address the user stories, use cases of the system were developed, which further clarified the requirements and provided a basis for understanding the system behaviour (giving basis for dynamic rather than static analysis).

The uses cases developed are shown in a table below:

ID	Use Case
UC1	Register
UC2	Log in
UC3	Manage Personal Learning
UC4	Browse and Search Catalog
UC5	Complete Learning Step
UC6	View User Profile
UC7	View Leaderboard
UC8	Create Course Draft
UC9	Edit Course Content
UC10	Manage System Settings
UC11	Review Course Drafts
UC12	Manage User Roles

---

*Table 2: Use Cases (Appendix 2.2 Use Cases)*

The table below shows how the use cases are related to the user stories

User Story	Use Cases Addressing It
USL1	UC1
USL2	UC2
USL3	UC3
USL4	UC3, UC5
USL5	UC4
USL6	UC4
USL7	UC3
USL8	UC7
USL9	UC6
USL10	UC5
UST1	UC8
UST2	UC9
UST3	UC9
USA1	UC11
USA2	UC11
USA3	UC10
USA4	UC12
USA5	UC11

*Table 3: Use Cases and their related requirements (Appendix 2.2 Use Cases)*

### 3.1.4 Use case diagram (UCD)

To depict how the use cases were related to the system actors, a use case diagram was created as shown below:




Figure 1: Use Case Diagram (Appendix 2.2 Use Cases)

As can be seen, the UCD also introduced the internal boundary for teachers and admins - specifying that these actors are not simply learners with privileges but there is a boundary to be crossed when becoming a teacher or an admin. The UCD also specifies the system boundary, which in the case of Learnify covers all the use cases developed.

### 3.1.5 Use case descriptions

In order to fully describe the use cases, use case descriptions were created; an example below shows such use case description, specifically for the UC5 - Complete Learning Step use case:

ID	UC5
Use Case	Complete Learning Step
Summary	A student engages with course content by completing exercises to test their knowledge.
Actor	User
Precondition	The User is enrolled in a course and is viewing a learning step.
Postcondition	Scenario A: The User answers correctly and proceeds. Scenario B: The User answers incorrectly and receives feedback.
Base Sequence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The System presents a learning step.</li> <li>2. The User provides a response to the activity.</li> <li>3. The User submits the response.</li> <li>4. The System evaluates the response.</li> <li>5. The System provides positive feedback. [ALT1]</li> <li>6. The User proceeds to the next unit.</li> </ol>
Alternate Sequence	<p>[ALT1] Incorrect Answer:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5a. The System determines the response is incorrect.</li> <li>5b. The System provides corrective feedback.</li> <li>5c. The User attempts the activity again (Go to step 2).</li> </ol>

Figure 2: Complete Learning Step Use Case Description (Appendix 2.2 Use Cases)

As seen above, the use case descriptions provided a structured way of understanding how the system should behave and gave a strong basis for the test cases.

All the use case descriptions were made in the same format with:

- Use Case ID and Name
- Summary
- Actor(s)
- Preconditions
- Postconditions
- Base Sequence
- Alternative Sequences

It was also determined that when the system fails to perform its action, the user should be notified of the

error and the inability to proceed. This was noted on the side of the Use Case Descriptions as a general alternative sequence.

### 3.1.6 System sequence diagrams (SSD)

System Sequence Diagrams (SSDs) were developed to illustrate the interaction between the system actors and the system as a black box. By focusing on the input and output events, the SSDs helped in identifying the necessary system operations and the data that needs to be exchanged to fulfill each use case.

An SSD was created for each of the 12 use cases, ensuring that the dynamic behavior of the system is fully captured from an external perspective.

The figure below shows the SSD for UC5 - Complete Learning Step, which highlights the iterative nature of the learning process and the system's role in providing feedback.




Figure 3: Complete Learning Step SSD (Appendix 2.3 Diagrams)

The system sequence diagrams were kept simple and focused on the core interaction. Nevertheless, for UC9 and UC11 it was decided to include alternate paths while not including anything else than the main success scenarios.

### 3.1.7 Activity diagrams

The development of activity diagrams was crucial in understanding the dynamic behaviour and the interplay of several use cases and domain entities. While use case descriptions provide a structured textual representation, activity diagrams allow for a visual understanding of the logical flow, decision points, and the interaction between the user and the system's core components.

A set of activity diagrams was developed to cover the most critical workflows of the Learnify platform, including user onboarding, course discovery, content creation, and the learning process itself.

The activity diagram below illustrates the core workflow of a Learner interacting with the platform. It demonstrates the interplay between UC3 (Manage Personal Learning), UC5 (Complete Learning Step), and

UC7 (View Leaderboard).




Figure 4: Learning and Achievement Activity Diagram (Appendix 2.3 Diagrams)  
13 of 42

This diagram is arguably one of the most important aspects of the application as it demonstrates something similar to a core loop of the system - a typical path a user takes within a session.

By modeling these workflows, the analysis phase ensured that the system's dynamic behavior aligns with the identified user stories and the relationships defined in the domain model.

### 3.1.8 Test Cases

Following the definition of the system's dynamic behavior through use cases, SSDs and activity diagrams, a set of high-level test cases was derived to formalize the acceptance criteria for the Learnify system. These test cases were constructed directly from the use case descriptions, specifically targeting the preconditions, base sequences, and alternative sequences defined in the previous sections.

The objective of defining these test cases during the analysis phase - rather than the testing phase - was to ensure understanding of system's functionality and to aid the definition of done.

The table with all test cases can be found as (Appendix 2.4 Tests) - the table provided there also contains the test case results as these test cases were used during the testing phase as well.

### 3.1.9 Domain model

The domain model was constructed for this project to better understand the problem domain and to aid communication among stakeholders. The crucial aspect of developing the domain model was identifying the relationships between different kinds of users, in particular the roles and responsibilities of Learners, Teachers, and Administrators; which had to be combined with the security aspect of the system as well as had to align with the shared understanding of the stakeholders.




Figure 5: Domain Model (Appendix 2.3 Diagrams)

The figure above shows the domain model for Learnify. It can be seen that the crucial aspect of fully describing the different system roles is understanding what entities exist and how they relate to each other.

The inheritance from the `User` entity reflects the fact that all system users have some common basic attributes, rights and behaviours that can be generalized.

The philosophy behind the attribute selection and abstraction into separate entities was to provide full flexibility for future development of the system, and ensuring that no restrictions are imposed for no reason. For example, Learning Steps are abstracted into three different entities to fully support any kind of idea of a learning step as seen both in the domain and from stakeholder interactions.

At the same time, the domain model was kept in its simplest form possible in terms of more abstract entity concepts. As can be seen on the domain model, the core aspects of the system are:

- Users
- Courses

- Learning Steps

And it could be further argued that Learning Steps only exist as a part of Courses, therefore the Domain Model is centered around the idea of Users learning from Courses, which did not change from the initial vision of the system.

The inclusion of stakeholders as entities within the domain model mostly arised from the need of defining and understanding attributes and relationships of Users.

### 3.1.10 Security Requirements

The security requirements for the system were developed as a part of the threat modelling process. The security objectives were as follows:

- **Confidentiality:** Protect user passwords and personal data from unauthorized disclosure.
- **Integrity:** Ensuring that data can not be altered or tampered with by unauthorized parties.
- **Availability:** Ensure the system remains accessible during high traffic or denial-of-service attempts.
- **Accountability:** Actions must be uniquely traceable to a specific entity.
- **Authenticity:** Verify that data inputs and users are genuine.

These objectives were developed based on the CIA triad and expanded to fit the needs of the system (Appendix 7.1 Threat Model).

Similarly to other parts of the analysis phase, stakeholder interactions shaped the system's security requirements. In particular, even testing the prototype (before having the core system functional) showed concerns about the authority of Administrators and Teachers, and needs for accountability for actions.

## 3.2 Design

### 3.2.1 System design

The aim of the designing phase was to establish a clear vision and guide for implementing the solution. Design phase created the largest gap between the initial problem definition and the approach taken to solve it by transforming certain concepts into an implementable or more flexible form (e.g. user roles).

**3.2.1.1 Wireframes** Wireframes were used along other rough sketches to design the components of the user interface without the hassle of dealing with the final styling. Because of the chosen methodologies, wireframes provided a strong basis for creating HTML skeletons of various razor pages.




Figure 6: All Courses Page Wireframe (Appendix 9.1 Wireframes)

The figure above depicts one of the wireframes created for the system - all courses page or as described in the analysis - “The Course Catalogue”.

The interface also includes features which are showed only to users with specific roles (Teacher, Admin); it can be seen that there are two action buttons named “Create Draft” which appears only for users with a Teacher role and “Waiting Drafts” which appears only for users who are an Administrator. These buttons give Teachers and Administrators quick access to content creation and moderation tool while keeping the learner view free from unnecessary elements.

The fidelity of the wireframes was kept low but the transformation into the chosen technology PlantUML (Open-Source Tool That Uses Simple Textual Descriptions to Draw Beautiful UML Diagrams., n.d.) provided a more visually accurate representation with less details provided from the creation inputs; ultimately resulting in wireframes that appear of higher fidelity.

### 3.2.2 Architectural overview

The architecture is a distributed, three-tier solution that aims for strict separation of concerns, scalability, and polyglot interoperability. The architecture facilitates interaction between a C# frontend, a C# logic middleware, and a Java data persistence layer.

**3.2.2.1 Client** The client-side application is built using Blazor in C# .NET. This layer hosts the web interface accessible to all system actors: learners, teachers, and admins. It is responsible solely for UI rendering and user input handling, delegating all business logic to the backend services.

The solution utilizes Blazor Server, which decouples the UI rendering from the client. This means that a significant part of the interactions is done on the blazor server rather than directly on the client machine.

**3.2.2.2 Logic Tier** The Logic Server, implemented in C# (ASP.NET Core), and acts as the central orchestrator. It exposes a RESTful API via HTTP(s) to the client, ensuring broad compatibility and standard web communication. This layer handles authentication, authorization (RBAC), and feature-specific business

rules. It serves as a protocol bridge, translating external HTTP requests into internal gRPC calls for the data layer.

**3.2.2.3 Data Tier** The Data Server is implemented in Java (Spring Boot), fulfilling the project's polyglot requirement. Communication between the Logic and Data servers is conducted via gRPC - Google's Remote Procedure Call framework. This choice leverages Protocol Buffers (Protobuf) for binary serialization, resulting in lower latency and higher throughput compared to text-based JSON over HTTP.

**3.2.2.4 Data Persistence** At the foundation of the architecture is a PostgreSQL database. The Java Data Server manages all database interactions, ensuring that the Logic and Client layers remain agnostic to the underlying storage mechanics.

**3.2.2.5 Architectural Diagram and Justification** The figure below depicts the final architecture of the system as described above:




Figure 7: Architectural Overview (Appendix 11.1 Architecture)

The mentioned technologies, frameworks, and tools were chosen both to fulfill the requirements but also prioritized flexibility and ease of development.

### 3.2.3 Class diagram design

We decided to make a class diagram for each of the servers, demonstrating their independence. These are the Client App, Logic Server and Data Server.

**3.2.3.1 Client App Class Diagram** This server is responsible for displaying the system to the client and to help the client navigate through our system, giving freedom to the user to use the system as they please, using high-level methods.




Figure 8: Client App Class Diagram

**3.2.3.2 Logic Server Class Diagram** In this server the logic of the system is defined through the controllers, allowing the client server to perform the actions requested by the client.




Figure 9: Logic Server Class Diagram

**3.2.3.3 Data Server Class Diagram** This server main responsibility is to manage the database by adding, fetching, modifying and deleting the entities, ensuring that the logic server requests are completed successfully.




Figure 10: Data Server Class Diagram

### 3.2.4 Communication protocol design

The system implements a multi-tiered architecture that utilizes distinct communication protocols for external and internal interactions. The sequence diagram below illustrates the end-to-end communication flow, demonstrating how the Client, Logic Server, and Data Server interact to process a request.




Figure 11: Application Layer Sequence Diagram

### 3.2.5 Security Design

Taking into consideration the earlier defined threat analysis and risk assessment, the security design focuses on the technologies used to defend against identified threats. System maintains various strategies of protecting the data at rest and while being transmitted.

#### 3.2.5.0.1 Authentification and Authorization

To address the threats of Spoofing and Elevation of Privilege, the System is based on stateless authentification architecture.

- Authentification: The System delegates auth operations to an AuthController. Once credentials are successfully validated, the System sends a JWT to the client. The System relies on JwtSecurityTokenHandler to sign the token using the HmacSha256Signature algorithm and a pre-configured secret key loaded through server level application settings.
- Authorization (RBAC): Access control is granted via ADDJwtBearer authentication method. The System inspects the claims of incoming requests to restrict access based on user roles (Learner, Teacher, Admin), effectively mitigating threats and unauthorized access.

#### ##### Data Protection and Integrity

To address Confidentiality and Integrity requirements, following strategies have been adopted to protect data throughout its lifecycle.

- Data at Rest: The system follows the principle of data minimization, ensuring no personal information is stored beyond the necessary authentication credentials (usernames and passwords). To reduce the impact of potential database leaks, passwords are never stored as plain text. The system utilizes the Argon2 algorithm. This hash algorithm provides resistance against brute-force attacks.
- Data during Transit: To protect data against Man-in-the-Middle Attacks, protection strategies differ based on network exposure: Client to Server: The Logic Server enforces Transport Layer Security (TLS) via the app.UseHttpsRedirection() middleware. This ensures that user credentials are encrypted when being transferred over the public internet. Logic to Data: Communication between the Logic and Data servers occurs via gRPC. While this traffic remains unencrypted, the data is serialized in binary Protobuf format. This unencrypted state is considered acceptable for the current project scope as it assumes strict network isolation.

#### 3.2.5.0.2 Input Validation

To reduce the possibility of injection attacks the system validates users input.

- The System's SecureAuthService is designed to handle user inputs and throw errors when invalid inputs such as mismatched passwords are detected, so that bad data is rejected before entering database.

- The system uses strict gRPC message typing (e.g., the AddUserRequest) to guarantee data structure. This ensures that injection attacks relying on malformed data structures or unexpected fields are impossible, as they are rejected by the protocol's strict binary validation before reaching the application logic.

#### 3.2.5.1 Interface Definition (gRPC & Protobuf)

Internal communication between the Logic Server and the Data Server is managed via gRPC. The data structures and service contracts are defined using Protocol Buffers (Protobuf), ensuring strict typing.

The next code snippet demonstrates the definition of the message structures (Requests and Responses) used within the system.

```
message User {
    int32 id = 1;
    string username = 2;
    string password = 3;
    repeated Role roles = 4;
}
```

```

message Role {
    string role = 1;
}

message GetUsersRequest {}

message GetUsersResponse {
    repeated User users = 1;
}

```

The next code snippet illustrates the service definition, detailing the RPC methods, their required parameters, and return types.

```

service UserService {
    rpc GetUsers(GetUsersRequest) returns (GetUsersResponse);
    rpc GetUser(GetUserRequest) returns (User);
    rpc AddUser(AddUserRequest) returns (AddUserResponse);
    rpc UpdateUser(UpdateUserRequest) returns (User);
}

```

**3.2.5.2 API Specification** The Logic Server exposes a RESTful API to external clients using standard HTTP/1.1 protocols. This design streamlines client integration by using standard HTTP verbs (GET, POST, PUT, DELETE) and status codes.

For example, authentication is handled via the /auth/login endpoint. By sending a POST request to <http://localhost:9090/auth/login> with the correct credentials, a client can successfully authenticate and connect to the system.

**3.2.5.3 Protocol Justification** A hybrid protocol approach was chosen to balance user experience with system performance, in specific, we chose to use HTTP for the logic server and gRPC for the data server:

- External Communication (HTTP/JSON): We utilized HTTP with JSON for client-server interaction because of its universality and readability. JSON is natively supported by web browsers and mobile clients, making the system easy to debug and integrate. While the text-based format introduces some overhead, the trade-off favors the ease of development and broad compatibility required at the client layer.
- Internal Communication (gRPC/Protobuf): For communication between the Logic and Data servers, gRPC was selected over REST. Unlike the text-based JSON, gRPC uses Protocol Buffers to serialize data into a binary format. This results in significantly smaller payload sizes and faster serialization/deserialization times. Furthermore, gRPC operates over HTTP/2, allowing for multiplexing and lower latency, which is critical for high-throughput internal traffic.

### 3.2.6 Database design

**3.2.6.1 Enhanced Entity Relationship Diagram** As means of bridging the gap from the problem domain in general and the Learnify system in specific, an EER diagram was created as can be seen on the figure below:

## Enhanced Entity-Relationship Diagram




Figure 12: Enhanced Entity Relationship Diagram (Appendix 2.3 Diagrams)

The EER developed does not significantly differ from the domain model as both diagrams are conceptual and could in theory be used interchangeably. However, the EER diagram further reflects the decisions made during analysis, which most notably reflected on the way how roles are handled.




Figure 13: SystemUser to Role Relationship

The figure above is a part of the domain model (Appendix 2.3 Diagrams) and focuses on the relationship between the User and their Roles. This relationship in contrast to inheritance based models provides a flexible and strict way of handling user roles - their permissions and access to the system. Most importantly it does not hide the complexities of inheritance into a seemingly simple abstraction and prevents the potential issues that could arise from mindless inheritance hierarchies.

Certain relationships could in theory be kept as many-to-many, however the need to attach attributes to these relationships led to the preference of a separate entity to hold the attribute thus separating the concerns and providing a more flexible design. This can be seen on, for example, the **UserCourseProgress** entity as shown below:




Figure 14: SystemUser to Role Relationship

**3.2.6.2 Relational Schema** Contrary to the conceptual modelling, the logical modelling required adherence to the rules and specificities of the relational model. Because of the designed use of standard relational database (PostgreSQL), the mapping of the EER needed to determine all the necessary resolutions of relationships, strong and weak entities, and the establishment of integrity keys.

The mapping of the EER diagram resulted in a relational schema and the to it related global relations diagram.

The mapping resulted in the relation schema as shown on the figure below:

## Strong Entities

SystemUser (id, username, password_hash) <b>PK:</b> id	Role (role) <b>PK:</b> role	Language (code, name) <b>PK:</b> code	CourseCategory (id, name, description) <b>PK:</b> id
--	-----------------------------------	---	--

LearningStepType (id, name) <b>PK:</b> id
---

Course (id, title, description, total_steps, language_code, category_id, author_id, approved_by_id) <b>PK:</b> id <b>FK:</b> language_code ref Language(code) <b>FK:</b> category_id ref CourseCategory(id) <b>FK:</b> author_id ref SystemUser(id) <b>FK:</b> approved_by_id ref SystemUser(id)
--

## Weak Entities

LearningStep (course_id, step_order, content, type_id) <b>PPK:</b> course_id, step_order <b>FK:</b> course_id ref Course(id) <b>FK:</b> type_id ref LearningStepType(id)
--

SystemUserRole (system_user_id, role) <b>PPK:</b> system_user_id, role <b>FK:</b> system_user_id ref SystemUser(id) <b>FK:</b> role ref Role(role)
--

UserCourseProgress (user_id, course_id, current_step) <b>PPK:</b> user_id, course_id <b>FK:</b> user_id ref SystemUser(id) <b>FK:</b> course_id ref Course(id)
--

Figure 15: Relational Schema (Appendix 4.1 Relation Schema)

As can be seen below on the part of Global Relational Diagram (Appendix 2.3 Diagrams), the many-to-many relationships got resolved into new relations - SystemUserRole, and UserCourseProgress.




Figure 16: Caption

**3.2.6.3 Global Relations Diagram (GR/GRD)** Relational schema and Global Relations Diagram are technically identical. In the project Learnify, the GRD was the main source of truth for later implementation of the database structure and discussing the data persistence design.

The final GR diagram is shown on the figure below:

## Global Relations Diagram




Figure 17: Global Relational Diagram (Appendix 2.3 Diagrams)  
26 of 42

It can be seen that the GRD reflects the same concepts as the relational schema, however, in this case the positioning of the elements provides a more natural step going from the EER and the domain model; although, the positioning did not fully preserve the conceptual relationships as seen in the EER diagram.

### 3.3 Implementation

The implementation of the system followed the designed architecture and communication protocols with a focus on setting up the core of the architecture first as one continuous vertical slice.

At first, a database schema was created in PostgreSQL, a Springboot project was created for the Data Server, and two .NET solutions were created for the Logic Server and the Client Application.

This stage did not include any actual logic but rather provided a skeleton of the system. One of the decisions taken at this stage was to maintain separate solutions for the Logic Server and Client Application. Despite the initial idea of implementing a shared solution, it was decided that the feature of C# anonymous types would suffice for most of the purposes of data transfer objects (DTOs) and that the added complexity of a shared solution would not be justified.

The implementation of the skeleton was followed by the implementation of a vertical slice which focused on fetching all courses from the database.

The individual components of the vertical slice can be seen below on the part of Domain Model (Appendix 2.3 Diagrams):



Figure 18: Caption

At a later stage, the original database setup was split into pure DDL script and a dummy data initial setup crucial for testing stages mentioned later in this document.

### 3.3.1 Methods and tools

Going further into implementation details, Java and C# programming languages were chosen to meet the requirements of multilanguage system. For storing information PostgreSQL database has been implemented. The development team chose C# Blazor .NET for the frontend because its component-based system gave a possibility for fast GUI development without needing an additional JavaScript code. On the Logic Server, ASP.NET Core provided an intuitive environment for managing REST endpoints and gRPC services, facilitating high-speed communication. It was achieved by using shared Data Transfer Objects (DTOs) and validation logic which kept data model changes synchronized between client and server systems. Java programming language was selected to run the Data Server because it met this semester's polyglot requirements and demonstrated how .NET and Java systems can work together using gRPC protocol, which is explained further in the integration logic paragraph below.

### 3.3.2 Servers Implementation

Data Server implemented using Java was intended to not have any code related to the main logic of the system. Its main responsibility was to handle operations of the services which were either taking data from the database or updating the database. The framework that was used in order to make the implementation process cleaner and more efficient was Spring boot. The team chose Spring Data JPA when it comes to handling data persistent with PostgreSQL due to the possibility of working with Java objects instead of raw SQL queries.

The Logic Server operated as the system's Web API which functioned as the core processing unit of the platform by using the C# ASP.NET Core framework. The Java server took care of database management while the Logic Server executed all business operations which enable the system to function properly. The system operated as a middleman between the Blazor client and the Data Server because it handled requests which followed system rules before sending data to the Data Server. It is worth mentioning that security took a big part on this server. The system used JWT (JSON Web Tokens) to handle user authentication which restricted access to particular features based on user authorization. All the main logic was kept here which made it simple to control features such as course enrollments and leaderboard system or course draft approval workflow. Using C# for this layer was a great fit because it worked perfectly with the Blazor client on another server, allowing the team to keep the code organized and easy to build on.

When it comes to Client Server, as mentioned before, Blazor C# was chosen. It gave the team a structured template to work on the fronted using reusable components and integrating logic using C# programming language instead of JavaScript. Client side was responsible for sending HTTP request to the WebApi through user friendly, GUI.

### 3.3.3 Integration Logic:

To showcase the path from GUI through the servers, the database, and back as well as communication between the servers, the following figures demonstrate the necessary logs and implementations of such functionality. The code can be found in (Appendix 3.1 Source Code).

**3.3.3.1 Login Feature** When an user who already has an existing account tries to log in, they input their credentials into the text field and clicks the login button.




Figure 19: Click login as teacher

After clicking the login button, the client side server sends a request to the Logic Server. The following json represents the HTTP request sent:

```
[Client] Sending HTTP POST /auth/login:  
{  
  "username": "teacher1",  
  "password": "password123"  
}
```

The Logic Server receives this request and initiates the validation process.

**Logic Server (AuthController.cs):**

```
[HttpPost("login")]  
public async Task<ActionResult> Login([FromBody] LoginRequest request)  
{  
  try  
  {  
    User foundUser = await authService.ValidateUser(request.Username, request.Password);  
    string token = GenerateJwt(foundUser);  
    return Ok(token);  
  }  
  catch (Exception e)
```

```
{
    return BadRequest(e.Message);
}
}
```

*Code Snippet 1: AuthController (Appendix 3.1 Source Code)*

The AuthController delegates the validation to the SecureAuthService.

**Logic Server (SecureAuthService.cs):**

```
public async Task<User> ValidateUser(string username, string password)
{
    User? existingUser = await GetUserByUsernameAsync(username) ?? throw new Exception("User not found");

    if (!Argon2.Verify(existingUser.Password, password))
        throw new Exception("Password mismatch");

    return existingUser;
}

private async Task<User?> GetUserByUsernameAsync(string userName)
{
    IEnumerable<User> users = await Task.Run(() => userRepository.GetMany());
    foreach (User user in users)
    {
        if (user.Username.Equals(userName))
        {
            return user;
        }
    }
    return null;
}
```

*Code Snippet 2: SecureAuthService (Appendix 3.1 Source Code)*

The SecureAuthService retrieves users via the gRPCUserRepository, which communicates with the Data Server.

**Logic Server (gRPCUserRepository.cs):**

```
public override IQueryable<User> GetMany()
{
    var resp = UserServiceClient.GetUsers(new GetUsersRequest());
    var users = resp.Users.Select(c => new User
    {
        Id = c.Id,
        Username = c.Username,
        Password = c.Password,
        Roles = c.Roles.Select(r => new Entities.Role { RoleName = r.Role_ }).ToList(),
    }).ToList();

    return users.AsQueryable();
}
```

*Code Snippet 3: gRPCUserRepository (Appendix 3.1 Source Code)*

The Protobuf message structure used for this communication is:

```

message User {
    int32 id = 1;
    string username = 2;
    string password = 3;
    repeated Role roles = 4;
}

message Role {
    string role = 1;
}

message GetUsersRequest {}

message GetUsersResponse {
    repeated User users = 1;
}

```

*Code Snippet 4: Protocol (Appendix 3.1 Source Code)*

Finally, the Data Server handles the gRPC request and retrieves the users from the database.

**Data Server (UserServiceImpl.java):**

```

@Override
public void getUsers(GetUsersRequest request, StreamObserver<GetUsersResponse> responseObserver) {
    try {
        List<SystemUser> users = userRepository.findAll();
        List<via.sep3.dataserver.grpc.User> grpcUsers = new ArrayList<>();

        for (SystemUser user : users) {
            grpcUsers.add(convertToGrpcUser(user));
        }
        GetUsersResponse response = GetUsersResponse.newBuilder()
            .addAllUsers(grpcUsers)
            .build();

        responseObserver.onNext(response);
        responseObserver.onCompleted();
    } catch (Exception e) {
        responseObserver.onError(e);
    }
}

```

*Code Snippet 5: UserServiceImpl (Appendix 3.1 Source Code)*

**3.3.3.2 Create Draft Feature** Once logged in, the teacher can create a course draft. This process involves the Client sending data to the Logic Server, which then forwards it to the Data Server.

## ← Create New Course Draft

The screenshot shows a user interface for creating a new course draft. At the top left is a back arrow icon. The main title is 'Create New Course Draft'. Below the title are several input fields:

- TITLE:** A text input field containing 'Draft title'.
- LANGUAGE:** A dropdown menu set to 'English'.
- CATEGORY:** A dropdown menu set to 'History'.
- DESCRIPTION:** A text area containing 'Draft description 123 123 123...'.

At the bottom right is a large blue button labeled 'CREATE DRAFT'.

Figure 20: Click Create Draft

### Client App (HttpCourseService.cs):

```
public async Task<Optional<Draft>> CreateDraft(CreateDraftDto dto)
    => await httpCrudService.CreateAsync<Draft, CreateDraftDto>("drafts", dto);
```

*Code Snippet 6: HttpCourseService (Appendix 3.1 Source Code)*

The Logic Server handles the request at the /drafts endpoint:

### Logic Server (CoursesController.cs):

```
[HttpPost("/drafts")]
[Authorize("MustBeTeacher")]
public async Task<ActionResult<Course>> HttpCreateAsync([FromBody] CreateCourseDto entity)
    => await CreateAsync(entity);
```

*Code Snippet 7: CoursesController (Appendix 3.1 Source Code)*

The controller uses the gRPCCourseRepository to send the data to the Data Server.

### Logic Server (gRPCCourseRepository.cs):

```
public override async Task<Course> AddAsync(CreateCourseDto entity)
{
    var request = new AddCourseRequest
```

```

{
    Title = entity.Title ?? "",
    Description = entity.Description ?? "",
    Language = entity.Language ?? "",
    Category = entity.Category ?? "",
    AuthorId = entity.AuthorId ?? -1
};

var response = await CourseServiceClient.AddCourseAsync(request);

return new Course
{
    Id = response.Course.Id,
    Title = response.Course.Title,
    // ... mapping other fields ...
};
}

```

*Code Snippet 8: gRPCCourseRepository (Appendix 3.1 Source Code)*

The gRPC messages for creating a course are defined as:

```

message AddCourseRequest {
    string title = 1;
    string description = 2;
    string language = 3;
    string category = 4;
    int32 authorId = 5;
}

message AddCourseResponse {
    Course course = 1;
}

```

*Code Snippet 9: Protocol (Appendix 3.1 Source Code)*

Finally, the Data Server persists the new course draft:

**Data Server (CourseServiceImpl.java):**

```

@Override
public void addCourse(AddCourseRequest request, StreamObserver<AddCourseResponse> responseObserver) {
    try {
        Course course = new Course();
        course.setTitle(request.getTitle());
        course.setDescription(request.getDescription());
        // ... additional field setting ...
        course = courseRepository.save(course);

        AddCourseResponse response = AddCourseResponse.newBuilder()
            .setCourse(convertToGrpcCourse(course))
            .build();

        responseObserver.onNext(response);
        responseObserver.onCompleted();
    } catch (Exception e) {
        responseObserver.onError(e);
    }
}

```

```
    }  
}
```

*Code Snippet 10: CourseServiceImpl (Appendix 3.1 Source Code)*

### 3.3.4 Security Implementation

Learnify bases its entire system security approach on the foundation of its Security Policy (Appendix 7.2 Security Policy). The document describes vital security measures which organizations employ to protect their information from unauthorized access and security breaches. The System depends on three critical security principles which include confidentiality, integrity and availability that protect its core functions through multiple essential security measures. The process needs each user to enter their personal login details for authentication. The policy specifies that users need to create passwords which contain at least eight characters to safeguard their accounts. Role-Based Access Control (RBAC) provides additional protection through its access management system which grants specific permissions to Learners and Teachers and Administrators based on their designated roles. The Logic Server performs user role verification through generated claims to authorize only permitted actions before processing any requests. The endpoints of WebApi logic server have been secured. The team strived to achieve data security by using a well-planned system which organizes information through classification and protects it with encryption methods. The system contains three types of data which include public information that users can access through registration and login pages, internal information that requires authentication to view course catalogs and content and sensitive information which needs encryption for user passwords. The system uses Argon2 as a secure password hashing function which includes salting to protect user information. The system operates with continuous security measures and regular software updates to maintain its network security. It functions through a firewall which grants access to particular ports that are essential for operation.

### 3.3.5 Deployment

A deployment diagram was created to visualize the physical deployment of the system components. The diagram illustrates how the system components are dependent on each other and how they interact once deployed. The diagram can be found as Appendix 13.1 Deployment Diagram or seen on the figure below:

## Learnify System Deployment Diagram




Figure 21: Deployment Diagram (Appendix 13.1 Deployment Diagram)  
36 of 42

### 3.4 Testing

#### 3.4.1 Testing Approach

Testing in this project was structured around the V-Model (Sommerville, 2016), where testing activities are planned in parallel with developments phases. Instead of treating testings as a final step, test considerations were introduced early, starting at the requirement analyses, and refined as the system design evolved. This approach ensured that development decision had a corresponding verification strategy.

The first step of the V-Model was requirement analysis, which directly maps to acceptance testing.

At this stage, testing focused on answering a simple but critical question:

How can we tell that the system fulfills the user's requirements?

Rather than writing code-level tests, the team defined high-level acceptance criteria for each use case. These criteria described:

- What user expects to achieve
- Under which conditions the system should allow or deny actions
- What outcome confirms that the requirement is fulfilled

These acceptance-oriented test ideas were later used to validate the system both manually and through automated test. In this way, test cases were already embedded in the analysis phase.

In practice, different types of tests naturally aligned with different parts of the V-Model:

- High-level test cases and use-case validation corresponded to the upper part of the V (requirements and acceptance testing).
- Automated tests focused mainly on the lower part of the V, especially unit and integration testing.

#### 3.4.2 Tools and frameworks

A combination of automated and manual testing tools was used throughout the project:

- xUnit / JUnit – Used for writing automated unit and integration tests.
- Mockito / Mocking frameworks – Used to isolate logic and mock external dependencies.
- HTTP client-based tests – Used for endpoint-level testing.
- .http files – Used early in development for manual REST endpoint testing.
- BloomRPC – Used for manually testing gRPC endpoints.
- In-memory repositories – Used to test logic without external dependencies.
- IDE tooling (Visual Studio / IntelliJ) – Used for writing, executing, and debugging tests.

#### 3.4.3 What was tested

Testing focused primarily on core logic and system-critical behavior, rather than attempting full coverage of all UI components.

The following aspects of the system were tested:

- Business logic in the logic server
- REST and gRPC endpoints
- Authentication and authorization behavior
- Role-based access control
- Course and draft management workflows
- Integration between services

The team aimed for high endpoint coverage, testing endpoints under different scenarios such as:

- Different user roles and credentials
- Authorized vs. unauthorized access
- Expected success paths

However, testing of faulty or malformed input data was less comprehensive. While access control and permissions were thoroughly tested, negative scenarios involving invalid data were sometimes under-tested. This limitation is acknowledged as an area for improvement.

#### 3.4.4 Method-level test case documentation

Method-level testing focused on logic-heavy and high-impact methods, following a white-box testing approach. Instead of testing every method, priority was given to areas where errors would have the greatest impact on system behavior.

For critical methods, tests were designed to cover:

- Normal execution paths
- Boundary conditions
- Exceptional cases
- Interface correctness

This approach ensured that the internal behavior of key methods was thoroughly validated, not just their external outputs. Test cases were documented to show clear intent and traceability between requirements, logic, and expected outcomes.

The table of all test case results can be found in (Appendix 2.4 Tests).

#### 3.4.5 Benefits and bug detection

Testing played an important role in maintaining system stability throughout development and gave the team confidence when introducing changes.

One of the main benefits of automated testing was that it enabled safe refactoring. Because core logic and most endpoints were covered by tests, the team could restructure and improve the codebase without the constant risk of breaking existing functionality. This was especially valuable in later stages of the project, where refactoring became more frequent as the system matured.

In several cases, features appeared to work correctly when tested manually through the user interface, but automated tests revealed issues that were not immediately visible. These included:

- Missing validation for null or unexpected input
- Edge cases and boundary values not being handled correctly
- Operations failing silently without clear feedback

The team followed a continuous test–fix–verify cycle during development. When a problem was discovered, it was corrected, committed through version control, and often accompanied by additional tests to prevent similar issues in the future. Although the project did not strictly follow Test-Driven Development from the start, the gradual shift toward automated testing significantly improved reliability, reduced regressions, and supported ongoing changes as the project evolved.

### 3.5 Result

Based on the defined use cases and their corresponding test scenarios, the system was evaluated through a combination of automated tests and manual verification. The implemented functionality covers the main workflows for learners, teachers, and administrators that were within the project scope.

The results show that all implemented use cases behave according to their expected outcomes. Core features such as user registration and login, course participation, learning activities, course creation, and administrative management were verified to function correctly.

Regarding security-related aspects, the system communicates over HTTP during development and testing. While the application configuration includes redirection to HTTPS outside of development mode, a full HTTPS setup with proper certificate handling was not established as part of this project. Additionally, no

explicit enforcement of a minimum password length (such as an 8-character requirement) is implemented in the current system.

The table with all test cases can be found as (Appendix 2.4 Tests) - the table provided there also contains the test case results as these test cases were used during the testing phase as well.

### **3.6 Final Product Showcase: Screenshots of the “Learnify” app UI or console logs showing successful data processing.**

### **3.7 Ethical Considerations:**

Requirement: You must describe ethical considerations and how negative impacts are minimized.

Content: Discuss data privacy (GDPR), user consent, or the societal impact of the app.

---

## **4 Discussion**

**4.0.0.1 What Has Been Accomplished** The main purpose of this project has been achieved through the creation of the “Learnify” distributed heterogeneous e-learning system which targets the problem of educational inequality. The system operates through a three-tier architecture which combines a C# Blazor client application with a Logic Server built in C# .NET and a Data Server developed in Java. The PostgreSQL database functions as the storage system which maintains all relevant information for every service. The system architecture uses gRPC protocol to establish fast communication between services while it employs HTTP protocol to enable client application interaction. The system has achieved full integration of 21 specific user stories which support the complete learning process. The system enables users to create new accounts through its registration feature. Users can browse course catalogs. Users can take part in courses. The system provides users with suitable interactive learning activities that deliver instant feedback. The system enforces a rigid role-based structure which applies to all users including Learners and Teachers and Administrators. The role hierarchy establishes a governance process which requires Teachers to obtain administrator approval before their content can be published. The security implementation utilizes industrial standards with Argon2 for Password Hashing with salting and JWT for Stateless Authentication. In addition, the User Experience has been strengthened with the incorporation of leaderboards for gamification and a Color Validated User Interface for color-deficient users. The overall requirements have been designed in accordance with the primary values laid down in the project and potential customers’ feedback.

**4.0.0.2 What Can Be Improved** Even with the successful implementation of the fundamental system, there are some aspects that need optimization towards the reduction of the identified security risks and the improvement of scalability. The basic application needs additional security measures to protect against advanced attacks even though it uses Argon2 password hashing and JSON Web Tokens. The Critical risk of unpatched software vulnerability exploitation requires automated scanning and effective patch management for future developments. The protection of high-risk systems against Man-in-the-Middle attacks and credential exploitation needs Transport Layer Security/Secure Sockets Layer combined with HTTP Strict Transport Security and Content Security Policies to prevent Cross-Site Scripting attacks and Multi-Factor Authentication. The system has passed normal functional tests to meet operational requirements but its performance under severe stress remains untested through extreme load testing. The risk assessment shows that Distributed Denial of Service requires future research to simulate high user volumes for identifying system bottlenecks. Concerning user experience, there is still a lot of room for improving the inclusivity of the platform. Although the support for color vision disabilities is a good starting point, the support needs to be extended to implement full compatibility with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines and screen readers for users with motor disabilities. In addition to this, the format of the learning model needs to change from the linear pattern that it currently supports to an adaptive path and also an advanced gamification system incorporating features like badges and streaks. Lastly, to avoid administrative delays that could arise in the future due to the expansion

of users, it is advised that the manual content reviewing system should be integrated with an AI-powered content review system.

---

## 5 Conclusion and Recommendations

The main goal of this study was to develop a scalable heterogeneous distributed e-learning system which tackles educational inequalities through superior performance and system integrity, while delivering an excellent user experience. The system development process required a three-tier architectural design which implemented a multi programming language approach by combining C#, Java, and the PostgreSQL database. The tests showed that the system operates effectively when handling multiple sessions and processing data.

The system delivered its core objectives but failed to achieve complete functionality because content moderation features remained unimplemented within the project timeframe. The system establishes a core structure which enables the creation of a distributed system.

Future research should direct its attention toward creating strong security systems which include Multi-Factor Authentication and advanced permission frameworks because the existing basic systems would need to evolve for commercial deployment. The learning platform will become better after the implementation of full accessibility features which include screen reader support and adaptive layout functionality. The platform requires testing for production-level usability and maximum load capacity to achieve production readiness and acceptable latency levels.

The project achieved success through its development of a distributed learning system which met all essential criteria established during the planning phases. However, there are still some areas which needs space for an improvement. The results of this study could possibly help educational institutions improve their technology systems which currently exist in schools. Digital learning systems produce various results which need to be evaluated during the evaluation process. The development team needs to resolve privacy issues and content recommendation problems and digital divide problems for future Learnify learning platform versions.

---

## 6 References

- Haleem, A., Javaid, M., Qadri, M. A., & Suman, R. (2022). Understanding the role of digital technologies in education: A review. *Sustainable Operations and Computers*, 3(1), 275–285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.susoc.2022.05.004>
- Project Description.
- PTI. (2025, March 2). 40% global population doesn't have access to education in language they understand: UNESCO. Deccan Herald. <https://www.deccanherald.com/world/40-global-population-doesnt-have-access-to-education-in-language-they-understand-unesco-3428194>
- Samonas, S., & Coss, D. (2014). The Cia Strikes Back: Redefining Confidentiality, Integrity and Availability in Security. In *Journal of Information System Security* (Vol. 10, Issue 3). <https://www.proso.com/dl/Samonas.pdf>
- Siemens, G. (n.d.). Connectivism: A Learning Theory for the Digital Age. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/6820668>
- Habermas, J. (1984). The theory of communicative action: Vol. 1. Reason and the rationalization of society (T. McCarthy, Trans.). <https://teddykw2.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/jurgen-habermas-theory-of-communicative-action-volume-1.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2000). The Dakar framework for action: Education for all: Meeting our collective commitments. UNESCO Digital Library. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000121147>
- Sommerville, I. (2016). Software Engineering Tenth Edition. <https://dn790001.ca.archive.org/0/items/bme-vik-konyvek/Software%20Engineering%20-%20Ian%20Sommerville.pdf>
- Open-source tool that uses simple textual descriptions to draw beautiful UML diagrams. (n.d.). PlantUML.com. <https://plantuml.com/>

## 7 Appendices

### 7.1 Appendix 2.1 Requirements

#### 7.1.1 Requirements

Can be found as requirements.png

### 7.2 Appendix 2.2 Use Cases

#### 7.2.1 Use Case Diagram

Can be found as UseCaseDiagram.svg #### Complete Learning Step Use Case Description Can be found as CompleteLearningStepUseCaseDescription.png

### 7.3 Appendix 2.3 Diagrams

#### 7.3.1 System Sequence Diagrams

Can be found in the SSDs folder (UC1 to UC12) #### Learning and Achievement Activity Diagram Can be found as LearningAndAchievement.png #### Domain Model Can be found as DomainModel.png #### Enhanced Entity Relationship Diagram Can be found as EER.png #### Global Relational Diagram Can be found as GR.png #### Application Layer Sequence Diagram Can be found as Application-LayerSD.png

### 7.4 Appendix 2.4 Tests

#### 7.4.1 Test Cases

Can be found as Tests.xlsx

### 7.5 Appendix 3.1 Source Code

#### 7.5.1 AuthController.cs

Can be found as System/LogicServer/RESTAPI/Controllers/AuthController.cs #### SecureAuthService.cs  
Can be found as System/LogicServer/RESTAPI/Services/SecureAuthService.cs #### gRPCUserRepository.cs  
Can be found as System/LogicServer/gRPCRepo/gRPCUserRepository.cs #### data\_protocol.proto Can be found as System/DataServer/DataServer/src/main/proto/data\_protocol.proto #### UserServiceImpl.java  
Can be found as System/DataServer/DataServer/src/main/java/via/sep3/dataserver/service/UserServiceImpl.java  
#### HttpCourseService.cs Can be found as System/ClientApp/BlazorApp/Services/HttpCourseService.cs  
#### CoursesController.cs Can be found as System/LogicServer/RESTAPI/Controllers/CoursesController.cs  
#### gRPCCourseRepository.cs Can be found as System/LogicServer/gRPCRepo/gRPCCourseRepository.cs  
#### CourseServiceImpl.java Can be found as System/DataServer/DataServer/src/main/java/via/sep3/dataserver/service/Cou

### 7.6 Appendix 4.1 Relation Schema

#### 7.6.1 Relational Schema

Can be found as RelationalSchema.png

### 7.7 Appendix 7.1 Threat Model

#### 7.7.1 Threat model

Can be found as ThreatModel.pdf

## **7.8 Appendix 7.2 Security Policy**

### **7.8.1 Security Policy**

Can be found as SecurityPolicy.pdf

## **7.9 Appendix 9.1 Wireframes**

### **7.9.1 All Courses Page Wireframe**

Can be found as Wireframes-2.png

## **7.10 Appendix 10.1: Stakeholder Interviews**

### **7.10.1 Interview David**

Can be found as Interview\_261125\_1.pdf ### Interview Andrej Can be found as Interview\_121025.pdf

## **7.11 Appendix 11.1 Architecture**

### **7.11.1 Architectural Overview**

Can be found as ArchitecturalOverview.png

## **7.12 Appendix 13.1 Deployment Diagram**

### **7.12.1 Deployment Diagram**

Can be found as DeploymentDiagram.svg