Comments

Section A: MCQ - feedback not provided.

The following is feedback for the second question on the first semester exam for Software engineering, unit COMP23420. For ease of reading, I have split this up into feedback for each question.

Question 2a

The question was related to spotting unnecessary activities in the given activity diagram. This question was generally answered well, with most answers identifying that the 'prepare for interview' and 'fill in application' activities are not needed as they are outside the scope of the system. Incorrect answers were generally due to the following:

•Only giving one unnecessary activity when two were required for the full four marks.
•Answering with activities that are needed for the activity diagram to be correct, displaying a lack of awareness of the difference between activities within and outside of the scope of the system.

Question 2b

This question was related to identifying missing activities from the activity diagram. This question was not as well answered as the first, with common problems being as follows:

•Only giving one missing activity when two were required for full marks.
•Incorrectly identifying flow problems as activity problems. A common example of this was citing the 'contact student 3 times' flow as the missing activity where the actual missing activity in this case was 'call for interview'. This is the core difference between an activity and the flow through the diagram.
•Some answers correctly identified the missing parts, but did not provide quotes from the scenario to back up their answers, a requirement that is clearly stated in the question.

Question 2c

This question was concerned with identifying the missing flow in the diagram and the quality of answers were generally related to how good the answers were to question 2b. Those answers that correctly identified the missing activities in the previous question tended to understand the difference between an activity and flow. Common problems with this question were:

•Only giving one example of missing flow through the diagram when two were required for full marks.
•Not understanding the use of flow in an activity diagram. This included naming missing activities instead of flow issues.
•Not providing accompanying quotes to support answers as required by the question. A common instance of this involved answers having drawings of new versions of how the flow should look; Whilst these diagrams were often correct, they had not followed the instructions given in the question. As the answers to questions 2b and 2c are closely related (in both cases, good examples of the missing flow in part 2c were directly related to the two main missing activities in part 2b), answers that noted this and had provided the relevant quotes in part 2b were given the marks.

Question 2d

This question was probably the one with the poorest answers. Common reasons for incorrect answers were:

•A commonly given incorrect answer was concerns over what happens to candidates who did not respond after being contacted three times. The scenario declared them as being flagged as 'unresponsive', this is sufficient.
•Giving trivial implementation issues that are too fine grained as an answer. Details such as "get supervisor's name" and "details of phd" are not necessary in the context of an activity diagram. These would be concerns further down the line of the system implementation, but not at this point.
•Answers including 'store <information> to database'. Again, this is too fine grained for an activity diagram.

Question 2e

The final question requested 3 use cases from the given scenario. Common mistakes included:

•Giving answers that were too fine grained. The most common example of this was giving "offer student position" or "not give offer" as a use case. Both of these answers would be part of the "notify student" use case, and would make up the two different flows given in the use case.
•Another example of a common answer that was too fine grained was "store information in database". Again, this is not enough for a use case and is really an implementation detail.
•A number of marks were lost for not giving the correct actors for the use cases. Often, answers only provided one actor, when there was usually between 3-4 necessary.

Q3: Not many students answered this question, but of those that did, most gave very good answers. One minor fault: some relations (associations) have no directions.