

COMP4 COMMENTARY SHEET v2.0					
EXEMPLAR PROJECT No.	4				
Programming Language:	Turbo Pascal				
Title/Type of System:	Repair management system for school IT Technicians				
Analysis	Band	Comments	Page	Mark	Max
Background and problem ident	2	Some background details.	1		
Description of current system	3	Adequate description of what is the current system that is actually used. See also form in appendix and very good interview.	1,2,A1		
User Identification	3	Users clearly identified.	1		
User needs and limitations	3	Clear description of user needs.	2		
Data sources and destinations	2	Reasonable, but for new system not existing system.	4		
Data volumes	2	Brief, but covers key points.	4		
Analysis data dictionary	2	Covers recording of faults but not assets in current system.	4		
DFDs existing and proposed	3	Good set of DFDs for existing and proposed systems, in appendix.	A2		
Objectives	3	Clear and numbered. Could be extended. Confirms adequate scope.	5		
Potential solutions	2	Brief comparison with two commercial systems.	6		
Proposed solution	3	Reasonable justification.	6		
Use of formal methods	3	An excellent interview on page 2 and sample form in appendix.	2,A1		
E-R model	2	Satisfactory, but does not include assets.	5	7	12
<b>DESIGN</b>					
Overall system design	2	This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix.	A3		
Modular structure	2	Diagram satisfactory but a bit confusing in places.	A7		
Design data dictionary	3	Detailed data dictionary.	7		
Record structure	3	Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files.	15		
Validation	3	Good suggestions, a range of different checks.	14		
File organisation and processing	3	Good comments on file processing made with each record plan.	14		
E-R model	2	Oddly drawn but concept can be seen.	7		
Storage material and format	3	Clear justification, with file sizes calculated.	17		
Algs for data transformation	3	Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good.	19		
User interface	3	Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations.	8		
Security and integrity of data	3	Very good.	23		
System security		Not done.			
Test strategy	2	A limited test strategy.	23	7	12
<b>TECHNICAL SOLUTION</b>					
Technical competence	3	Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started.	24	12	20
<b>SYSTEM TESTING</b>					
Design of test plan	4	43 tests planned, covering entire scope of system.	68		
Minimal test data	4	Clear test data given with almost every test.	68		
Typical data	4	Lots of examples.	68		
Erroneous data	4	Several examples.	68		
Extreme data		No examples.			
Annotated test results	4	Evidence of good range of tests being carried out. Some could do with a bit more explanation but mostly well explained.	78	6	8
<b>SYSTEM MAINTENANCE</b>					
System overview	2	Brief written overview. Some additional material in appendix.	56,A3		
Algorithms	3	Good descriptions of two algorithms.	56		
Annotated listings	3	Clearly set out code. Sensible variable and procedure names. Level of commenting fine.	24		
Procedure and variable lists	3	Very clear and detailed lists and descriptions of algorithms and variables.	61	5	7

[illegible]