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APWCR - Proposal Peer Review

***Overall:*** *What are the 2 biggest strengths of the proposal? (Always start with a nod to that which is already working well in the document.)*

1. The proposal is extremely detailed, with descriptions that are clear and easy to understand. Almost all of the information seems like it contributes to the overall ideas, and there is very little fluff.
2. The information is organized in a good way, in that there are models and tables that allow for strong summarization.

***Clarity of the situation description****: Is the About the Organization clear? Is it well written? Is it complete?*

The team provides a clear introduction for APWCR, where they outline the mission of the organization and provide a comprehensive background on its roots. In addition, there is information on the APWCR’s funding, which is considered one of the organization’s biggest issues. The language is consistent and remains professional throughout the paper.

*What information is missing? What additional information is needed?*

To the extent of our knowledge, the proposal provides a robust overview on various relevant pieces of information. Perhaps moving forward, given that the proposal covers what the team knows, there could be room for understanding what the team still does not know or lacks subject knowledge on in order to reach out to the right people and move their project closer in the right direction.

***Robustness of the case:*** *What are the weaknesses in their argument for their proposed solution? What would you need to see added in order to believe the argument?*

One weakness in the argument is that the intention of the website is not very clearly presented. Since this is a small organization with one main client, the website should fulfill the goal that the client really wants. It can either be a showcase of their past projects and asks for more donations, or be an educating website with relative information to the issue with a call to action section, including the donation. Given that this is at an early stage, it is understandable that the team or even the client does not fully understand the purpose of the website. But it should be kept in mind when proposing the solution and designing the website.

***Appropriateness of the solution:*** *Are the expected outcomes appropriate to the project?*

The outcomes are appropriate to the project.

*What is missing? Are they feasible?*

1. A more specific timeline can be included, which can give the client and the team a clearer view of how the project should progress.
2. For the final draft, it would be great if it includes the specific web pages that the team is going to implement. Specifically, the team can list out the pages that are essential and the ones that are just nice-to-have, and organize this information into a table like the user stories.

***Risks in the approach:*** *Why are you glad that this is not your project?*

1. It seems like the team will have to build an entire new website from scratch which could be a lot of work.
2. The team also has to leave enough time for training the client which can take up some time as well.
3. It also seems like the client does not have a clear sense of what the website should do. The organization functions years without the websites, and they didn’t try to fix the issue. Thus, it feels extra hard for the team to make a functioning and engaging website.

*What 2 things are most likely to go wrong with the proposed approach?*

1. Maintainability is the most critical part of the project. If the team fails to allocate enough time for training George, the point of contact at APWCR, or leave sufficient documentation that is understandable to George, the project is likely to become its predecessor.
2. The team mentions that they are concerned about not completing all the tasks that George assigns for the team. One of the big challenges of the project is to figure out the scope of it and what specifically goes into the design. If the team cannot maintain good communication over the design, the project is likely to become costly and affect the team’s rest of the plan.

*What alternative approach(es) (e.g. technologies, plans) would you suggest, or how would you improve the proposed approach?*

We would suggest that your team really stick to the agile approach and maintain the high level of interactions between the team and the client, so that you can nail down all the design details without misinterpreting the scope. We would also suggest coming up with a timeline and make sure to have really sufficient time for training George who appears to be unfamiliar with technologies.

**Notes:**

1. In the Communication section, “Therefore, no established systems for ensuring data security or for sharing files internally.” is a sentence fragment.
2. The client was asked to install “Zoom”, assumed as a future communication tool. Yet based on the description of client’s understanding of technology, the team should be aware of the downside of teaching the client and potentially waste too much time on the tools.
3. In the “Project Opportunity” section, there is a sentence that states “the George”, which is incorrect grammar.
4. Showing the agile model is helpful, but it can be more informative if you guys can include what your goals are for each or each couple of sprints. A timeline would be helpful for the team to keep up with and for the client to understand the expected progress.
5. Since it was mentioned earlier that George has limited experience with web technology, how much time should be allocated for George's training? I think the needed time might be non-trivial, so it would be good if it has its place in the team's final timeline.
6. “As the CEO, I want to see a website template of the proposed design so that I can see if what they design is what I have in mind.” - Is this a user story of the website or a requirement of the project? It feels more like the former if the design refers to "design of the website."