

Seminar 1 – Assessment

Assessment for: Linus Mattsson

- Does the CM contain all the information needed by Soundgood?
 - It contains mostly all of the information required for the project. Some missing attributes we found was whether an instructor can teach ensembles, and which instruments an instructor could teach as this was not given for every instructor.
- Is it easy, that is a reasonable number of hops, to collect information related to all of the major entities (student, lesson, instructor, etc).
 - The hops between the entities are well defined and the model has a reasonable number of hops with clear names. Every hop is well defined and utilized in a simple and readable manner.
- Does the CM have a reasonable number of entities? Are important entities missing?
 - There is a reasonable number of entities, perhaps too few. For example, putting all of the information for all of the different types of lessons in one entity. It could be split up.
- Are there irrelevant entities, for example entities without attributes? Are there attributes for all data that shall be stored? Do all attributes have cardinality? Is the cardinality correct? Are the correct attributes marked as NOT NULL and/or UNIQUE?
 - There are no irrelevant entities, none without attributes. Almost all attributes have cardinality. For the attribute “level”, there are supposed to be three different tiers, not two.
 - The attributes are correctly marked as NOT NULL and UNIQUE, when it is necessary.
- Does the CM have a reasonable number of relations? Are important relations missing? Are there irrelevant relations? Do all relations have cardinality at both ends and name at least at one end?
 - The CM does have a reasonable number of relations; however, it could be considered if a relation between Instrument and Instructor could exist. All relations also have names at least one end.

- Are naming conventions followed? Are all names sufficiently explained?
 - Yes, entity and attribute names are well defined and clear. Nothing is confusing.

- Is the notation (UML or crow foot) correctly followed?
 - Yes, the crow foot notation is correctly followed in this model. For example, the model accurately shows that one student can attend many lectures.

- Are all business rules and constraints that are not visible in the diagram explained in plain text?
 - The payment and pricing are briefly explained in the report, but it would have helped if the model contained some comments alongside the financial entities to flesh out the data a bit more. A comment like “the instructor salary is calculated by keeping track of the lessons the instructor teaches...” would help to flesh out the model a bit.

- Is the method and result explained in the report? Is there a discussion? Is the discussion relevant?
 - Yes, the method and result are explained in the report.

Assessment for: Samia Serbouti

- Does the CM contain all the information needed by Soundgood?
 - Yes, the model covers all the essential information required by the school. The group thought about everything, a nitpick would be that the model should contain the roomID for each lesson.
- Is it easy, that is a reasonable number of hops, to collect information related to all of the major entities (student, lesson, instructor, etc).
 - Yes, the model has a reasonable number of hops between entities and the data is easily followed throughout the model.
- Does the CM have a reasonable number of entities? Are important entities missing?
 - The CM has a reasonable number of entities. No important entities are missing, but it could be considered if a “Booking” entity or something like it would be beneficial.
- Are there irrelevant entities, for example entities without attributes? Are there attributes for all data that shall be stored? Do all attributes have cardinality? Is the cardinality correct? Are the correct attributes marked as NOT NULL and/or UNIQUE?
 - Perhaps the “ContactPerson” entity is not necessary, it could be considered an attribute of another entity instead.
 - It could be considered if “Receipt” entities are necessary.
- Does the CM have a reasonable number of relations? Are important relations missing? Are there irrelevant relations? Do all relations have cardinality at both ends and name at least at one end?
 - Perhaps there could be a relation between instrument and instructor, but it may not be necessary.
- Are naming conventions followed? Are all names sufficiently explained?
 - Naming conventions are followed, good names are chosen for the entities as well as the relations. The name of attributes sufficiently explains what it does.
- Is the notation (UML or crow foot) correctly followed?
 - Yes, the model correctly follows the crow notation with some minor errors. I might be wrong, but in the model it shows that “one or many lessons can be assigned to one or many timeslots”. But each lesson has a unique lessonID. The model could instead show that each lesson is

assigned to only one timeslot, while each timeslot can accommodate multiple lessons. A roomID attribute would be useful here.

- Are all business rules and constraints that are not visible in the diagram explained in plain text?
 - Many of the things in the CM is explained in text, when it is not directly visible in the diagram.
- Is the method and result explained in the report? Is there a discussion? Is the discussion relevant?
 - Yes, the method and result are explained in the report.