## Peer Evaluation by Group 4

# Group 2 [ 89/90 ]

### Section 1 [ 9/9 ]

* The team has the knowledge and understanding of their problem domain

They Fully understand what is the problem they are dealing with - or we are all dealing with - productivity management. And they are trying to provide a tool for that.

* CSR written from customer’s; it describes the problem that needs to be solved

They didn’t talk about how to achieve it in a software level, instead, they talked what problem should be dealt with from the customer’s view.

* Glossary is adequate defined.

### Section 2 [ 6/6 ]

* Requirements statements are enumerated.

It tells all the things users will do in user stories. The weight is perfectly arranged.

* The On-Screen Appearance requirements derived from the needs of users, and it matched the system requirements.
* The requirements are specific enough to illustrate what kind of problems they are dealing with.
* Requirements are testable. For example, view emails, writing notes, creating tasks, etc. They are all testable and very specific.
* The priority weight was designed properly.
* They even have a paragraph to explain how the priority weights from. That is a good point.

### Section 3 [ 30/30 ]

* They defined the stakeholders properly. Taking the examples of them, they used students, professors and TA for stakeholders.
* They also extend the stakeholders to a wider level - school faculty and companies.
* The actors they defined are specific and clearly, including which APIs they will use and what functions the APIs will provide.
* UC's named are verb phrases.

For example they use Notes Taking and Reviewing, Slack Team Communication and so on.

* UC is consistent with system requirements.
* UC's listed the associated actors; actor types (relative to UC's) are defined.
* Use cases are described clearly. And all of them can be achieved and tested.
* Format for fully-dressed/detailed UC's is followed.
* Scenario steps are very clearly. The flow of events is stated very clear and with much detail.
* Formatting of fully-dressed UC's is consistent.
* Detailed use cases are not duplicated - they are very clearly used for different functions and no inappropriate overlap.
* Use cases describe what happens *inside* the system, instead of focusing on what happens on the *boundary* of the system

For example, they illustrated how the system would request or feedback what kind of information from where for what.

* Terms they used here are explained in glossary.
* Entry/exit conditions (or preconditions, postconditions) stated.

They specified when the system would request a Destroy function based on the Exit behavior of the user.

* They focused on the key functions of the system.

How to use widgets and how to use the tools for the productivity dashboards.

* UC diagram were described in narrative.
* UC diagram is consistent with the use case descriptions.
* Traceability matrix are provided based on the system requirements and use cases.
* System sequence diagrams are consistent with the corresponding scenarios in use case description.

### Section 4 [ 15/15 ]

* Interfaces are explained with detailed use instructions.
* Different parts of the system are described vividly.
* Easy to see how the user interface will support the execution of your use cases.
* User effort estimation does appear to represent a typical usage scenario.
* Terms are defined in glossary.

### Section 5 [ 25/25 ]

* Domain concepts matched use cases or system requirements.
* Concepts and concepts name were chosen properly.

They used concepts like Widgets, Dashboard Controller and Authentication Handler, which are phases.

* They have defined the protocol to communicate with other systems.
* They have traceability matrix to indicate the relationship of Use Case and Domain Concepts.
* Concepts in their domain are illustrated clearly and easy to understand, even though the concept itself might be a little bit tricky.
* Terms are defined in glossary.

### Section 6 [ 5/5 ]

* They have a table for different milestones in different stages.
* They have divided their project into different parts according to different functions, which were easy for them to breakdown the project and setting the time for it.
* They have text explanation for their future work.

### Section 7 [ -1/-5 ]

* Only URL without a title shown
* They used official documents, which is reliable.

For example, they used diagram from creately, where I guess is the place they drew most of their diagrams.