

Module Guide for Software Engineering

Team 4, EvENGage
Virochaan Ravichandran Gowri
Omar Al-Asfar
Rayyan Suhail
Ibrahim Quraishi
Mohammad Mahdi Mahboob

November 6, 2025

1 Revision History

Date	Version	Notes
Date 1	1.0	Notes
Date 2	1.1	Notes

2 Reference Material

This section records information for easy reference.

2.1 Abbreviations and Acronyms

symbol	description
AC	Anticipated Change
DAG	Directed Acyclic Graph
M	Module
MG	Module Guide
OS	Operating System
R	Requirement
SC	Scientific Computing
SRS	Software Requirements Specification
Software Engineering	Explanation of program name
UC	Unlikely Change
[etc. —SS]	[... —SS]

Contents

1 Revision History	i
2 Reference Material	ii
2.1 Abbreviations and Acronyms	ii
3 Introduction	1
4 Anticipated and Unlikely Changes	2
4.1 Anticipated Changes	2
4.2 Unlikely Changes	2
5 Module Hierarchy	2
6 Connection Between Requirements and Design	4
7 Module Decomposition	4
7.1 Hardware Hiding Modules	4
7.2 Behaviour-Hiding Module	4
7.2.1 User Authentication Module (M1)	4
7.2.2 User Authorization Module (M2)	4
7.2.3 Form Template Module (M3)	5
7.2.4 Form Submission Module (M4)	5
7.2.5 Event Management Module (M5)	5
7.2.6 Event Notification Module (M6)	5
7.2.7 Registration Module (M7)	5
7.2.8 Attendance Tracking Module (M8)	5
7.2.9 Report Generation Module (M9)	6
7.3 Software Decision Module	6
7.3.1 Analytics Module (M10)	6
7.3.2 Database Access Module (M11)	6
7.3.3 Audit Module (M12)	6
8 Traceability Matrix	6
9 Use Hierarchy Between Modules	7
10 User Interfaces	8
11 Design of Communication Protocols	8
12 Timeline	8

List of Tables

1	Module Hierarchy	3
2	Trace Between Functional Requirements and Modules	7
3	Trace Between Anticipated Changes and Modules	7

List of Figures

1	Use hierarchy among modules	8
---	---------------------------------------	---

3 Introduction

Decomposing a system into modules is a commonly accepted approach to developing software. A module is a work assignment for a programmer or programming team (Parnas et al., 1984). We advocate a decomposition based on the principle of information hiding (Parnas, 1972). This principle supports design for change, because the “secrets” that each module hides represent likely future changes. Design for change is valuable in SC, where modifications are frequent, especially during initial development as the solution space is explored.

Our design follows the rules laid out by Parnas et al. (1984), as follows:

- System details that are likely to change independently should be the secrets of separate modules.
- Each data structure is implemented in only one module.
- Any other program that requires information stored in a module’s data structures must obtain it by calling access programs belonging to that module.

After completing the first stage of the design, the Software Requirements Specification (SRS), the Module Guide (MG) is developed (Parnas et al., 1984). The MG specifies the modular structure of the system and is intended to allow both designers and maintainers to easily identify the parts of the software. The potential readers of this document are as follows:

- New project members: This document can be a guide for a new project member to easily understand the overall structure and quickly find the relevant modules they are searching for.
- Maintainers: The hierarchical structure of the module guide improves the maintainers’ understanding when they need to make changes to the system. It is important for a maintainer to update the relevant sections of the document after changes have been made.
- Designers: Once the module guide has been written, it can be used to check for consistency, feasibility, and flexibility. Designers can verify the system in various ways, such as consistency among modules, feasibility of the decomposition, and flexibility of the design.

The rest of the document is organized as follows. Section 4 lists the anticipated and unlikely changes of the software requirements. Section 5 summarizes the module decomposition that was constructed according to the likely changes. Section 6 specifies the connections between the software requirements and the modules. Section 7 gives a detailed description of the modules. Section 8 includes two traceability matrices. One checks the completeness of the design against the requirements provided in the SRS. The other shows the relation between anticipated changes and the modules. Section 9 describes the use relation between modules.

4 Anticipated and Unlikely Changes

This section lists possible changes to the system. According to the likeliness of the change, the possible changes are classified into two categories. Anticipated changes are listed in Section 4.1, and unlikely changes are listed in Section 4.2.

4.1 Anticipated Changes

Anticipated changes are the source of the information that is to be hidden inside the modules. Ideally, changing one of the anticipated changes will only require changing the one module that hides the associated decision. The approach adapted here is called design for change.

AC1: The specific hardware on which the software is running.

AC2: The format of the initial input data.

...

[Anticipated changes relate to changes that would be made in requirements, design or implementation choices. They are not related to changes that are made at run-time, like the values of parameters. —SS]

4.2 Unlikely Changes

The module design should be as general as possible. However, a general system is more complex. Sometimes this complexity is not necessary. Fixing some design decisions at the system architecture stage can simplify the software design. If these decision should later need to be changed, then many parts of the design will potentially need to be modified. Hence, it is not intended that these decisions will be changed.

UC1: Input/Output devices (Input: File and/or Keyboard, Output: File, Memory, and/or Screen).

...

5 Module Hierarchy

This section provides an overview of the module design. Modules are summarized in a hierarchy decomposed by secrets in Table 1. The modules listed below, which are leaves in the hierarchy tree, are the modules that will actually be implemented.

M1: User Authentication Module

M2: User Authorization Module

M3: Form Template Module

M4: Form Submission Module

M5: Event Management Module

M6: Event Notification Module

M7: Registration Module

M8: Attendance Tracking Module

M9: Report Generation Module

M10: Analytics Module

M11: Database Access Module

M12: Audit Module

Level 1	Level 2
Hardware-Hiding Module	No Modules
Behaviour-Hiding Modules	M1: User Authentication Module M2: User Authorization Module M3: Form Template Module M4: Form Submission Module M5: Event Management Module M6: Event Notification Module M7: Registration Module M8: Attendance Tracking Module M9: Report Generation Module
Software-Decision Modules	M10: Analytics Module M11: Database Access Module M12: Audit Module

Table 1: Module Hierarchy

6 Connection Between Requirements and Design

The design of the system is intended to satisfy the requirements developed in the SRS. In this stage, the system is decomposed into modules. The connection between requirements and modules is listed in Table 2.

[The intention of this section is to document decisions that are made “between” the requirements and the design. To satisfy some requirements, design decisions need to be made. Rather than make these decisions implicit, they are explicitly recorded here. For instance, if a program has security requirements, a specific design decision may be made to satisfy those requirements with a password. —SS]

7 Module Decomposition

Modules are decomposed according to the principle of “information hiding” proposed by Parnas et al. (1984). The *Secrets* field in a module decomposition is a brief statement of the design decision hidden by the module. The *Services* field specifies *what* the module will do without documenting *how* to do it. For each module, a suggestion for the implementing software is given under the *Implemented By* title. If the entry is *OS*, this means that the module is provided by the operating system or by standard programming language libraries. *Software Engineering* means the module will be implemented by the Software Engineering software.

Only the leaf modules in the hierarchy have to be implemented. If a dash (-) is shown, this means that the module is not a leaf and will not have to be implemented.

7.1 Hardware Hiding Modules

There are no hardware components for this system.

7.2 Behaviour-Hiding Module

7.2.1 User Authentication Module (M1)

Secrets: The internal methods used for verifying user identities within the system.

Services: Authenticates users by validating credentials and provides access to the system.

Implemented By: Backend JavaScript API.

Module Type: Abstract Object Module.

7.2.2 User Authorization Module (M2)

Secrets: Rules defining access levels and user roles. Defines which features are to be accessed by each role.

Services: Provides the system with a ruleset on what each roles have access to.

Implemented By: Backend JavaScript API.
Module Type: Abstract Data Type Module.

7.2.3 Form Template Module (M3)

Secrets: The structure and layout of form templates used in surveys and event creation.
Services: Provides reusable blueprints for constructing event or survey forms. Allows for the creation of new forms and editing of preexisting forms.
Implemented By: React Frontend, Backend PostgreSQL Database Schemas.
Module Type: Abstract Data Type Module.

7.2.4 Form Submission Module (M4)

Secrets: Validation rules of the user input data.
Services: Receives and validates user-submitted forms and stores them in database.
Implemented By: Backend form processing JavaScript API.
Module Type: Abstract Object Module.

7.2.5 Event Management Module (M5)

Secrets: Event data structures and scheduling rules.
Services: Enables creation, editing, and cancellation of events by administrators.
Implemented By: React Frontend with Backend event processing JavaScript API.
Module Type: Abstract Object Module.

7.2.6 Event Notification Module (M6)

Secrets: Notification delivery logic and timing rules.
Services: Sends alerts to users regarding new events, updates, or cancellations.
Implemented By: Third-Party Messaging APIs.
Module Type: Library.

7.2.7 Registration Module (M7)

Secrets: Mapping between users, events, and registration states.
Services: Allows users to register, modify, or cancel event participation. Provides validation and confirmation of registration within the event.
Implemented By: Backend JavaScript APIs.
Module Type: Abstract Data Type Module.

7.2.8 Attendance Tracking Module (M8)

Secrets: Methods for recording attendance and validating entry codes.
Services: Tracks event attendance and verifies participant access.

Implemented By: Backend JavaScript APIs.
Module Type: Abstract Data Object Module.

7.2.9 Report Generation Module (M9)

Secrets: Formatting logic for report generation and provides static data structure of the report.

Services: Converts analytics data into exportable human-readable reports.

Implemented By: Third Part Apis with JavaScript and React.

Module Type: Abstract Data Object Module.

7.3 Software Decision Module

7.3.1 Analytics Module (M10)

Secrets: Algorithms for aggregating and calculating statistics.

Services: Computes summaries based on the data provided for set statistics and performs data analysis.

Implemented By: Javascript Backend Library.

Module Type: Library.

7.3.2 Database Access Module (M11)

Secrets: Database schema design and access.

Services: Provides database operations to query and insert to database through a unified database layer.

Implemented By: Drizzle ORM with JavaScript APIs. **Module Type:** Abstract Data Object Module.

7.3.3 Audit Module (M12)

Secrets: Policy and data structure for recording administrative actions.

Services: Provides methods to track user and admin activities to ensure traceability and compliance.

Implemented By: Backend Javascript API with PostgreSQL Database. **Module Type:** Abstract Data Type Module.

8 Traceability Matrix

This section shows two traceability matrices: between the modules and the requirements and between the modules and the anticipated changes.

Req.	Modules
FR-1	M ³ , M ⁴
FR-2	M ⁹ , M ¹⁰
FR-3	M ⁷ , M ⁵
FR-4	M ⁷
FR-5	M ⁵
FR-6	M ¹¹
FR-7	M ¹¹ , M ³ , M ⁴
FR-8	M ⁹ , M ¹⁰
FR-9	M ³ , M ⁴
FR-10	M ⁵
FR-11	M ²

Table 2: Trace Between Functional Requirements and Modules

AC	Modules
AC ¹	M??
AC ²	M??
AC??	M??

Table 3: Trace Between Anticipated Changes and Modules

9 Use Hierarchy Between Modules

In this section, the uses hierarchy between modules is provided. Parnas (1978) said of two programs A and B that A *uses* B if correct execution of B may be necessary for A to complete

the task described in its specification. That is, A *uses* B if there exist situations in which the correct functioning of A depends upon the availability of a correct implementation of B. Figure 1 illustrates the use relation between the modules. It can be seen that the graph is a directed acyclic graph (DAG). Each level of the hierarchy offers a testable and usable subset of the system, and modules in the higher level of the hierarchy are essentially simpler because they use modules from the lower levels.

[The uses relation is not a data flow diagram. In the code there will often be an import statement in module A when it directly uses module B. Module B provides the services that module A needs. The code for module A needs to be able to see these services (hence the import statement). Since the uses relation is transitive, there is a use relation without an import, but the arrows in the diagram typically correspond to the presence of import statement. —SS]

[If module A uses module B, the arrow is directed from A to B. —SS]

Figure 1: Use hierarchy among modules

10 User Interfaces

[Design of user interface for software and hardware. Attach an appendix if needed. Drawings, Sketches, Figma —SS]

11 Design of Communication Protocols

[If appropriate —SS]

12 Timeline

[Schedule of tasks and who is responsible —SS]

[You can point to GitHub if this information is included there —SS]

References

David L. Parnas. On the criteria to be used in decomposing systems into modules. *Comm. ACM*, 15(2):1053–1058, December 1972.

David L. Parnas. Designing software for ease of extension and contraction. In *ICSE '78: Proceedings of the 3rd international conference on Software engineering*, pages 264–277, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 1978. IEEE Press. ISBN none.

D.L. Parnas, P.C. Clement, and D. M. Weiss. The modular structure of complex systems. In *International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 408–419, 1984.