

Workshop 1: Feedback to Filip Rydberg & co

From Zarah, Mikael, Morgan

As a developer would the model help you and why/why not?

Yes, because it is a good visual description of real world objects that can work as inspiration for the later software development and helps us understand the boat club business. It follows Larman's criteria's for a good Domain model. It represents real-situation conceptual classes and not software objects (p. 134).

Do you think a domain expert (for example the Secretary) would understand the model why/why not?

We think he/she would understand it because it deals with the reality and not software classes and things typical for software development.

What are the strong points of the model, what do you think is really good and why?

Overall clear readability and understandability which is good.

What are the weaknesses of the model, what do you think should be changed and why?

Maybe there should be a BoatType-class. If all boat of one type is deleted there is no information left about that kind of boat. I.e. the boat type should exist even if there is no boats of that particular type in the club at the moment (Larman p. 148).

Does there have to be an association between member and calendar and between member and event? According to Larman associations should only be shown when there is need for **memory** of a relationship between two classes. If there is an association between member and calendar it means there is value in remembering that a particular member has looked up a particular calendar entry (p. 150-151).

Association name between calendar and member, and secretary and member is missing. Larman states that an association should have a name (p. 151).

Association names should be for example Owns instead of Own. Books instead of Book and Belongs-to instead of Belong (Larman, p. 153).

We suggest that the boat attribute spot should be changed to for example availability since it is a number or text and not something that exists in the real world (Larman, p. 146).

Missing multiplicity on associations. Larman states that "the ends of an association may contain a multiplicity expression indication the numerical relationship between instances of the classes." (p. 151)

Larman writes attributes singular and begins with small case letter (p. 159). For example, startDate and not StartDate.

Some attributes are not specified in the requirement description, such as the attributes under Member (address, phone, email, etc) and Boat (width, length). Larman says to identify the attributes that are needed to satisfy the information stated in the requirements of the current scenarios (ch 9.16).

Do you think the model has passed the grade 2 (passing grade) criteria?

Yes. After a few changes.

References

1. Larman C., Applying UML and Patterns 3rd Ed, 2005, ISBN: 0131489062