ARCHITENTERPRISES

Team 20

Lab number 2

Debugging Specification Inspection

February 24th, 2013

Version 1.0

By signing below, each group member approves of this document and contributed fairly to its completion.

Raymond Tang, Andrew McMillion, Archit Rupakhetee, Tyler Lenig

On our honors, as students of the University of Virginia, we have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this assignment.

Raymond Tang, Andrew McMillion, Archit Rupakhetee, Tyler Lenig

Contents

Inspection Checklist

Throughout the compilation of the document, we verified that the following list was completed. This is not exhaustive, but it does cover the most important and prevalent issues that needed to be addressed in our specification document.

Content

The preamble provides a brief overview of the specification and the system itself.

Any assumptions made in the document are clearly stated.

Each event has an associated mode and action.

Each mode has an associated definition.

A mode transition table and diagram exist.

The mode transition diagram has a brief summary of it.

A mock-up of the user interface is included.

A brief summary of the interface mock-up is included.

Each input data item has the appropriate documentation and definition.

Each output data item has the appropriate documentation and definition.

Each symbolic constant has an associated definition and value.

Each condition has an associated definition.

Each text macro has an associated definition.

Format

The document has all of the required formatting for any document (i.e. face page, approval page, pledge and table of contents).

The document has a preamble.

All text macros, conditions, symbolic constants, events, modes, input and output data items all are displayed in tables that clearly show the appropriate attributes of each.

Every text macro is surrounded by '!'

Every mode is surrounded by '*'

Every input data item is surrounded by '/'

Every output data item is surrounded by '//'

Every symbolic constant is surrounded by '$'

Every condition is surrounded by '%'

Each text section is indented and double-spaced.

Use of Technology

An appropriate editing program should be used to create the GUI mock-up.

An appropriate program should be used to create the mode transition diagram.

An appropriate word processing unit that has an ample amount of editing features.

A network to allow for collaboration on the document.

Appearance

A clear, business appropriated font is used.

The size of the font is neither too big nor too small.

The colors used in the document are business professional and do not take away from the content in the document.

An appropriate logo is included as a header on every page.

All tables have equally size cells that allow for ease when discerning the material contained in them.

All text sections are displayed in a clear, concise fashion.

Mistakes and Corrections

The main mistakes that were made in the document were from the content and appearance. Initially, we believed that an event table was all that was needed to define modes but, upon closer examination of SCR documentation, we discovered that a table defining each mode was required.

We also initially believed that modes could not be entered but multiple events. Once we discovered that multiple events to enter modes were not only permissible but required, we quickly changed our event table to have modes be able to be entered by a variety of events.

Another content mistake that we encountered lied with detecting the difference between an input data type and a text macro. When we first began to compile our event table, we allowed input data items to be modified by our implementation. Once we became aware that our software does not deal with operator mishaps, we changed our events to alter text macros instead of input data items.

When we began to create input and output data items, we were not aware of the required documentation that each of them needed (i.e. class, acronym, value encoding, etc.). Once we became aware, we added these it to make sure that our data items were completed appropriately.

The main mistake we made in appearance was throughout our font choice. When compiling the document, we were not consistent with the font that we were using. Once we began to finalize the document, it became tedious to ensure all fonts were of the same type and shape.

Creating a logo was also full of complications and difficulties. We were unable to find a font in our word processor that was appropriate for our logo so we had to download one from a third party. Once we had the font, the rest of the logo construction was very easy to complete.

The main mistake that we made when dealing with our use of technology was making tables in Google docs and trying to translate those tables to our word processor. When we copied the tables into our word processor, it disrupted the format of not only the table but the rest of the document. This made the translation from Google docs to our word processor a time consuming a tedious task. This mistake was also evident in the appearance and formatting components of our checklist.

The main mistake we made in formatting was through the use of the various delimiters. When we began the document, we made a lot of errors with delimiters because we were unaware of the proper ones to use. Once we used

the delimiters more and more, the mistakes became less and less and we were able to use all of them with ease.

Inspection Summary

Throughout the completion of our specification document, we used our checklist to make sure we did not omit any parts that needed to be included. The checklist was also a dynamic document that was expanded as we completed the document and became aware of more important things that needed to be added to it.

In each of our versions, we reviewed the specification document and used our checklist to document our progress. The most mistakes in the entire process were made during the rough draft process. Although during this process we added the most content to the document, it was not in the proper format or appearance which is why so many different versions of the document were required. Without repeating this process with our inspection checklist, the specification document would have been much more tedious to complete and less comprehensive as a final product.