CO510 Group Work – Stage 1
Feedback – Version 2018.01.09.01

There is no separate assessment mark for this stage but its achievement will contribute 10% of the final mark for the group assessment.

This feedback is provided to help each group maximise its achievement in subsequent stages so it is recommended that you review the comments and consider making relevant changes for work on future stages.

Feedback is provided under three areas.

Clarification of the requirement

Groups were expected to clarify the customer's requirements which, as given, were inadequate for creation of a UML use case diagram leading to a satisfactory implementation.

User stories

Groups were expected to provide 8 user stories in the correct style and format. The stories should contain a user requirement, details clarifying the requirement, and acceptance tests that would demonstrate fulfilment of the requirement.

Note that, at this early stage, the evaluation is confined to the way the stories have been written, rather than their accurate reflection of the requirements. For instance, a story about document access might not correctly represent the permissions requirements. In a real analysis, it would obviously be important for the stories to be accurate as well as correctly written, but we have not commented on that here.

UML Use case diagram

A use case diagram satisfying the major requirements of the system. While the diagram does not have to be complete, at this stage, the notation should have been used correctly and the diagram should accurately reflect the system being designed.

Examples of appropriate actors would be: Director, Manager, Reviewer, Employee, HR Employee.

Appropriate actor relationships might be that Manager and Director are specializations of Reviewer and HR Employee is a specialization of Employee.

Feedback

- Was clarification obtained from Miles? No

- User stories.

  - Sufficient provided? Yes

  - Contain the three elements? Yes

  - Written appropriately? Most of the stories try to cover too much ground. Have one story per document type, for instance. More detail is needed for the tests.

- Use case diagram.

  - Appropriate notation? I think you are confused between include and extend. For instance, the read use case should include getting permission and not extend it, and remaining in the current position might be extended by a salary increase recommendation.

  - Appropriate actors? Use singular nouns for actors: Manager rather than Managers, for instance. Annual Performance Review is not an actor.

  - Appropriate actor relationships? The generalisation arrow is the wrong way around for Reviewer.

  - Appropriate use cases? Be careful over wording; e.g., "Recommend dismissal" (clearly an action) rather than "Dismissal recommendation" (possibly a document).

  - All use cases have an actor? Yes

  - Use cases documented? The descriptions are not appropriate. For instance, if the pre-condition for creating a review is that the member of staff is due a review, then you cannot have as an alternative flow that they are not due a review. For creating a personal details record you have re-stated the pre-condition as if it was an action. For creating a probation record, the first event is really the pre-condition.

  - Adequate coverage of the system? Yes

  - Overall assessment:

Indicative mark (5/10)

The mark does not take into account either small group size or the issue of cards to group members. Such adjustments will be made in calculating the overall assessment mark.