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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Comments** | **mark** | **Out of** |
| Overview, product description and system boundaries | **Overall this is clear enough. Some of the system boundaries are not really very appropriate though, for example, elderly customers not knowing how to use an online system is not a system boundary definition. What exactly is the boundary here? Are you going to prevent elderly customers from using the system So have a think about these and redefine clearer ‘system’ boundaries for the final report (go back and review what these really mean)** | **4** | **5** |
| Requirements (functional and quality) and stakeholders. Mapping of use case diagram to requirements, and ranking. | **I think the first fitness criteria listed as part of the functional requirements involved with student registration are really ‘business rules’. Otherwise, overall the functional requirement list is described at about the correct level for this exercise and document.**  **As a set of example quality requirements, then those listed are reasonable.**  **A fair effort with the overall use case diagram. Some of those in the illustration are a little vague, and overall I think there could have been a little closer mapping to the functional requirements listed (or perhaps some use cases not reflected in the functional requirements).**  **The ranking is reasonable.** | **8** | **10** |
| Textual use cases (x 3) | **Use case #1**  **The first thing to say is that use cases at this level should not involve any UI specific language, and this includes reference to web pages. Whereas the activity diagrams are intended to model business processes, these use cases are meant to reflect an actor interacting with a software system, so ‘phoning the office’ is not appropriate. Before ‘entering’ any data, the actor should be ‘prompted’ to enter specific data by the system (this is not the case for step 2). Step 4a is not really an extension point as it is naturally part of the main scenario – extension points should denote alternative work-flows. Extension point 9a is a valid extension point, but you should indicate the alternative path now takes place rather than leaving it hanging.**  **Use case #2**  **The main issue with this is that it is really describing an existing business work-flow between student and staff member (so would be better described as an activity diagram). The idea of the use case is a sequence of interactions between a single user and the system. So perhaps there is still some misunderstanding.**  **Use case #3**  **A similar comment – it needs to be described in terms of language whereby a single actor is interacting with a system i.e., the system prompts for information and the actor enters it (and the system can assess and take alternative paths)**  **Overall, the use cases have a reasonable structures, but you need to be clearer on the distinction of an existing work-flow that should be modelled (as requirements) using activity diagrams, and a series of system/actor interactions.** | **6** | **10** |
| Business process and activity diagrams (x 3) | **Activity diagram #1**  **Is generally good and clearly reflects a business process. Note that really the idea of an activity diagram for requirements is to map to an existing business process rather than a proposed interaction with a software system. I make a general note about this below.**  **Activity diagram #2**  **The title is wrong because this does not involve allocating a trainer (which was done as part of P1). In terms of this activity model the ’check the form’ activity is probably superfluous, but otherwise overall this is good.**  **Activity diagram #3**  **The work-flow seems a little back to front as the actual ‘take the test’ activity is before the guard that 35 days have been completed (so this doesn’t make sense to me). Otherwise, the overall intention is intuitive, and overall you do seem to have grasped the activity diagram models.**  **So overall, you just have to remember that as part of a requirements phase activity diagrams are really attempting to model the existing rather than the ‘proposed’ process of a new software system.**  **I appreciate that the specification stated that the business processes should be *related* to the software system, and in a sense that is true, but as a requirements technique they should only reflect the existing process that ultimately might become integral to the new system rather than a prediction of how the new system might operate. So this is a slight misinterpretation of the phrasing in the specification, but I have taken this into account with regard to the provisional marking.** | **8** | **10** |
| Validation plan | **For the purposes of this document the list of acceptance tests is reasonable** | **5** | **5** |
| **Total** |  | **31** | **40** |

**Note that all numeric marks are merely provisional and subject to moderation and external examiner scrutiny.**

**The requirements document component is weighted as 20 per cent of the module assessment.**