KariAnn Harjo

ITSE 1450

Module 5 Case in Point 1

The Data Flow Diagram (DFD) presented in Figure 5-19 has several discernible errors when evaluated against standard DFD creation guidelines. One of the evident mistakes is the direct data flow between the "CLASS ROSTER" and "SEATING CHART" data stores. As a fundamental rule, data shouldn't flow directly between data stores without an intervening process. Another noticeable discrepancy is the "MEET WITH ADVISOR" process, which lacks a clear output, and the "CHECK OPEN CLASSES" process, which is missing a defined input. These oversights contravene the basic principle that every process should have both an input and an output.

Additionally, the flow between "INSTRUCTOR" and "CLASS ROSTER" is unlabeled, making it ambiguous. This breaks the rule that all data flows must be adequately labeled to describe the data being conveyed. The data store "GRADES" has a direct connection to the "STUDENT" entity, bypassing any mediating process, which is a deviation from standard practice. Lastly, while the "STUDENT" entity interacts with the system, it lacks a comprehensive input/output relationship with a specific process. The "CALCULATE GRADE" process also seems to be devoid of a clear input, though it does provide an output to "GRADES." Summing it up, junior analysts should pinpoint at least six issues in this DFD, underlining the importance of adhering to DFD conventions for clarity and accuracy.