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(3 ECTS)

Dietmar Pfahl
dietmar.pfahl@ut.ee
Schedule – Sessions in red are mandatory

- 09 February - Introductory Session 1 (Dietmar Pfahl)
- 16 February - Introductory Session 2 (Dietmar Pfahl)
- 23 February & 02 March & 09 March & 16 March - Individual Consultation (optional & on request by student only - first come first serve principle) - Online or face-to-face
- 23 March – Student Presentations 1 (work in pairs)
- 30 March – Student Presentations 2 (work in pairs)
- 06 April – Student Presentations 3 (work in pairs)
- 13 April – Student Presentations 4 (work in pairs)
- 20 April – Student Presentations 5 (work in pairs)
- 27 April – Student Presentations 6 (work in pairs)
- 04 May – Student Presentations 7 (work in pairs)
- May 11 & 18 – Consultation for final reports (optional & on request by student(s) only - first come first serve principle)

- 23 February & 02 March & 09 March & 16 March - Individual Consultation (optional & on request by student only - first come first serve principle) - Online or face-to-face in my office (room 3507)
- 27 March - Deadline for submitting draft reports & slides of Presentations 1 (submit before 23/59)
- 23 March - Presentations 1: 1st and 2nd year students (work in pairs)
  - In-Person Slides
  - Topic AO-3: Evolution of software architecture paradigms in mobile applications - taken by Rene Kütt and Kristofer Käser
  - Topic AO-4: Evolution of software architectural styles in web applications - taken by Daichi Ando and Volodymyr Chernetskiy
  - Topic TQ-10: Security concepts in microservices and microservice architecture - taken by Matin Manafov and Adil Abdurrasakov
  - Note: The presentation session is followed by a 30 min quiz (in Moodle). All students who did not give a presentation today must take the quiz. In the quiz you must say which presentation was best and which was worst with regards to content, form, timing, and style of presentation. Justifications must be given.
- 28 March - Deadline for submitting draft reports & slides of Presentations 2 (submit before 23/59)
- 30 March - Presentations 2: 1st and 2nd year students (work in pairs)
  - In-Person Slides
  - Topic SI-1: Similarity/Difference of code smell frequency across programming languages/platforms - taken by Monika Shrestha and Worrananong Chanchalapak
  - Topic SI-2: Pros and cons of static code analysers - taken by Artem Filipenko and Zhilydz Akmatbekova
  - Topic SI-7: Interactive static code analysers - taken by Karoline Holter
  - Note: The presentation session is followed by a 30 min quiz (in Moodle). All students who did not give a presentation today must take the quiz. In the quiz you must say which presentation was best and which was worst with regards to content, form, timing, and style of presentation. Justifications must be given.
- 04 April - Deadline for submitting draft reports & slides of Presentations 3 (submit before 23/59)
- 06 April - Presentations 3: 1st and 2nd year students (work in pairs)
  - In-Person Slides
  - Topic TQ-3: Using machine learning to solve the test oracle problem - taken by Zhasii Qu and Serp Aktug
  - Topic TQ-4: Using machine learning to speed up automated testing - taken by Kehinde Esther Ogundeyi and Sammar Ahmad
  - Topic TQ-7: Automatic test oracle generation - taken by Merlin Kasemalu and Peter Kallaste
  - Note: The presentation session is followed by a 30 min quiz (in Moodle). Only students who did not give a presentation today must take the quiz. In the quiz you must say which presentation was best and which was worst with regards to content, form, timing, and style of presentation. Justifications must be given.
- 17 April - Deadline for submitting draft reports & slides of Presentations 4 (submit before 23/59)
Tasks

• Draft Report + Presentation Slides (submit 2 days before presentation)
• Feedback on presentations (via Quiz in Moodle at end of session)
  • Quiz closes at 23:59 of presentation day!
  • Must give feedback at least for 5 sessions (excluding the one where you give a presentation)
  • Must be given by each non-presenting student individually; feedback is given per presentation
  • In the quiz you must say which presentation was best and which was worst with regards to content, form, timing, and style of presentation. Justifications must be given. If the feedback is too shallow it will not count.
• Final Report (deadline: 23 May)

For reports and presentations:
1st and 2nd year students work in pairs
Feedback must be given individually
Feedback
(each non-presenting student → for all presentations)

• Timing (12 min):
  • Not too long – not too short – content appropriately distributed?

• Content:
  • Logical – understandable – complete?

• Slides:
  • Readable – not too full – visual supporting (not repeating) what is said?

• Presentation:
  • Clearly understandable – calm?

Be constructive! Make improvement suggestions!
Feedback – BAD Example (anonymized)

- The XXX group was better at the day despite being single member XXX really presented well. He was loud and clear. All the research questions were clearly explained.

- The XXX group was not good enough. They were not really facing the audience. They were just reading the slides.

→ This feedback gives 0 marks
Feedback – GOOD Example (anonymized)

PRESXXX

• The search string seemed to return a lot of results, but I guess this was because of Google Scholar. I was a bit confused by EC2 (remove everything after 50 results), although for just the seminar I suppose it's alright, especially when there are 170,000 results. I think RQ1 was a bit hard to quantify, but they did well considering the question was a bit open ended. Good and clear presentation from both of the participants. The slides were nicely formatted and I liked how the reflections and discussion was presented. Timing was good as well.

PRESXXX

• A really thorough and detailed presentation. Content wise this was probably one of the best and most detailed reports so far (judging from the data that was brought out in the presentation). The Research Questions were great, although RQ3 could have been split into two, if the writers of the report wanted to focus more on advantages & disadvantages separately. The Exclusion/Quality criteria made sense and it was nice to see the breakdown of the quality criteria. Also, I really liked the breakdown of the search string, seemed pretty unique and a good touch. Otherwise the presentation was clear and nice to listen to. It seemed a bit long, but there was a lot of data to go through, so I don't think that's an issue. This was my favourite from today.
Today’s Presentations (20 April)

• Topic BP-2: Methods to extract security issues from business process models - by Carolin Kirotar and Marta Napa

• Topic PM-2: Teaching agile software development to students and engineers - by Joanna Mae Cabuyadadao and Lana Botchorishvili

• Topic PM-4: Management practices in game development - by Kaarel Rüüsak and Toomas Tamm