Department of Computer Engineering, Bilkent University CS319 Object Oriented Software Engineering Group 11

Design Goals & Subsystem Decomposition Diagram - D3 Section 1 - Eray Tüzün 22/04/2025



Furkan Mert Aksakal 22003191 Furkan Komaç 22102165 Alper Biçer 22003097 Erkan Can Arslan 22103948 Deniz Yazıcı 21902557

Contents

Top-2 Design Goals	2
User-friendliness / Usability	
Reliability	
Possible Trade-offs	
Subsystem Decomposition Diagram	

Top 2 Design Goals

The design goals stem from the analysis of the **non-functional requirements** for the TA Management System. While building the platform, the two goals below will have highest priority—even when trade-offs arise, as explained at the end of each section.

User-friendliness / Usability

The system must be effortless for every stakeholder—TAs, instructors, and department staff—to learn and operate.

- Intuitive dashboards: Each role lands on a tailored home-screen that shows only the actions relevant to it (e.g., "Log Duty," "Approve Tasks," "Assign Proctors"). Common actions are reachable in ≤ 2 clicks.
- **Guided forms & smart defaults:** When a TA records a duty, the form pre-selects the current course/section and auto-computes effort hours from a drop-down template, reducing typing and errors.
- Real-time feedback: Toast notifications confirm a submission or flag validation errors < 1 s after the user clicks "Save," so the user never wonders whether an action succeeded.
- **Accessible visual cues:** Colour-blind-safe status badges (green = approved, yellow = pending, red = rejected) make state obvious at a glance.
- Search & filter everywhere: All tables (TA list, proctor roster, duty log) support type-ahead search and multi-facet filtering, enabling staff to locate information in < 5s.

Reliability

The platform must consistently perform critical operations—duty logging, proctor assignment, leave blocking—without error or data loss.

- ACID transactions: Every create/update/delete on duties, proctor slots, or leave requests runs inside a single database transaction; if any sub-step fails, nothing commits.
- **Exactly-once scheduling:** A message-queue feeds the proctor-assignment engine. Consumer groups guarantee that a TA is never double-assigned for the same exam.
- **Health-checked micro-services:** Containers restart automatically on failure; rolling updates ensure ≥ 99.9 % monthly uptime—critical during finals week when load peaks.

- **Versioned audit log:** Immutable, append-only records (timestamp, actor, before/after JSON diff) allow rapid forensic analysis and restore trust when disputes arise.
- **Nightly point-in-time backups & PITR:** Automatic snapshots plus a 7-day WAL archive let admins recover to any moment within the past week in case of corruption or operator error.

Possible Trade-offs

- 1. *Reliability vs Modifiability* Defensive checks, contracts, and a > 85 % test-coverage gate slow down feature releases. Feature flags and blue/green deployments will let the team experiment safely.
- 2. *Reliability vs Cost-effectiveness* Running redundant database replicas and a message bus increases infrastructure spend. We limit replicas to exam periods and scale down during off-peak months.
- 3. *User-friendliness vs Efficiency* Rich UI components and live search add client-side weight, which may slightly increase initial page-load time. Lazy-loading and code-splitting will mitigate the impact.
- 4. *User-friendliness vs Security* Keeping workflows "password-free" for instructors (SSO token only) improves UX but heightens risk if tokens leak. We counterbalance with 15-minute idle timeouts and device-bound refresh tokens.

By prioritising **User-friendliness** and **Reliability**, the TA Management System delivers a **smooth daily workflow** for its users while **protecting exam integrity** and historical workload records, in line with established system-design best practices.

Subsystem Decomposition Diagram

link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qpHeOokRLjLRHgvIW3bL7bTl1J7oLOyb/view?usp=sharing

