

Team 16

Presentation: _5_ / 5

the report is well formatted, easy to read, and easy to navigate

Quality of writing: _5_ / 5

language, grammar, clarity, professionalism

Introduce the team: _3_ / 3

both the team name and a picture of the team are present

Introduce the team members: _2_ / 4

- inconsistent perspective: first-person, third person
- Carlos' bio is barely half of the required word count
- run-on sentences in Kenny's bio

Share a meal: _3_ / 3

a picture of everyone sharing a meal is present

- mmm, pizza

Personas: _4_ / 7

must contain: photo, gender, age, personality, skills, environment, attitude towards technology in general, attitude towards computer software, goals when using the system

Too many irrelevant details are not useful!

We want at least four personas:

- a researcher (like Alejandro)
- a graduate student
- a tech-savvy librarian (like Kirsta)
- a library programmer

-The personas are meant more for giving you an understanding of your clients than for you to learn factual trivial information about them.

- "Dr. Paz is single, but has one son from a previous marriage." is just creepy and does not give you any information that will help you make design decisions.

-good job breaking gender stereotypes with the male librarian!

-Other than the unnecessary detail, you did give a decent description of the required characteristics.

User Stories: _17_ / 26

3 / 3: follow the format "As a _role_, I want _something_, so that _benefit_."

0 / 2: the _role_ is a Persona described in the previous part.

- "admin" is not a persona

1 / 1 : include an identifier

3 / 6 : all functionality described by the customer is included

- user story 3: login is more about persistent data per user than simple program access

- user story 15 belongs to your librarian persona, not your researcher. It also seems epic; saving data for later date and providing useful data for librarian are two separate tasks.

6 / 6 : no extra functionality, only what's described by the customer

4 / 8 : clear, self-contained, *testable*, all acceptance criteria are clear

- no acceptance criteria

System metaphor: _4_ / 8

1 / 2 : the metaphor is simple, easy to follow, clearly maps to the software system under design

- I'm not convinced that the analogy maps: journalists mainly look for information, whereas we're investigating the links between articles

1 / 2 : the naming of components is clear and descriptive

- you guys put a lot of faith in my ability to read between the lines. Perhaps a clear description of which components map to which parts of the analogy would clear things up.

1 / 2 : suggests appropriate key players/components

- What happens to the report written by the journalist?

1 / 2 : suggests appropriate interactions between key players/components

- Again, the journalist doesn't really do what your web crawler is supposed to do.

Release plan: _18_ / 29

4 / 8 : structure: all releases, with dates, all user stories

- no dates

- in the spirit of Agile, you are supposed to set your releases at REGULAR (eg. weekly) intervals, not when assignments/phases happen to be due.

5 / 6 : estimation of costs

Need to specify what the unit is!

-no need to say "High, Must". Seems a bit redundant. Just use one system.

6 / 6 : estimation of values

2 / 5 : appropriate rankings/ordering (value and risk first)

-some of the prioritization seems odd to me. For example, you have a low-priority 6-day task in release 2. If it's so expensive and unimportant, why put it so up front? Why do you have high-value tasks in very late releases?

1 / 4 : video follows the rules of the game

-that's not the way the game is supposed to work. Business people tell the developers the priorities; the developers only give time estimates. The businessperson should be actively involved in the game (ie. in the video)

Interview : _10_ / 10

-You guys did well! Good explanations