|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Team Being Reviewed: Group 11 – G. Sanikommu and M. Kumar | | | | | Date: 11/27/17 |
| Reviewer: Jason Hansen | | | | |  |
| Category for Review  *(Rate the work presented based on the criteria stated below)* | Needs Improvement | Criteria Achieved | Mastered | Comments  *(If you rated any category less than “Mastered”, you need to explain why and be specific with your explanations so that the authors can correct the deficiencies based on your comments)* | |
| **Overall Project Requirements** | | | |  | |
| * Did the models adequately define the scope of the project? Listing what is and what is not included so that no confusion applies when reviewing the models? |  | X |  | Some minor things could have been added to better define the system (login), but, for the most part, the parts that are unique to this project were covered. | |
| * Did the models, in concert with the JBGE analysis, accurately represent the problem space? |  |  | X | With a few minor things missing, it does a good enough job of presenting the problem space. | |
| * Did the document overall properly present the model to the client and to developers? |  |  | X | Well enough that the client should be able to understand what the system will do and the developers should have enough to complete a majority of the system. | |
| **JBGE Analysis** | | | |  | |
| * JBGE Process   Did the team demonstrate an understanding of the JBGE concept and process? Did they apply the agile values and principles properly? |  |  | X | For the most part they did a good job. I might have skipped the CRUDE analysis and some of the CRC cards and done a Sequence Diagram for the login, but I think everyone will approach the problem differently. | |
| * Quality of the JBGE analysis.   Is the JBGE analysis sufficient/appropriate? (In other words: did their JBGE analysis result in information important to developers or other stakeholders being lost?) |  | X |  | I think there was some information lost in the login process, how to handle invalid payment, and in how the handling of making an appointment for a plane or instructor when the plane, instructor, or both are not available. | |
| **Functional Models** | | | |  | |
| * Use Case Diagram drawn properly?   Is the diagram “syntax” correct? - Are proper symbols used to define actors, use cases and the relationships between and among the two? Are the labels adequate and proper? (Use cases should be verb phrases so that combining actor and use case, a logical noun-verb phrase can be stated eg: Customer selects product to purchase) |  | X |  | All relationships and symbols appear to be correct. Use case labels could be more clear. Instead of single word labels, should have at least two words. Actor labels are good. | |
| * Use Case Diagram complete?   Is scope properly identified? Does the diagram include or cover all of the problem space? |  | X |  | While the problem space seems to be covered, I feel that some of the connections between the use cases are missing. It seems like there should be some relationship shown between the login, reservation, payment, and manage schedule use cases. There is enough for someone who knows what the new system entails, but may be lacking for someone new to the system. | |
| * Use Case Descriptions properly formatted?   (Don’t be overly detailed in your requirement here – did they name the use cases, provide for traceability, state initial and post conditions, and properly list normal, sub-, and exceptional flows appropriately?) |  |  | X | Some of the steps were a little confusing/duplicated, but still good. The payment use case description is missing a section for billing for the plane rental. | |
| * Use Case Descriptions complete?   Have they followed their JBGE analysis/plan? Did they cover all of the use cases with descriptions where needed? |  |  | X | Met their JBGE plan and covered all the major use cases. | |
| * Activity Diagrams properly drawn?   Has proper syntax been followed? Perfect is not the goal but complete information must be properly communicated. |  | X |  | Layout for Reservation Diagram could use some work and branches are missing choice labels. | |
| * Activity Diagrams sufficient?   Have they followed the JGBE analysis and completely covered what you see as all of the complexity requiring explanation with their set of Activity Diagrams? |  |  | X | Followed their JBGE plan and provided adequate number of diagrams. | |
| **Structural Models** | | | |  | |
| * Do the CRC cards (if needed – JBGE – and presented) sufficiently identify and specify the classes? Do all CRC cards produced have a corresponding class on the class diagram? |  |  | X | Provided CRC cards listed in JBGE and each class on the class diagram had a CRC card. However, if I remember correctly, the concrete classes that are part of an abstract class should only have the attributes listed on their CRC card that are not part of the abstract class. | |
| * Balancing   Are all classes, attributes, operations (methods), and relationships identified in the class diagram and CRC cards justified by the problem description and functional models? |  | X |  | All classes, attributes, operations, and relationships appear to be justified. It does appear that a few attributes might be missing (Instructor’s pilot number, plane tail number, payment type, etc). | |
| * Class Diagram correctness   Does the class diagram use proper “syntax” or notation? Are all symbols used in the diagram used correctly? And completely? |  |  | X | Only thing I’m not sure of is the black diamond symbol as I’m not quite sure how it is used. Good job on this! | |
| * Object Diagram   If used, is it used properly? Does it use proper notation? Does it convey useful information? Does it match (balance with) the class diagram? |  | X |  | It is used properly with proper notation. It differs from the class diagram in that the aircraft attaches to the Instructor on the Object Diagram and to the Reservation on the Class Diagram | |
| **Behavioral Models** | | | |  | |
| * Communications Diagrams completeness   Are there sufficient diagrams present to explain complexity of the system and properly communicate all of the necessary information to the developers? (Per the JBGE analysis) |  |  | X | Appear to be complete. May need to include attributes for some but does not affect the readability of the diagram. | |
| * Communications Diagram correctness   Do the diagrams use the proper notation? Do they balance with the class diagram and object diagram(s)? Do all messages have a corresponding relationship on the class diagram? |  |  | X | Used proper notation and all messages have matching relationship on class diagram. | |
| * Sequence Diagrams completeness   Are there sufficient diagrams present to explain complexity of the system and properly communicate all of the necessary information to the developers? (Per the JBGE analysis) |  | X |  | Adequate information provided for the payment and reservation system. May want to add one for the login and account creation process so that the developers know how you’d like this part handled. | |
| * Sequence Diagram correctness   Do the diagrams use the proper notation? Do they balance with the class diagram and object diagram(s)? Do all messages have a corresponding relationship on the class diagram? | X |  |  | Only suggestion is for the Reservation Sequence Diagram. You may want to put the plane before the instructor availability check since there is no guarantee that an instructor will be booked. Also, on the same diagram, you mention a pilot and I don’t know if this is the instructor or customer. | |
| * State transition diagrams completeness   Are there sufficient diagrams present to explain complexity of the system and properly communicate all of the necessary information to the developers? (Per the JBGE analysis) | X |  |  | On the Reservation BSM, might want to go back to the start if the plane or instructor is not available. If not, each time they try to change their reservation, and either is not available, it will kick them out of the reservation system and make them start over. Same for the Payment BSM. If the payment or booking ID is not verified, need someway to handle this. | |
| * State Transition Diagram correctness   Do the diagrams use the proper notation? Do they properly and completely explain the management of the state of the class to which they correspond? Do they balance with the class diagram and object diagram(s)? |  | X |  | All notation and balancing is good. See above note about management. | |
| * CRUDE (or at least CRUD) analysis   Does the analysis communicate useful information? Does it cover the class diagram completely? (If required by JBGE analysis) |  |  | X | Looks good! | |
| Strengths of the team’s model presentation include: Written in a very professional manner with page numbers and an index. Contains a good amount of information that will go a long way to helping develop the reservation system. I think they did a very good job for their first time conducting a system analysis and design project. | | | | | |
| Suggestions for improving the team’s model presentation include: Needs work on consistency (Figure numbers referenced in writing are different than those on the figures), some work on grammar, and flow of writing. Nothing too major. Some of the figures were a little hard too read. | | | | | |