|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Team Being Reviewed: Group 6 | | | | | Date: 11/25/17 |
| Reviewer: Jie Tao | | | | |  |
| 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** | | | The scope of the project is defined well and completely.  Only the user requirements are classified by actors, which leads to some duplicate user cases. | |
| * Did the models, in concert with the JBGE analysis, accurately represent the problem space? | X | | | There are only minor vague points.   1. Non student type can hire instructor on the bias of plane model 2. No assumption or description for pilots or customers canceling reservation. | |
| * Did the document overall properly present the model to the client and to developers? | X | | | To the client, it will be hard to read or match user case with user requirements. And some charts or tables are lack of description. | |
| **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 |  | Mostly done well. They might reduce the number of CRC cards and merge some user case description together for some simple classes or related user cases. | |
| * 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 | Mostly done well. They can give more information about why these diagrams are enough for developers or clients. Not only on the point of keeping system completeness. | |
| **Funcitonal Models** | | | |  | |  |  |
| * Use Case Diagram drawn properly?   Is the diagram “syntax” correct? - are proper symbols used to define actors, usecases 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 |  | Some user cases do not start with verb: Login & Registration, reservation, planes management, client tracking or license management.  Some tringle relationships: Browse for reservation availability, Reservation and manage reservation.  A little confuse: why logbook&payment management includes license management | |
| * Use Case Diagram complete?   Is scope properly identified? Does the diagram include or cover all of the problem space? |  |  | X | A minor confusion: planes management seems should include manage plane information and plane schedule. | |
| * 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 | Well done. | |
| * Use Case Descriptions complete?   Have they followed their JBGE analysis/plan? Did they cover all of the use cases with descriptions where needed? |  |  | X | Well done. | |
| * Activity Diagrams properly drawn?   Has proper syntax been followed? Perfect is not the goal but compelte information must be properly communicated. |  | X |  | These two activity diagrams are trying to combine the different seniors together. E.g. login, update information, verify and create/ update reservation together. Which could lead to the confusion for the developers. | |
| * Activity Diagrams sufficient?   Have they followed the JGBE analysis and competely covered what you see as all of the complexity requiring explanantion with their set of Activity Diagrams? |  |  | X | [the characters are too vague, I can only guess]  what if pilot or plane changes their plan if the date has been reserved. | |
| **Structural Models** | | | |  | |  |  |
| * Do the CRC cards (if needed – JBGE – and presented) sufficently identify and specify the classes? Do all CRC cards produced have a corresponding class on the class diagram? |  |  | X | User is an 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 |  | Cannot find user case “manage reservations” which create or update a reservation. | |
| * Class Diagram correctness   Does the class diagram use proper “syntax” or notation? are all symbols used in the diagram used correctly? And completely? |  |  | X | The relationship between customer/instructor and airmen\_certification shouldn’t be many-many relationship. | |
| * Object Diagram   If used, is it used properly? Does it use proper notation? Does it convey useful informaition? Does it match (balance with) the class diagram? |  |  | X | align with 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 | Align with sequence 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 correcsponding relationship on the class diagram? |  | X |  | There is a “reservation System” which didn’t exist in the function model or 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 | Align with activity diagram. But I think it is better to split some flows into different sequence diagram in the variety scenarios. | |
| * 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 correcsponding relationship on the class diagram? |  | X |  | * There is an actor named “system” which didn’t exist in the function model * There is an action “CertificationUpdate” after payment, but no explanation. * Instructor& instructor schedule should be two objects as well as plane&plane schedule | |
| * 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 |  | I am not sure about this state transition diagram. In my mind,  the state machine is used for an object not for a process. We might figure out which object in what kind of states when something triggers it. Typically, in the design stage, it will be an attribute in spec objects. | |
| * State Transition Diagram correctness   Do the diagrams use the proper notation? Do they properly and compeltely 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 |  |  | The states should be a group of states of an object. It cannot be a process or an action. | |
| * CRUDE (or at least CRUD) analysis   Does the analysis communicate useful information? Does it cover the class diagram completely? (if requried by JBGE analysis) |  |  | X | CRUD table shows “read” between customer and instructor/admin, but the relationship didn’t exist in the class diagram. Or it might be not read. | |
| Strengths of the team’s model presentation include:   1. Detail and logical user requirements, which is easy for the client and develop to understand the whole picture. 2. A good assumption gives a good support for the following analysis. 3. Clear user case diagram and user case description, balanced with user requirements 4. User CRUDE to check the diagram | | | | | |
| Suggestions for improving the team’s model presentation include:   1. The balance between behavior diagram and function diagram 2. Improve state machine. 3. Make Active diagram readable 4. Give some simple description for each part, while the clients or developers can understand the diagram or table quickly. | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |