

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	0.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Initial draft
2/3/05	Bo Lee	0.1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Added Section 2
2/4/05	Bo Lee	0.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Updated Section 2• Updated reference (informal peer review comment)

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
TABLE OF FIGURES	4
TABLE OF TABLES.....	5
1. Purpose.....	6
1.1 Overview	6
1.2 References	6
1.3 Change Summary	6
2. Peer Review Items, Participants and Roles	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3. Peer Review Milestones	9
4. Peer Review Process	10
5. Classification of Defects	11
5.1 Priority and Criticality.....	11
5.2 Classification	11
6. Schedule for Peer Review	12
7. Appendices: Forms for Peer Review Data Gathering	12
7.1 Agile Data Reporting Forms	12

Table of Figures

Table of Tables

Table 1 – Elaboration Iteration II Description 7
Table 2 - Artifact Review Criteria 8

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/>

Life Cycle Plan, version 4.0

http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7/RLCA/LCP_RLCA_S04b_T07_V04.0.doc

1.3 Change Summary

Version	Description
0.2	Updated Section 2 Peer Review Items, Participants and Roles

2. 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	Bo Lee (Review Leader) Vu Nguyen All IV&Vers
Rose Model	Maxim Krivokon	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Bo Lee (Review Leader) Vu Nguyen 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	Maxim Krivokon	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	Bo Lee (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	[TBD]	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	[TBD]
Iteration Assessment Report	[TBD]	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	[TBD]
Test Assessment Report	[TBD]	IV&V Review, Agile Internal Review	[TBD]

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.

3. 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.

4. 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

5. Classification of Defects²

5.1 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.

5.2 Classification

5.2.1 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.

5.2.2 Wrong

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

5.2.3 Extra

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

² As defined in MBASE Guidelines

6. Schedule for Peer Review

Refer to [LCP Section 4.4] for details.

7. 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