# Critique Report — BS2-8-2’s Artifact 3-4, Impact Mapping & Product Backlog for Automatic Time Table Creation

# Prepared by

**BS2-8-4 group** (Roman Solovev, Kusal KC, Zuhair Abbas, Amadey Kuspakov)

# Reference Links

**Impact Mapping** (Presentation + Report)

[https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1-65zj52SpDxYP59kz9m7lWDGEBT1UcdAwGLHGNKN550](https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1-65zj52SpDxYP59kz9m7lWDGEBT1UcdAwGLHGNKN550/edit#slide=id.g50829c1ec9_0_77)

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1D2j3ThV5P_VM6hDSIVJCdJQ3ALclvDoCVsbbg5Wkpac>

**INVEST + Backlog** (Presentation + Report)

[https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1XLkd0celJsdThscxRhWKtntJaK-eohsMy1HsXH-wAjI](https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1XLkd0celJsdThscxRhWKtntJaK-eohsMy1HsXH-wAjI/edit#slide=id.g523bd40cd8_0_77)

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/15SqmRp2ertH4s3NyxbYaMBJ0lSLwgEkAKeKl6ej3ibM](https://docs.google.com/document/d/15SqmRp2ertH4s3NyxbYaMBJ0lSLwgEkAKeKl6ej3ibM/edit#heading=h.gjdgxs)

# Artifact 3: Impact Mapping

## Strengths

1. The Impact Map, along with the presentation, is clean and well-designed. They are easy to read and not cluttered with heavy text or figures.
2. The information presented in the Impact Map are both relevant and precise. They really did a good job keeping information to the point. There aren’t any extra, unnecessary information, so the reader gets exactly what they are looking for.
3. Reflection analysis is detailed and well-explained. They pointed out both strengths and weaknesses of Impact Mapping and stated how it is going to be helpful for them.

## Weaknesses

1. The number of impacts they included for each user type are low and expressed in a rather minimalistic manner.

If possible, more impacts can be added to give more clarity to each user’s role. Existing impacts can be detailed more as well.


1. Impacts are not clearly distinguished whether they are positive ones or negative ones. This distinction is an important aspect for analyzing how different users can affect the system mechanics.
2. Impact Mapping reflection report says they set the so-called SMART goal; however, it isn’t justified in presentation anywhere. It would be better if they stated how they applied the SMART technique to come up with the current goal.
3. Grammatical inconsistencies are very common throughout the reports and presentation, sometimes even leading to ambiguity. Consider the following extract from their file:

“Criterion of achievement: Mean amount of time spending on creating timetable decrease at least on 20%.”

They probably mean “decrease to 20%”. But, again, 20% of what? Do they mean “20% **of** **existing** mean time”??

## Recommended Actions

1. Consider many options whenever applicable: this allows for comparisons so as to pick the most apt one, instead of flatly considering just one choice. Consider following extract:



There, most likely, are several ways to evaluate the defined metric(s), but they chose just this one. It is better if they also showed what other ways were available to them, and if they chose this from others, then maybe give a justification as to what led them to choose this.

1. Maybe use spellcheckers and/or tools like **Grammarly** to ensure correct usage and clear sentences so as to relay what you wanted to express more accurately, without leading to any ambiguity.

# Artifact 4: INVEST + Backlog, User Stories

## Strengths

1. Again, information is short and to the point. Their documents are clean and show only the relevant details; there is virtually no information bloating.
2. Most of the INVEST criteria were defined in a clear and very distinguished, atomic manner.
3. The backlog is really effective and practical. For example, the mention of JIT (Just-in-time) methodology; this is how things work in real world—most of the time, we do not need to go into details in advance and just need to carry on with what’s available and needed at the time.


## Weaknesses

1. Certain parts are rather vague and do not specifically justify the context. Consider the following extract from INVEST criteria:



This is self-conflicting—the first part “should not be concise” and the second part “not overburdened with details” are opposing. If it is not to be overburdened with details, it implies that it has to be concise and vice-versa.

1. Some parts seemed rather inconsistent. See below an extract of a user story taken from their report:



Isn’t the whole point of having an automated time table creation app requiring no intermediaries? The application system should collect the professors’/TAs’ preferences **itself** and not through DoE staff. If DoE collects them, how is it different from existing approach?

## Recommended Actions

1. It is recommended that the backlog, which is now in tabulated format, be presented with a visual structuring *as well*, probably using a mind-map tool. Tabulated form looks rather congested and wordy; it’s easier to understand and remember visually grouped structures.
2. Try avoiding vague terms/details, or rephrasing them, to ensure the text relays what it is meant to. Consider this extract below:



It’s unclear here what they mean by “in terms of solution details”. If such terms were to be used, better explain what they mean from your perspective (here, for instance, say what you mean by “solution details”).

# Conclusion

The strongest aspects are cleanliness, relevancy, and preciseness in their reports. The weakest parts are grammatical inconsistencies and some vague expressions. With the use of right tools, their reports will be more effective.