09 Aug. 2015

SENG 422 TA Lab Assessment Report on Project Part 3

TA: Philip B. Alipour

Project Part 3 Assessment Requirements:

1. The following groups have been evaluated for project part 3 out of a **15% total** on **Aug. 7, 2015,** same hour 4:00pm and location as the labs have been frequently held.
2. It was asked to submit reports in electronic copy (1 report per group), after system demo presentation and evaluation.
3. The following comments are the written comments as the evaluation process was made on each group based on the following criteria:

   System Demo evaluation criteria (total 15%):
   - External web service (interaction) with the relevant component(s) such as system DB **2%**
   - DB + Logic + UI + Login (sub)-system **5%**
     - This includes the evaluation of system security components
   - Code + map + checklist (updates/alterations must be according to **GSI standards** (see the document on it as well as **Appendix B** of the project specs doc) or weblink: https://www.ltsa.ca/docs/Requirements-for-Electronic-Land-Title-Plans.pdf)
     - This includes **system performance evaluation** and **CRUD direct and dynamic updates** where each group was required to demonstrate **6%**
   - Report and presentation (conducting the demo): e.g., .doc, .pdf or .txt ReadMe file in order to describe the program, package, usage, runtime environment, etc. **2%**
   - All of these criteria must correspond to project evaluation criteria (software quality requirements) presented in **sec 4.3** of system specs document.
4. Each group was required to present according to the criteria given above, such as each one of the group members play the role of one of the actors in the system (e.g. system manager/surveyor).
   The **questions revolved around the components** mentioned in the criteria, such as making sure that the students have implemented/integrated these components into their system accordingly.
5. The group members played the role of actors during their system demo presentation in a consecutive manner (or even concurrent user logins with data updates and retrievals which was part of the system performance evaluation)

Summary comments on Team No. 1 (grade breakdown):

1- External web service (interaction) with the relevant component(s) such as system DB **2% (advanced and complete demo)**

2- DB + Logic + UI + Login (sub)-system **5% (advanced and complete demo)**
Specific comments: Security evaluation was proven to its core both in code and frontend concerns as the actor logs into the system.
In addition GUI components and direct changes/updates through code were demonstrated.

3- Code + map + checklist (updates/alterations must be according to **GSI standards**

a. This includes system performance evaluation and CRUD direct/dynamic updates **4.5%**

Specific comments:

- This group has managed to demonstrate direct and regular CRUD updates in practice. However, compared to group # 3 where they have demonstrated a real-time survey plus time response graph on 1000 users as their system's advanced feature which was a system requirement with other advanced accessibility options (wireless and mobile user-friendly access), performance evaluation on a number of concurrent users was not presented by group #1, and it was difficult to evaluate this part. Nevertheless, theoretical discussions between us were made based on the previous report on part 2 of the system architecture. Other components of this system relevantly covered system performance based on their own merits and not on a grand level (macroscale on user population).
- The code was evaluated both on the DB part, webpage construction, as well as information updates. Full marks were given on both checklist CRUD and map functions (inclusive of graphics).
- Future advanced features on the system e.g., GSI evaluation or claim made by a user who must meet the GSI standards to be evaluated by the system e.g. plan sheet size as being correct/not after clicking on yes/no/(N/A) button, although this was not a system requirement but could have been improved for a higher mark as the **"system future enhancements"** aspect of the project. No points were further deducted nor gained.

4- Report and presentation (conducting the demo): e.g., .doc, .pdf or .txt ReadMe file in order to describe the program, package, usage, runtime environment, etc. **2% (advanced and complete demo)**

5- Based on point # 3, - on the performance 0.5% out of 2% was gained.

Total: 13.5% final mark.

Summary comments on Team No. 2 (grade breakdown):

1- External web service (interaction) with the relevant component(s) such as system DB **2% (advanced and complete demo)**

2- DB + Logic + UI + Login (sub)-system **5% (advanced and complete demo)**
Specific comments: Security evaluation was proven to its core both in code and frontend concerns as the actor logs into the system.
In addition, GUI components and direct changes/updates through code were demonstrated.

3- Code + map + checklist (updates/alterations must be according to **GSI standards**

a. This includes system performance evaluation and CRUD direct/dynamic updates **4.5%**

Specific comments:

- This group has managed to demonstrate direct and regular CRUD updates in practice. However, compared to group # 3 where they have demonstrated a real-time survey plus time response graph on 1000 users as their system's advanced feature which was a system requirement with other advanced accessibility options (wireless and mobile user-friendly access), performance evaluation on a number of concurrent users was not presented by group #2, and it was difficult to evaluate this part. Nevertheless, theoretical discussions between us were made based on the previous report on part 2 of the system architecture. Other components of this system relevantly covered system performance based on their own merits and not on a grand level (macroscale on user population).
- The code was evaluated both on the DB part, webpage construction, as well as information updates. Full marks were given on both checklist CRUD and map functions (inclusive of graphics).
- Future advanced features on the system e.g., GSI evaluation or claim made by a user who must meet the GSI standards to be evaluated by the system e.g. plan sheet size as being correct/not after clicking on yes/no/(N/A) button, although this was not a system requirement but could have been improved for a higher mark as the **"system future enhancements"** aspect of the project. No points were further deducted nor gained.

6- Report and presentation (conducting the demo): e.g., .doc, .pdf or .txt ReadMe file in order to describe the program, package, usage, runtime environment, etc. **2% (advanced and complete demo)**

4- Based on point # 3, - on the performance 0.5% out of 2% was gained.

Total: 13.5% final mark.

Summary comments on Team No. 3 (grade breakdown):

1- External web service (interaction) with the relevant component(s) such as system DB **2% (advanced and complete demo)**

2- DB + Logic + UI + Login (sub)-system

Specific comments: Security evaluation was proven to its core both in code and frontend concerns as the actor logs into the system.

- GUI components and direct changes/updates through code based on the DB component were demonstrated.
- However, compared to other groups, the UI and DB although smart and restricted to specific users, the admin listing or general listing and restricted access weren't demonstrated on a greater scale. The group's logic of choice makes this system least vulnerable compared to other security models implemented by the other groups, but restricted UI didn't give much for me to fully evaluate the security subsystem. Other aspects of the security remained robust as claimed by this group. In addition, the graphical features regarding map display and information were there but could have been improved upon, e.g. "20 degrees Celsius" and not just "20" blank, through concatenating the integer value with string value once the main data is retrieved from the Google map server.
- This group regardless of being a small group has done a great job in demonstrating the system with advanced features in most cases. Thus, **4.5%** out of **5%** was gained.

3- Code + map + checklist (updates/alterations must be according to **GSI standards**

a. This includes system performance evaluation and CRUD direct/dynamic updates **5.5% (advanced and almost complete demo)**

Specific comments:

- This group managed to demonstrate direct and regular CRUD updates in practice. Compared to other groups, this group demonstrated a real-time survey plus time response graph on 1000 users as the system's advanced feature which was a system requirement with other advanced accessibility options (wireless and mobile user-friendly access), performance evaluation on a number of concurrent users. Discussions on the real-time performance were made between us describing the system architecture strengths vs. weak points.
- The code was evaluated both on the DB part, webpage construction, as well as information updates. Full marks were given on both checklist CRUD and map functions (inclusive of graphics).

However, a log-based system dumping data for backup purposes as well as real-time updates compared to other groups, especially group #1, was not available here **which reduced 0.5%.**

- Future advanced features on the system e.g., GSI evaluation or claim made by a user who must meet the GSI standards to be evaluated by the system e.g. plan sheet size as being correct/not after clicking on yes/no/(N/A) button, although this was not a system requirement but could have been improved for a higher mark as the "**system future enhancements**" aspect of the project. No points were further deducted nor gained.

4- Report and presentation (conducting the demo): e.g., .doc, .pdf or .txt ReadMe file in order to describe the program, package, usage, runtime environment, etc. **2% (advanced and complete demo)**

Total: 14% final mark.

Nice having you this term!

Cheers,

Philip

==========

Philip B. Alipour,
Ph.D. Candidate in Electrical, Computer Engineering and Quantum Physics,
Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Victoria, V8W 3P6, Canada
Office: ELW Room # A358,
Email: phibal12@uvic.ca or philipbaback_orbsix@msn.com
Homepage: http://web.uvic.ca/~phibal12/