User Story Feedback From Client

For E1.1, it is correct, but we need to use another guidance to replace the video tutorial.

For E1.2, the priority should be ‘must have’ instead of ‘could have’. The reliability of the report is very important, which is the basic need.

For E1.3, the client does not think it was a story, it is not applicable. He thinks mental health is one of the competencies. As a result, we delete the user story (by adding a strikethrough line).

For E1.4, the client does not feel that academic performance needs to be considered at this stage, and we can consider adding it in the future.

For E1.5, it is correct. This is an existing feature that the Ruby platform already has. Perhaps there is room for improvement.

For E1.6, it is correct. The client says they haven't made many improvements in that area as of yet.

For E1.7, it is correct. For E1.8, the priority should be ‘low’ instead of ‘high’. However, for now, the client says they have not opened access to the parents yet, parents are not active users of the system. This is a business question. As a result, we do not need to think about completing these two user stories for now.

For E1.9, it is correct, but not for now. They have considered these features but have not gone live with them because the data they currently have access to is not as reliable as it could be. They are trying to find a better way to use that data.

For E1.10, the priority should be ‘won’t have(low)’ instead of ‘could have(high)’. The client says that this kind of comparison between classmates is of little significance because each person in a class may choose different courses and plans for the future.

For E1.11 and E1.12, they are both correct.

For E1.13, the description “Create prioritization for the importance of different general capabilities based on the relevant teaching area” should be “Create prioritization for the confidence of different general capabilities based on the relevant teaching areas”, the latter one is more acceptable for the teachers.

For E2.1, it is correct.

For E2.2, it is correct.

For E2.3, it is correct. This is not the main task.

For E2.4, it is correct.

For E2.5, the priority should be ‘low’ instead of ‘high’. We are in the prototype stage, and we do not need to do any work for the security.

For E2.6, it is correct. Different visualization methods may be better. For example, we can consider showing a class report, which differs from the current ones. This is a new idea.

For E2.7, the priority should be ‘won’t have(low)’ instead of ‘could have(medium)’. There are too many learning systems in the school. The ruby is more focused on the assessment.