|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Team Being Reviewed: Group One | | | | | Date: |
| Reviewer:Kyle Felker | | | | | 11/27/17 |
| 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** |  |  | |
| * Did the models, in concert with the JBGE analysis, accurately represent the problem space? |  |  | X |  | |
| * Did the document overall properly present the model to the client and to developers? |  |  | X |  | |
| **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** |  | |
| * 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** |  | It explains general principles, but there were places I had questions that it didn’t answer, for example, why do a communication diagram for some things but a sequence diagram for others? | |
| **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 minor errors: inclusion arrows are supposed to be dotted, association lines are not supposed to be arrows and are supposed to have asterisks. But it doesn’t impede understanding of the diagram. | |
| * Use Case Diagram complete?   Is scope properly identified? Does the diagram include or cover all of the problem space? |  |  | X |  | |
| * 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 |  | |
| * Use Case Descriptions complete?   Have they followed their JBGE analysis/plan? Did they cover all of the use cases with descriptions where needed? |  | X |  | Their naming is not consistent, and this is a problem throughout the document, making it hard to cross-verify the diagrams. | |
| * Activity Diagrams properly drawn?   Has proper syntax been followed? Perfect is not the goal but compelte information must be properly communicated. |  |  | X |  | |
| * 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 |  | Some of the use-cases, like “perform admin tasks,” have alternatives and sub flows, but are not modeled with activity diagrams. | |
| **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 | Not really sure these were even needed-most of the information can be gleaned from the object diagram | |
| * 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 |  |  | Not everything balances. For example, there’s a reference to a user profile database” object in the communication diagrams that’s not represented on the object diagram. As noted before, naming consistency is very poor throughout the document, making it unclear what corresponds to what. | |
| * 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 diagram isn’t hierarchical-association relationships should be parallel, inheritance relationships should be vertical. | |
| * 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 |  | It matches, but I don’t see that this was needed-their object model is very simple. | |
| **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 |  | |
| * 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 database class that appears here that is nowhere else in any of the diagrams. | |
| * 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 |  | |
| * 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 |  | |
| * 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 |  | |
| * 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 |  | |
| * 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 |  | |
| Strengths of the team’s model presentation include: I thought the idea of wrapping billing into the reservation object was very clever. | | | | | |
| Suggestions for improving the team’s model presentation include: Better consistency in naming, and the document needed more balancing than it got. | | | | | |