

Communication Systems Design (CSD): 2015

Dejan Kostic dmk@kth.se

Midterm Project Workshop Guidelines

Midterm project workshop doesn't seem directly producing any kind of grade. The work that you have done so far on the deliverables, including the project plan and weekly status reports, will be taken into account however for the final grade.

I do think that it's important that you get some kind of feedback at this point, so I will look at the learning objectives matrix (described in the course memo) and tell you where you stand with respect to it. I will also tell you what kind of grade you would get if I were to grade the project at this point (obviously assuming that you should be halfway through it). I will grade the team work, not individuals. Individual grading will be done at the very end after looking at the report tables and repositories (what commits are done by whom) more thoroughly.

Here is what will happen during week 45:

- by Monday 23:59 CET you should upload a fully developed, detailed project plan to your group website. This is one of your major deliverables for this midterm project workshop. The plan should be aligned with the initial one so as to clearly identify any deviations.

- by the same time, you should upload a presentation that you plan to give on Tuesday. Make sure that all your deliverables are publicly visible because two other groups will go over them on Wednesday and give you feedback by 1800 hrs. The review matrix will be as follows

Team 1 reviewed by teams 2 and 3

Team 2 reviewed by teams 3 and 4

Team 3 reviewed by teams 4 and 5

Team 4 reviewed by teams 5 and 6

Team 5 reviewed by teams 6 and 1

Team 6 reviewed by teams 1 and 2

- we are allocating one academic hour for each group and we will start the presentations at 10 AM on Tuesday in Ka-211. Your presentation should not be longer than 25 minutes and this gives us 20 minutes for questions. Use figures/screenshots of your work/results to better illustrate your findings but do not show any code. Also discuss problems that you have.

- at this point, I leave it up to you how you're going to organize the presentations (who will present what). However I expect that each group member will be able to do a decent job answering questions about any given piece of work. This is one more reason why code reviews are useful. For the final project presentations, it is likely that I will choose some subset of students at random to present. Right now, I think you're too stressed out to be subjected to this requirement. You were all mostly working together so I think asking you about any part of the work that your team members are doing is not too harsh.

- the presentation should cover the following items:

- Introduction (Team members and Project name)
- Project GOAL (Short and Sharp) and key objectives for achieving the goal
- Approach
- Work splitting (wrt Gantt)
- Technical challenges & Problems
- Short Demo/video up to 5 minutes (if any)
- 2nd term planning (wrt Gantt)

- as you're having to do a project yourself, it shouldn't be too hard to look at other groups' deliverables with a critical eye and state objectively what is good and what is worrisome.

- some of the things you should look for are: whether the team is working effectively together, are all the members contributing, is the work progressing nicely, was there too much time spent on some task, what is the quality of the work performed, what are some of the risks lying ahead, and ultimately, whether you think the project will make it. To put you in the right mindset, imagine that you are a project officer for the European commission, and you're trying to decide whether to put several million euro more into this project after this project review.

- putting together the review: If you want to know how this is done at the European Commission funding meetings: a reviewer fills out a form (as Section headers, you could address the key points I mentioned), then they meet to discuss, and once they have some kind of a consensus (is the project going to pass, fail, or require remedial actions) they edit the document by subdividing the work. Typically one person

merges all the comments pertaining to a single section into meaningful, coherent text. Once everything is pasted together the reviewers check other section to make sure their views were represented correctly.

Best regards,

Dejan