CIS 315 Mid Term

For each question, a substantive answer, with respect to given grades, will possess the following characteristics. Each question will ask students to integrate two concepts explained in the course, thus far.

No limits are placed on answers, but a correct answer must show experiential participation in the course thus far, with added support from the text and notes produced in lecture.

No UML is required. APA or MLA format is necessary, as well as spell and grammar checking. An electronic deliverable will be submitted via email at the end of class.

Assume that each question demands a 'why' response, beyond any listed answers. The exam will take place August 18th. Please arrive in class ready to write on each topic.

Required Topics (5 points each)

1.
When employing an Ishikawa analysis to model an 'as-is' system at a company, what insights does it yield, which are useful in constructing a software requirements analysis?

2.
When constructing a use case analysis, what are three analyses to conduct, to yield this kind of UML?

3.
When constructing a problem domain in the approach to an analysis, what diagrammatic analyses are particularly helpful? What merits does each yield, in the run-up to a comprehensive systems analysis?

4.
In constructing a system of strategic merit, must a problem domain analysis of the corporation precede a corporate strategy analysis? Why or why not? What tools are particularly distinctive for each phase, and in what order should they be performed?

Grading Rubric

A
- Each concept is researched using the course textbook, then cited in the answer.
- All cited language is paraphrased.
- Definitions for each concept are explained before synthesized.
- Each response builds upon the fundamental definitions, and uses the scholarly basis for the concept as basis for the answer.
- The student shows evidence of effort put toward mastering the concepts.

B
- Concepts are researched through web-based articles, and though cited, do not possess substantive scholarly merit.
- Quotes by other authors are used as explanations for concepts, and demand effort by the reader to interpret.
- Definitions are recited from sources, and/or do not provide actual proof of comprehension.
- Each response begins a discussion on the merger of the concepts, but does not develop it.
- There is evidence that the student has studied the material, but has not mastered it.

C
- Concepts are explained without citation to any source, and are paraphrased from a personal understanding.
- Quotes by other authors are used as explanations for concepts, and demand effort by the reader to interpret.
- Explanations are reaching, or are not clear.
- Language exhibits some exposure to the concepts, but no clear effort at grasping the material.

D
- Language is riddled with grammatical and spelling errors, and shows a lack of effort or focus.
- Concepts are not discussed with effort to define nor determine authoritative definitions.
- Citations are lacking entirely.
- Some evidence of course attendance is evinced by personal, experiential exposure to the topic.
- It is clear that the student has participated in a systems analysis course.

E/F
- The response is missing or is not understandable.