**Project Evaluation**

Project evaluation is defined as efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability of a department, program or agency. It supports a project by measuring the extent to which the objectives are met, identifies achievements, identifies areas for improvement, encourages decisions to be taken, including changes to objectives and the project methodology.

The proponents explained to the respondent the evaluation procedures. After the explanation, the proponents start to set up the computer system that has been used to show the system and then set up the hardware of the system. After the brief explanation and showing the system, the questionnaires were distributed to the respondents and followed by the system demo and using the ISO 9126, the respondents evaluated the system.

After the evaluation, the researches tallied the respondents rating to the system and computed the arithmetic mean. The overall rating was interpreted using the numerical range and equivalent descriptive interpretation of Likert’s scale.

***Table 12*.** Evaluation of Software Quality: Functionality

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Functionality** | | |
| **Sub-Characteristics** | **Average Mean** | **Descriptive Rating** |
| 1. Suitability | 4.94 | Excellent |
| B. Accurateness | 4.24 | Very Good |
| C. Interoperability | 3.95 | Very Good |
| D. Compliance | 3.70 | Very Good |
| E. Security | 3.99 | Very Good |
| **Criterion Mean** | **4.16** | **Very Good** |

Table 12 shows the evaluation of software quality in terms of functionality characteristics. It is composed of sub-characteristics like suitability, accurateness, interoperability compliance and security and all of these tallied an average mean having a descriptive rating equivalent to “Very Good”. Attaining a criterion mean of 3.79, this concludes that the objectives of the system and its functions were met.

***Table 13*.** Evaluation of Software Quality: Reliability

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reliability** | | |
| **Sub-Characteristics** | **Average Mean** | **Descriptive Rating** |
| 1. Maturity | 4.02 | Very Good |
| 1. Fault Tolerance | 3.84 | Very Good |
| 1. Recoverability | 3.78 | Very Good |
| **Criterion Mean** | **3.88** | **Very Good** |

Table 13 shows the evaluation of software quality in terms of reliability characteristics. It is composed of sub-characteristics like maturity, fault tolerance, and recoverability and all of these tallied an average mean as well as criterion mean having a descriptive rating equivalent to “Very Good”. Through this rating, the ability of the system to give reliable results needed for the requirements is achieved.

***Table 14*.** Evaluation of Software Quality: Usability

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Usability** | | |
| **Sub-Characteristics** | **Average Mean** | **Descriptive Rating** |
| 1. Understand ability | 4.30 | Very Good |
| 1. Learnability | 4.19 | **Very Good** |
| 1. Operability | 4.05 | Very Good |
| **Criterion Mean** | **4.18** | **Very Good** |

Table 14 shows the evaluation of software quality in terms of usability characteristics. It is composed of sub-characteristic like understandability, having an average mean equivalent to descriptive rating “Very Good”. The other two sub-characteristics learnability and operability tallied an average mean having a descriptive rating equivalent to “Very Good”. The criterion mean for this software quality ended up with a descriptive rating of “Very Good”. Obtaining an Very Good rating proves that the ease of use of the system and ability to be learned and understood fulfilled the respondents.

***Table 15*.** Evaluation of Software Quality: Efficiency

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Efficiency** | | |
| **Sub-Characteristics** | **Average Mean** | **Descriptive Rating** |
| 1. Time Behavior | 4.19 | Very Good |
| 1. Resource Behavior | 4.00 | Very Good |
| **Criterion Mean** | **4.10** | **Very Good** |

Table 15 shows the evaluation of software quality in terms of efficiency characteristics. It is composed of sub-characteristics like time behavior and resource behavior and both tallied an average mean and criterion mean having a descriptive rating equivalent to “Very Good”. With these ratings, the system’s efficiency in terms of responding rapidly and need not to consume much of resources is relatively satisfying.

***Table 16.*** Evaluation of Software Quality: Maintainability

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Maintainability** | | |
| **Sub-Characteristics** | **Mean Average** | **Descriptive Rating** |
| 1. Analyzability | 3.82 | Very Good |
| 1. Changeability | 3.94 | Very Good |
| 1. Stability | 4.05 | Very Good |
| 1. Testability | 4.05 | Very Good |
| **Criterion Mean** | **3.97** | **Very Good** |

Table 16 shows the evaluation of software quality in terms of maintainability characteristics. It is composed of sub-characteristics like analyzability, changeability, stability, and testability and all of these tallied an average mean having a descriptive rating equivalent to “Very Good”. Having a criterion mean of 4.37, the maintainability characteristic has also a “Very Good” descriptive rating meaning the system’s ability to be analyzed, changed, to be stable and tested satisfied the respondents.

***Table 17.*** Evaluation of Software Quality: Portability

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Portability** | | |
| **Sub-Characteristics** | **Mean Average** | **Descriptive Rating** |
| 1. Adaptability | 4.21 | Very Good |
| 1. Installability | 4.09 | Very Good |
| 1. Comformance | 3.93 | Very Good |
| 1. Replaceability | 3.90 | Very Good |
| **Criterion Mean** | **4.03** | **Very Good** |

Table 17 shows the evaluation of software quality in terms of portability characteristics. It is composed of sub-characteristics like adaptability, installability, compormance, and replaceability and all of these tallied an average mean along with the criterion mean having a descriptive rating equivalent to “Very Good”. This just means that the ability of the system to be easily installed, adapt to environment, and comply with standards had made an impact to the respondents.

***Table 18*.** Summary of Project Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristics** | **Criterion Mean** | **Descriptive Rating** |
| Functionality | 4.16 | Very Good |
| Reliability | 3.88 | Very Good |
| Usability | 4.18 | Very Good |
| Efficiency | 4.10 | Very Good |
| Maintainability | 3.97 | Very Good |
| Portability | 4.03 | Very Good |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.05** | **Very Good** |

Table 18 shows the project evaluation summary of all the characteristics needed for the software quality. Functionality, Reliability, Usability, Efficiency, Maintainability, and Portability had the same descriptive rating equivalent to “Very Good”. Having a criterion mean of 4.48, the Usability characteristic got the highest rating among other characteristics. This just goes to show that the respondents found the system easy to use, understand, and to learn and this also gives the researchers the satisfaction that the system is user-friendly.

**Chapter 5**

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the study that was conducted. Included in this summary are summary of findings, conclusion, and recommendations.

**Summary of Findings**

Based on the analysis of data, the results are as follows:

1. On the result of the evaluation of RECIPINOY: A Recipe Sharing Application with Calorie Counter using Android Technology:
   1. The software quality for functionality characteristic was rated a descriptive rating of “Very Good” and has a criterion mean of 4.16. The system provides a suitable function that the software meets the objectives and prevents unauthorized user access in the system.
   2. The software quality for reliability characteristic has a descriptive rating of “Very Good” with a criterion mean of 3.88. The ability of the system to give reliable results has been achieved.
   3. The system’s usability characteristic obtained a rating of “Very Good” with the criterion mean rating of 4.18. This shows that the system is easy to be learned and also it provides an understandable process.
   4. The software quality for efficiency was rated of “Very Good” and it has a criterion mean of 4.10. The system shows its capability to respond quickly and the resources are used effectively.
   5. The software quality for maintainability acquired a criterion mean of 3.97 and has an equivalent rating of “Very Good”. This shows that the system has capability to be stable, easy to fix errors and ability to be maintained.
   6. The software quality for portability got an average criterion mean of 3.83 with the descriptive rating of “Very Good” showing that the system is easy to install, conforms to the standards and adapts to environment.

**Conclusions**

After a thorough observation, evaluation, analysis and findings, the following ideas were concluded:

* The system was designed to help on sharing and promoting various kinds of Filipino recipe online and help build a community for Filipino Cuisine enthusiasts. It also includes a calorie counter that calculate the estimated calorie content of each recipe posted in the a pplication.
* The system was successfully created using Microsoft Windows 7 or 8.1, Java and Android SDK, Phonegap, OnsenUI, PHP, MySQL, phpmyAdmin, SQLite, Sublime Text 3, Adobe Photoshop CS6, Phonegap Developer App, Google Maps as software requirements, and Computer System and Android Device and Wi-Fi Modem for hardware requirements.
* The performance of the system was evaluated based on functionality, reliability, usability, efficiency, maintainability and portability. It obtained an average mean of 4.03 with a descriptive rating of “Very Good”. This proved that the system is functional and reliable.

**Recommendations**

Based on the foregoing conclusions, the following are recommended for the further improvement of the project.

1. The system provide a more specific location of each recipe up to cities and town.
2. The system include the nutrition facts of each recipe.
3. The system allows users to upload and post video of actual preparation of the recipe.
4. The system can be accessed by other users using other platform through an online website.