**PEER REVIEW FEEDBACK**

**Used in support of: INFO 3140, INFO 3240, INFO 3300, and INFO 4240**

**\* Review the assignment document and class rubrics before completing**

**Purpose:**

The purposes of the peer-review process are three-fold.

The first purpose is to encourage students to produce the best possible materials by providing a specific and structured proofreading and review process before the product is turned into the instructor for grading.

The second purpose is to allow peer-to-peer instruction, having each student raise the level of learning of the class by presenting new ideas and applications of concepts to their peers.

The third purpose is to provide students with additional opportunities to practice analytical and critical-thinking skills in the course as they analyze the structures, evidence, arguments, and plans as presented by their peers.

**Feedback:**

**Assignment name: Phase 3 Review Date: 10/23/2022**

**Submission by: Morgan Henry**

**Peer reviewer: Jackson Holmbeck**

Read/review the deliverable once without pausing to write comments. Then read/review the deliverable again with the following questions in mind:

1. Does the deliverable follow the submission and assignment guidelines?

The project does hit most of the deliverables. He has a .bak file to restore his OLTP, but it is not located in a folder titled OLTP. Morgan also updated his documentation and those changes as well as his work on the ETL were reflected in his change log. There were three containers, one that used the build script to create the data mart, one that loaded the tables, and one that loaded the fact table. In the load dimensions there are SCDs and Morgan used all of the attribute types (0, 1, and 2) in at least one of his dimensions. He used his type 2 attribute to record historical changes to the last name of the employees so that if they changed their name they would still have both last names in the data mart.

1. Does the deliverable provide evidence for critical, practical and creative thinking? Provide evidence.

Morgan did a good job at selecting which attributes needed to be a certain type which took some critical thinking of how data might change in the SCD. Morgan also loaded his fact table using the super sonic method which also represented critical thinking as he created one large query to fill the table instead of making many different lookups to fill the fact.

1. Provide positive feedback that the deliverable does well.

You made it look very clean and straight forward. It really helped when reviewing to see the steps you took to load the dims and the fact. Obviously good job getting everything into the fact and without errors. You did a good job selecting which types of attributes needed to be and how that was shaped by potential business situations. Great work overall!

1. Provide recommendation(s) for deliverable improvement(s).

One thing that did not fit the rubric was that you have your .bak file for the OLTP in the root directory. Before you turn it in you should add a file named OLTP and put that .bak file inside.

Another small thing you could change would just be to put DM in the name of your ETL package and I only bring this up because it is in the deliverable. I believe that was everything, good work getting your package to execute properly!