

IC470, Software Engineering
Lab 3

Due: As per the course syllabus

Focus: Peer review of drafts of another lab group's Formal Capstone Proposal(s) (Milestone 3, Part I).

Grading: Since this is a peer review, your evaluation results will not impact the other group's grades in this course. **However**, *your* team will be graded based on the quality of the Peer Review Report that you develop (outline given below) and the IC480 Capstone Proposal Review Rubric (see the course's [Resources](#) page).

Lab Partners: If there are other mids in this section from your capstone team, you may work together as a lab group. If not, pair up with another free mid from this section and work together as a lab group.



1. Find another lab group in this section and provide access to each other's formal capstone proposal(s). Lab groups with mids from different capstone teams will have more than one proposal that needs to be reviewed.
 - a. You will need to print out two copies of the Peer Review Report so type up your responses rather than hand write them.
 - b. You may find it convenient to share a Google document between your lab partners and all work on the same document.
2. Each lab group review the formal capstone proposal(s) of the other lab group, with particular attention to the Functional Requirements Trace Table and corresponding Acceptance Test Plan test cases.
3. Prepare a **Peer Review Report** that addresses the following:
 - a. **Reviewers:** Names of lab group members conducting the peer review.
 - b. **Reviewees:** Team number of the team whose proposal is being reviewed.

- c. **Overview.** A one or two sentence description of the project being reviewed (*not* just the title).
- d. **Functional Requirements/test cases.**
 - i. Are there an appropriate number of functional requirements (at least 2 – and no more than 4 – per team member and not including any preliminary steps functional requirements)? *If not, explain what is wrong.*
 - ii. Do the test cases show all aspects of each Functional Requirement being met? *If not, identify what is missing and provide an explanation.*
 - iii. Are the normal/abnormal designations accurate? *If not, identify which are not and provide an explanation.*
 - iv. Are all test cases “useful?” *If not, identify which are not and provide an explanation.*
 - v. Do all test cases include the “Expected Result” of running the test case. *If not, identify which do not and provide an explanation.*
 - vi. Can all test cases be objectively validated? *If not, identify which are not and provide an explanation.*
 - vii. Are any Functional Requirements missing? *If so, identify what is missing.*
- e. **Risk Analysis.**
 - i. Does the risk management plan for all identified risks make sense? *If not, identify which do not and provide an explanation.*
 - ii. Are there any risks that have not been identified, and that should be addressed by the team? *If so, provide an explanation.*
- f. **Project Plan.**
 - i. Does the team’s Project Plan Gantt Chart make sense? *If not, explain why.*
 - ii. Are the parts of the project that *can* be concurrently worked on *actually* going to be concurrently worked on according to the project plan. *If not, identify which are not and provide an explanation.*
- g. **Overall layout, organization and content.** Is anything missing from the proposal being reviewed? Explain.
- h. **Strengthening suggestions for team.** What areas need to be strengthened (and how)?
- i. **Suggestions for team.** What other suggestions do you have for the team for improving their proposal?

4. **Proposal Review Rubric scores.** After completing part 3 above, each lab group use the IC480 Capstone Proposal Review Rubric (see the course's [Resources](#) page) and give your evaluation showing the consensus of the reviewing group regarding the indicated categories on the Review Rubric. Rather than printing out the rubric sheet, simply give your evaluation for each category identified in the rubric in this section of your Peer Review report.
 - a. Provide an explanation for any category that is not evaluated as “Exceeds Expectations” along with suggestions for improving the capstone proposal in this category.
 - b. Be frank and fair in your feedback, as this will help the other team improve their capstone proposal’s content.

Deliverables:

1. **To your instructor.** Each lab group give their instructor a copy of their Peer Review Report and also a copy of their completed IC480 Capstone Proposal Review Rubric for all the capstone proposals in the other lab group.
2. **To the team being reviewed.** Finally, each lab group give a copy of their Peer Review Report and a copy of their completed IC480 Capstone Proposal Review Rubric to the other lab group and answer any questions they have.