

Peer Review Plan

Data Mining of Digital Library Usage Data

Team 07

Clients

Jewel Ward

Team Members

Project Manager: Maxim Krivokon

Developer: Bo Lee

Developer: Genesan Kim

Developer: Vu Nguyen

IV&Ver: Shing-Cheung Chan

IV&Ver: Marie Chi

IV&Ver: Kristine Guevara

Version History

Date	Author	Version	Changes made
2/1/05	Bo Lee	1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Initial draft
2/3/05	Bo Lee	1.1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Added Section 2
2/4/05	Bo Lee	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Updated Section 2• Updated reference (informal peer review comment)
2/22/05	Bo Lee	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Updated Section 2 Table 1
4/2/05	Bo Lee	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• [IOC revision]• Updated Section 2 Table 1
4/24/05	Bo Lee	3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Updated section 2 table 1• Updated section 5 table 4

Table of Contents

- TABLE OF CONTENTS4**
- TABLE OF FIGURES5**
- TABLE OF TABLES.....6**
 - 1. Purpose..... 7
 - 1.1 Overview 7
 - 1.2 References 7
 - 1.3 Change Summary 7
 - Version 7
 - Description..... 7
 - 1.2 7
 - Updated Section 2 Peer Review Items, Participants and Roles 7
 - 1.5 7
 - Updated Section 2 Peer Review Items, Participants and Roles. 7
 - Peer Review Items, Participants and Roles..... 8
 - 2. Peer Review Milestones 11
 - 3. Peer Review Process 12
 - 4. Classification of Defects 13
 - 4.1 Priority and Criticality 13
 - 4.2 Classification 13
 - 5. Schedule for Peer Review 14
 - 6. Appendices: Forms for Peer Review Data Gathering 17
 - 7.1 Agile Data Reporting Forms 17

Table of Figures

Table of Tables

Table 1 – Elaboration Iteration II Description..... 8
Table 2 – Artifact Review Criteria..... 10

1. Purpose

1.1 Overview

The purpose of this Peer Review Plan (PRP) is to describe the review plan of Data Mining of Digital Library Usage Data for the Digital Archive of Leavey Library, the University of Southern California. This document focuses on peer review processes including schedules, resources and artifacts to be reviewed. The participants of peer review processes include development team members and IV&V members. The review will cover both documentation artifacts and source code.

1.2 References

MBASE Guidelines v 2.4.2:

http://sunset.usc.edu/classes/cs577b_2005/guidelines/MBASE_Guidelines_v2.4.2.pdf

Project Website:

<http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/>

1.3 Change Summary

Version	Description
1.2	Updated Section 2 Peer Review Items, Participants and Roles
1.5	Updated Section 2 Peer Review Items, Participants and Roles.
2.0	Updated Section 2 Peer Review Items, Participants and Roles.
3.0	Updated Section 2 Peer Review Items, Participants and Roles. Updated Section 5 Schedule for Peer Review

Peer Review Items, Participants and Roles

Elaboration Iteration II (RLCA)

The following table identifies the artifacts, author, type of review, and review participants of peer reviews performed in Elaboration Iteration II. Since we are 4-member team, each artifact is reviewed by three other team members plus three IV&Vers. One of the reviewers acts as a Review Leader for the particular artifact. The artifact, the primary author, the type of review and the required participants are stated in the Table 1. The Review Leader for each artifact is also mentioned.

Table 1 – Elaboration Iteration II Description

Artifact	Author	Type of Review	Participants Required
OCD	Bo Lee	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Maxim Krivokon (Review Leader) Genesan Kim All IV&Vers
SSRD	Bo Lee	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Maxim Krivokon (Review Leader) Genesan Kim All IV&Vers.
SSAD	Maxim Krivokon	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Vu Nguyen (Review Leader) Genesan Kim, Bo Lee All IV&Vers
Rose Model	Maxim Krivokon	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Vu Nguyen (Review Leader) Genesan Kim, Bo Lee All IV&Vers
LCP	Vu Nguyen	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Maxim Krivokon (Review Leader) Genesan Kim All IV&Vers
FRD	Genesan Kim	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Maxim Krivokon (Review Leader) Vu Nguyen All IV&Vers

Iteration Plan	Vu Nguyen	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Genesan Kim (Review Leader) Bo Lee All IV&Vers
Quality Management Plan	Bo Lee	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Genesan Kim (Review Leader) Vu Nguyen All IV&Vers
Peer Review Plan	Bo Lee	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Vu Nguyen (Review Leader) Genesan Kim All IV&Vers
Test Plan and cases	Maxim Krivokon, Bo Lee	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Maxim Krivokon (Review Leader) Vu Nguyen All IV&Vers
Transition Plan	Genesan Kim	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Vu Nguyen (Review Leader) Maxim Krivokon All IV&Vers
System Software Support Plan	Vu Nguyen	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Genesan Kim (Review Leader) Maxim Krivokon All IV&Vers
Iteration Assessment Report	Vu Nguyen	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Makxim Krivokon (Review Leader) Genesan Kim All IV&Vers
Test Procedure and Results	Genesan Kim	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Bo Lee (Review Leader) Vu Nguyen All IV&Vers
Peer Review Report	Bo Lee	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Vu Nguyen (Review Leader) Genesan Kim All IV&Vers
User Manual	Genesan Kim	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Vu Nguyen (Review Leader) Maxim Krivokon All IV&Vers
Training Materials	Genesan Kim	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Vu Nguyen (Review Leader) Maxim Krivokon All IV&Vers

Regression Test Package	Bo Lee	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Vu Nguyen (Review Leader) Genesan Kim All IV&Vers
Packaged Tools and Procedures	Genesan Kim	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Vu Nguyen (Review Leader) Bo Lee All IV&Vers
Code	Maxim Krivokon Bo Lee Vu Nguyen Genesan Kim	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	All IV&Vers

Artifact Review Criteria

Table 1 - Artifact Review Criteria

	Conditions
Entry Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The artifact is developed following MBASE guidelines for the anchor point that the artifact focusing on • The author has stated his or her objectives for the review. • The author has stated the entry and exit criteria.¹ • The document has been spell-checked.
Exit Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author has addressed all issues addressed in the review • Open issues and defects are resolved

¹ From Agile Internal Review Process from CSCI 577b course.

2. Peer Review Milestones

Refer to [LCP Section 4.4] for details about schedules.

Completion of Planning

Schedule for peer review is drafted in MS Project Plan as detailed in [LCP Section 2.2], however exact date of each peer review can vary and the team members will be confirmed the exact date in the beginning of each iteration.

Overview Meeting

The development team will setup an overview meeting for the first day of the scheduled peer review. However, overview meeting can be skipped if members are clear on the artifacts to be reviewed.

Preparation

Each reviewer will prepare for the review by studying and understanding the artifact and the MBASE guidelines.

Peer Review Meeting

Peer review meetings are held with the participation of the required reviewers. Review leader is in charge of keeping the meeting note.

Peer Review Data Summary and Results Reporting

The author collects results from the review. The results of peer review meeting are collected in Quality Reports.

3. Peer Review Process

The project follows the Agile Internal Review Process from The Center for Software Engineering. This process is applied for CSCI 577b course.

Tasks	Responsible
1. Distribute either a physical or an electronic copy of the artifact with objectives and entry/exit criteria to the assigned reviewers.	Author
2. Distribute either a physical or an electronic copy of the review form (“AgileInternalReview_form.xls”) to each reviewer. (Only for first review)	Project manager/QM
2-1. If necessary, author/project manager explains on document background, purpose, design rationale, etc. (i.e. a fast walkthrough) to IV&Vers.	Author/Project manager.
3. Based on the complexity of the artifact, determine whether an overview meeting is required or not. (An overview meeting can be used to describe the important features of the work product, state review objectives and describe assumptions, history and context of work to the rest of reviewing team and also distributing review materials such as review form.)	Author and Review Leader, Project manager
4. Indicate the date by which ‘Areas of Concern Log’ (review comments) is to be provided.	Author
5. Examine the artifact, understand it, keep log about the concerns, and raise questions about it. Fill out the ‘Areas of concern log’ form. Deliver the form with comments to the author after completing the review.	Reviewers
6. After the final date of the review period, check out the artifact.	Author
7. Based on the reviewers’ comments, determine whether a meeting with reviewers is necessary or not. It is possible that new issues will be raised during the meeting. Record these issues in ‘Areas of Concern Log’ as well.	Author
8. Perform any necessary rework to the artifact (including any other project artifacts affected by defects identified). Mark ‘Area of Concern Log’ to indicate action taken. Record defects and resolve issues raised on ‘Problem List’.	Author
9. After finish rework, check in the artifact and fill out the ‘Review Results Summary’.	Author

4. Classification of Defects²

4.1 Priority and Criticality

Priority

- How important the issues to the stakeholders and clients. Values are high/medium/low.
 - These can be those defects that affect on the main system capabilities (SSRD 4.2), which may drive different, undesirable results when not get fixed.

Criticality

- The degree of loss when the issues did not get fixed. Values are high/medium/low
 - These can be those defects caused by misunderstanding of the constraints, or miscommunication between team members or between client and team members.

4.2 Classification

4.2.1 Missing

Information that is specified in the requirements or standard, but not present in the document. A defect is labeled as missing if it was specified by requirements or guidelines and is not included in the document. If such thing as comments on code or references are not present, they are of type Missing.

4.2.2 Wrong

Any information incorrectly presented in the item reviewed is labeled as wrong.

4.2.3 Extra

Information that is not specified in the requirements or standards but is present in the document.

² As defined in MBASE Guidelines

5. Schedule for Peer Review

Table 2 Assessment Activities in LCO and LCA

Technique	Date applied	Document	Quality Report Location
Agile Internal Reviews	09/21/04	OCD Early Sections	OCD Early Sections QR http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7/LCO/QR/OCD_LCO_QR_F04a_T07_V01.0.xls
Agile Internal Reviews	10/08/04	OCD version 2.0	OCD QR http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7/LCO/QR/OCD_LCO_QR_F04a_T07_V02.0.xls
Agile Internal Reviews	10/08/04	SSRD version 1.0	SSRD QR http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7/LCO/QR/SSRD_LCO_QR_F04a_T07_V01.0.xls
Agile Internal Reviews	10/08/04	SSAD version 1.0	SSAD QR http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7/LCO/QR/SSAD_LCO_QR_F04a_T07_V01.0.xls
Agile Internal Reviews	10/08/04	UML Rose file	UML Rose QR http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7/LCO/QR/UML_LCO_QR_F04a_T07_V01.0.xls
ARB Review	10/20/04	LCO Draft	Hardcopy
Informal Review	10/23/2004	OCD version 4.0	n/a
Informal Review	10/23/2004	SSRD version 1.3	n/a
Informal Review	10/23/2004	SSAD version 1.2	n/a
Informal Review	10/23/2004	LCP version 2.0	n/a
Informal Review	10/23/2004	FRD version 2.0	n/a

Quality Assessment Activities Planned for Construction Phase:

Table 3 Table of assessment activities during RLCA time

Technique	Applied when	What document	Quality Report location
Agile Internal Reviews	2/11/05	OCD	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/RLCA/QR
Agile Internal Reviews	2/11/05	SSRD	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/RLCA/QR
Agile Internal Reviews	2/11/05	SSAD	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/RLCA/QR
Agile Internal Reviews	2/11/05	UML Model	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/RLCA/QR
Agile Internal Reviews	2/11/05	FRD	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/RLCA/QR
Agile Internal Reviews	2/11/05	Iteration Plan	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/RLCA/QR
Agile Internal Reviews	2/11/05	Quality Management Plan (QMP)	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/RLCA/QR
Agile Internal Reviews	2/11/05	Peer Review Plan (PRP)	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/RLCA/QR
Agile Internal Reviews	2/11/05	Test Plan and Case Description	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/RLCA/QR
Buddy Check	2/18/05	OCD, SSRD, FRD, LCP, Test Plan and Case Description, PRP, QMP, Iteration Plan, Rose Model	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/RLCA/QR

Table 4 Table of assessment activities during Construction

Technique	Applied when	What Artifact	Quality Report location
Agile Internal Reviews	3/18/05	Administrative Module	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/IOC/QR
Agile Internal Reviews	3/18/05	Review Defect Maintenance	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/IOC/QR
Agile Internal Reviews	3/18/05	Query and View Review Defects	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/IOC/QR
Agile Internal Reviews	3/18/05	Reports (5 reports)	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/IOC/QR
Agile Internal Reviews	3/18/05	Changes Log Module	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/IOC/QR
Code Inspection	3/17/05	Source Code	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/IOC/QR
Agile Internal Reviews	3/17/05	SSSP	http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/IOC/QR
Agile Internal Reviews	4/20/05	Code	N/A
Agile Internal Reviews	4/22/05	All documents and artifacts	N/A

Refer to [LCP Section 4.4] for details.

6. Appendices: Forms for Peer Review Data Gathering

7.1 Agile Data Reporting Forms

This set of forms is on the following worksheets of "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls"

- Areas of Concern Log
- Problem List Cover
- Problem List