Requirements Modelling Feedback

In order to provide feedback and improvements we have referred to the ACW and the SystemsAnalysis1920\_Lab3.pdf file provided on the canvas site.

We have sectioned the report into 5 different sections: Introduction, Overall Description, Requirements, Diagrams and Testing. Underneath each table you will find an overview, in which we elaborate on the contents of the table.

We used a table structure to give feedback on each section as we believe this would make it very easy and clear to see what improvements need to be made and for which sections. This also made it easy for us as a team to break down and analyse the document and provide quality feedback.

The improvements we have provided are only suggestions.

# Introduction

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sections** | **Comment** | **Errors** | **Missing?** | **Improvements** |
| Introduction | Good start however the introduction paragraph needs some refining. | Some information is not relevant. | No. | Refine the introduction. |
| Purpose |  | Section missing. | Yes. | Include section. |
| Scope |  | Section missing. | Yes. | Include section. |
| Definitions and Acronyms |  | Section missing. | Yes. | Include section. |
| References |  | Section missing. | Yes. | Include section. |
| Overview |  | Section missing. | Yes. | Include section. |

## Overview:

You have made a good attempt at an introduction, however, we believe that you are missing a few key parts of the introduction section. In order to make your software requirements specification more clear and concise we suggest that you refer to and use the format provided in SystemsAnalysis1920\_Lab3.pdf file. The structure suggested will allow the client to easily identify what the purpose and the scope of the project is as well as be able to quickly look up any terms and references used in your document.

We believe that your introduction paragraph is fairly good, however it requires minor refinement as it seems that you have tried to combine introduction and purpose into a single paragraph.

# Overall Description

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sections** | **Comment** | **Errors** | **Missing?** | **Improvements** |
| Product Perspective |  | Section missing. | Yes. | Include section. |
| Product Functions | This was a good start, you briefly described the functions but needs work. | Structure needs improvement. | No. | It looks like you’re just reciting from the spec. Properly describe and structure the section. (Don’t keep it as a massive chunk of text). |
| User Characteristics | You have correctly pointed out all of the characteristics. | No obvious errors. | No. | Optionally you could convert the bullet points into sentences for better description, however you did point out what was required. |
| Constraints |  | Section missing. | Yes. | Include section. |
| Assumptions |  | Section missing. | Yes. | Include section. |
| Personas | This was nicely laid out, well organised and easy to understand. | No obvious errors. | No. | The goals are too specific to the system. E.g. “Read drafts from Academic” is not a personal goal.  Your scenarios seemed more like use cases rather than persona scenarios. |

## Overview:

This was a great start to this section but there is still crucial information missing.

You should immediately focus on implementing the system constraints, assumptions you had when coming into this project, and a product perspective. On the Lab 3 spec (really useful document as you may be able to tell) outlines the sections required in the overall document and gives a brief description of what is expected.

Following on what you have currently in this section is pretty good. The structure could be a little better and some minor refining to the product functions are required but it’s pretty minor fixes.

# Requirements

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sections** | **Comment** | **Errors** | **Missing?** | **Improvements** |
| User Interfaces | N/A | Section missing. | Yes. | Include section. |
| Hardware Interfaces | N/A | Section missing. | Yes. | Include section. |
| Software Interfaces | N/A | Section missing. | Yes. | Include section. |
| Communication Interfaces | N/A | Section missing. | Yes. | Include section. |
| Functional Requirements | Good Amount of detail for each requirement. | Not enough requirements. | No. | The structure could be improved upon, and you should list every functional requirement the program has in this section. |
| Design Constraints | The Constraints should be separate from the functional requirements. | Not structured properly | No. | The constraints should be a seperate section from the functional requirements. |
| Individual Requirements |  | Section missing. | Yes. | Include section. |

## Overview:

This was a great start to the functional requirements section of the requirements, however your structure could be improved upon. There is plenty of detail in the sections you have included but you have not included all the requirements within the application, the functional requirements purpose is to list out each function of the system to the client before development begins.

The constraints section has been merged with the functional requirements (should be separate). This does not include enough detail to explain all the constraints of the system. This section is also missing the hardware/software interfaces, user interfaces and communication interfaces. Although most of this section is missing what has been done is a great start, I would suggest however you follow the SystemsAnalysis1920\_Lab3.pdf which lists out all the content needed for the assignment.

# Diagrams - Use Case & Activity

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sections** | **Comment** | **Errors** | **Missing?** | **Improvements** |
| Use Cases (Scenarios & Diagrams) | Limited explanation of use case diagrams as well as of the activity diagrams.  The use cases shouldn’t be mixed with the activity diagrams | The actors are meant to be the different users of the system.  System failures should be included in the scenarios. | No | The use case diagram could have been divided differently such as for each part of the system. |
| Director of Study | Inconsistency within activity diagrams (font/layout) | Rotate the activity diagram | No | Include use case diagrams  Include level of priority, inputs and outputs (scenarios) |
| Programme Director | Inconsistency within activity diagrams (font/layout) | No obvious errors | No | Include level of priority, inputs and outputs (scenarios) |
| Module Leader | Inconsistency within activity diagrams (font/layout) | No obvious errors | No | Include level of priority, inputs and outputs (scenarios) |
| Academic | Inconsistency within activity diagrams (font/layout) | No obvious errors | No | Include level of priority, inputs and outputs (scenarios) |
| Faculty Hub | Inconsistency within activity diagrams (font/layout) | No obvious errors | No | Include level of priority, inputs and outputs (scenarios) |

## Overview:

You have given a limited explanation of use case diagrams as well as activity diagrams. The actors are meant to be the different users of the system. The use cases and scenarios shouldn’t be mixed with the activity diagrams as they are very different in their own way. You should also add a brief description under each activity diagram in order to make it easier for the client to understand.

There has been an inconsistency within the diagrams as well as their layout and positioning within the document. Your use case diagrams were especially hard to understand. You could include within the scenarios, the level of priority of the task as well as the inputs and outputs of the system. There hasn’t been any obvious errors beside layout and formatting of the document.

# Testing - Plans & Traceability Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sections** | **Comment** | **Errors** | **Missing?** | **Improvements** |
| Test Cases | N/A | Section Missing. | Yes. | Add section. |
| Traceability Matrix | N/A | Section Missing. | Yes. | Add section. |

## Overview:

You have neither started nor completed this section as of yet. To meet the requirements for this section, you should aim to perform at least 8 different test cases, ideally including each actor in at least one of the tests. Each test should cover the description, inputs, expected results, actual results, dependencies, initialisation and test steps of said test case.

As for the traceability matrix, you should create a table with columns and rows labeled R1-8 (requirements) and T1-8 (test cases) respectively. This traceability matrix will help to track and present the correlation between the test cases and the requirements.

## Other

We also advise you to take a look at the formatting of your systems requirement specification, for example the table of contents shouldn’t be at the bottom of the document and your use cases and activity diagrams shouldn’t be mixed together as this makes it difficult to read the document.