

## **CO510 Group Work – Stage 1**

### **Feedback – Version 2018.12.28.01**

There is no separate assessment mark on SDS for this stage but its achievement will contribute 10% of the final mark for the group assessment.

This feedback is provided to help each group maximise its achievement in subsequent stages so it is recommended that you review the comments and consider making relevant changes for work on future stages.

Feedback is provided under three areas.

#### **Clarification of the requirement**

Groups were expected to clarify the customer's requirements which, as given, were inadequate for creation of a UML use case diagram leading to a satisfactory implementation.

#### **User stories**

Groups were expected to provide 8 user stories in the correct style and format. The stories should contain a user requirement, details clarifying the requirement, and acceptance tests that would demonstrate fulfilment of the requirement.

Note that, at this early stage, the evaluation is confined to the way the stories have been written, rather than their accurate reflection of the requirements. For instance, a story about document access might not correctly represent the permissions requirements. In a real analysis, it would obviously be important for the stories to be accurate as well as correctly written, but we have not commented on that here.

#### **UML Use case diagram**

A use case diagram satisfying the major requirements of the system. While the diagram does not have to be complete, at this stage, the notation should have been used correctly and the diagram should accurately reflect the system being designed.

Examples of appropriate actors would be: Director, Manager, Reviewer, Employee, HR Employee.

Appropriate actor relationships might be that Manager and Director are specializations of Reviewer and HR Employee is a specialization of Employee.

## Feedback

- Was clarification obtained from Miles? Yes
- User stories.
  - Sufficient provided? Yes
  - Contain the three elements? Yes
  - Written appropriately? No Several of the stories (e.g., 1 and 3) are not related to the way that Yuconz works. The test sections are not written correctly. Review the class material on user stories.
- Use case diagram.
  - Appropriate notation? No
  - Appropriate actors? Yes, but there is no value in listing the separate directors. Use singular nouns: “Manager” rather than “Managers” and Directors can also be reviewers.
  - Appropriate actor relationships? They are a bit arbitrary. Director is missing from the Reviewer specialisation. The second reviewer is not necessarily a director.
  - Appropriate use cases? They are a mix of actions (e.g., Modify document), which is fine, and things (e.g., Termination record) which are not. Use cases are always actions. In the personal details diagram, the database is represented as a use case rather than an actor.
  - All use cases have an actor? No
  - Use cases documented? Yes, but these need refining. For instance, in Probation Record, the first step of the normal flow is really the pre-condition rather than a step, and the alternative flows of the New Annual Review scenario are very repetitious: in fact, the first two appear to be identical because the copy/paste/edit cycle was left incomplete.
  - Adequate coverage of the system? Yes, but not correctly.
  - Overall assessment: You need to review how to write use case diagrams so that they capture only actions rather than artefacts or control flow.

**Indicative mark (4/10)**

The mark does not take into account either small group size or the issue of cards to group members. Such adjustments will be made in calculating the overall assessment mark.