**MARIA STRIKI EVALUATIONS**

**REPORT 1: Part 1 + Part 2 + Part 3**

**Section**

**Customer Stated Reqs (9 points)**

Problem Statement: (5points) Glossary: (4 points)

**System Reqs (6 points)**

Functional Reqs Specs (2) Non-Functional Reqs Specs (2) UI Reqs (2)

**Functional Reqs Specs (30 points)**

Stakeholders/Actors/Goals (2) Use Case casual description (8 points) Use Case diagram (5 points)

Use case Full Description (10 points) System Sequence Diagrams (5 points)

**User Interface (15 points)**

Preliminary Design (11 points) Effort Estimation (4 points)

**Domain Model (25 points)**

Concepts (10 points) Associations (5 points) Attributes (5 points) Contracts (5 points)

**Plan of Work (5 points)**

**References (-5 points)**

**GROUP 1:**

An excellent, concrete, and honest effort. The Use Case Diagrams and Domain Modeling are a little simplistic but this is so just because of the inherent nature of the system and because of the fact that the students are simulating part of what can be a “fully-dressed” home automation system. There is only an issue with the Domain Modeling, your section 5.1.1. with the definition of concepts and their classification to knowing (K) or doing (D). I do not completely agree with how the (K) and (D) has been attributed to a number of concepts. For example, “Get all User Information” should be a (D) not a (K), and so on and so forth. But other than that, the work of this team has been very detailed, complete, and well-put together. Congratulations.

**Note**: You are also very well addressing the paragraph on your own unique innovation or incremental contribution I asked for. Thank you!

**Points**: 9 (Cust. Reqs) + 6 (Sys Reqs)+ 25 (Func Reqs Specs) + 15 (UI) + 22 (Dom. Model) + 5 (PoW) = 82/90 points

**Project Management + Table of Contexts**: 8/10 points

**Total Points**: 90/100

* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

**GROUP 5:**

Another excellent and concrete effort with technical detail that is necessary without becoming overwhelming. The “customer”/reader can feel confidence about the work conducted, plan of work, and about if group 5 are meeting their requirements. So, this is an exemplary document about how a SE documentation should be written.

You are missing some helpful detail here on your UI (perhaps you did not get around to starting the design yet) and you are missing the table of context. Although your contribution to Report 1: Part 1 + Part 2 was excellent and you practically got 40/40 for this effort, I feel that you did not make the same amount on effort for Report 1: Part 2 (remaining of) + Part 3. I would like to see a more evolved state of your UI for example. Also, please for next time, I would like a more detailed breakdown of responsibilities….

**Note**: You are also addressing adequately and convincingly the paragraph on your own unique innovation or incremental contribution I asked for. Thank you!

**Points**: 9 (Cust. Reqs) + 6 (Sys Reqs) + 30 (Func Reqs Specs) + 6 (UI) + 24 (Dom. Model) + 5 (PoW) = 80/90 points

**Project Management + Table of Context**: 4/10 points

**Total Points**: 84/100

* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

**GROUP 6:**

Yet another excellent presentation even though it’s missing a couple of sections. You are addressing adequately and convincingly the paragraph on your own unique innovation or incremental contribution I asked for. What I like best here in comparison to all reports I’ve read is how smartly you transition from having almost 20 requirements to only a couple of Use Cases. So, your design in this manner, appears to be not only complete and technically sound, but also practical. Moreover, you present your work to the “customer”/reader very well, the level of technical detail is sufficient without becoming inundating. You present correct Full dressed use case tables, sequence diagrams and domain modeling. You forgot to address the section of “Use Case Casual Description”. Although casual …. it is not to be omitted. An introduction and a guideline to all the use cases and fully dressed use case table that are going to be presented is more than essential. This is where you put the thrust of your effort to give the reader an the complete vision of what your system accomplishes and how external actors contribute to it, without forcing the reader to go blindly into reading the fully dressed tables. First, one needs to understand the high level of how you are addressing the problem before getting into the details. Otherwise, fully dressed use cases and use case tables become pointless and without perspective. So please make sure you complete this section. Your Sequence diagram is a little simplistic, I think you are missing some detail here. You are trying to address all use cases with one diagram but I think there are nested states here that require separate or more detailed manipulation. Your UI diagram has been illustrated without any helping introduction, escorting description. Your domain model analysis appears to be technically sound and well documented. And so is your plan of work.

**Points**: 9 (Cust. Reqs) + 6 (Sys Reqs) + 22 (Func Reqs Specs) + 6 (UI) + 30 (Dom. Model) + 5 (P oW) = 78/90 points

**Project Management + Individual Contr + Table of Context**: 6/10 points

**Total Points**: 84/100

--- - - - - - -- - - - -- - -- - -- -- --

**GROUP 3:**

Another excellent and concrete effort with adequate technical detail. I like the fact that you clearly state what your incremental contribution to a very popular project like this can be. I particularly enjoyed your initiative to map colors to complexity weights. This makes the document easy to read and even … pleasant. This is an exemplary document about how a SE documentation should be written. Your use cases are adequate and appear to be addressing the problem completely. You have done excellent work with your Use Case and Sequence Diagrams, as well as with your User Interface. Excellent work on fully dressed use case tables. You are still missing a description or reference to the non-functional requirements and you are not providing a detailed merit of contributions. Who did what in your group? And something else. You have complex and multiple use cases to work on. Do you think you have enough time to work on and demo all that you are proposing? Your plan of work requires more fine grade analysis and furthermore you need to identify the corresponding contribution from each member of your team. Arrows to/from main scenario are missing in the events descriptions within your fully dressed use case tables. You’re missing description of the non-functional requirements and you need more work on your casual use cases description.

**Points**: 9 (Cust. Reqs) + 2 (Sys Reqs) + 25 (Func Reqs Specs) + 11 (UI) + 25 (Dom. Model) + 3 (PoW) = 77/90 points

**Project Management + Table of Context**: 6/10 points

**Total Points**: 81/100

* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -- -- -

**GROUP 8:**

You made a good effort catching up from last time. Your problem statement and glossary is very good and really improved from last time. You are also addressing the issue of what novelty or incremental contribution you are adding on, which is very important.

Your functional requirements section is not put together very well though. I think you have confused this with the Actors Contribution for Use Cases. For the FULL REPORT 1 please try to address this issue. Read more carefully about functional requirements and address your functional requirements better. Moreover, your manipulation of the Casual Use Cases Description is a little … too laconic. The point here is to give the customer/reader the vision and a thorough understanding of what you are trying to do and why, before one delves into the details contained in the Fully Dressed Use Cases Description. So, for the Full Report 1, please try to address the casual description of use cases a little more carefully. Your non-functional requirements are a little lacking as well. You need to elaborate on them. They are all correct and valid but you must give some justification why you selected to work on these particular NFR. For example, why is number 7 a quality requirement? Why do you need to collect data … during this semester? Please try to make your document more user friendly.

Your Fully Dressed Use Case table appear complete and technically sound. You are missing the arrows back and forth from the main scenario though.

Your Sequence Diagrams are very detailed and correct. Well done!

Your domain analysis luckily contains a number of valid, seemingly correct diagrams and this is why you were able to get most of the grades for this part. However, please not that you should write down in the form of a table the exact concepts you are using, and to which category they belong to, the corresponding associations and attributes, and their description (exactly as described in Dr Marsic’s textbook). Please try to address this issue when finalizing Report1 Full.

You lost some marks from UI as well, because in your write up it is not conveyed that you have placed a lot of consideration on the design. This is just a print screen from google maps without any more detail on how you will implement the additional functionalities you are proposing. Please try to work on this not only for Report 1 Full but for your upcoming demo as well.

You are one of the few groups that clearly stated each group member’s contributions and this is a considerable pros. I am looking forward to your Full Report, after addressing the issues discussed.

**Points**: 8 (Cust. Reqs) + 3 (Sys Reqs) + 25 (Func Reqs Specs) + 5 (UI) + 14 (Dom. Model) + 3 (PoW) = 58/90 points

**Project Management + Individual Contribution + Table of Context**: 8/10 points

**Total Points**: 66/100

* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -- -- -

**GROUP 9:**

Your problem statement is ok although your contribution seems to be minimally incremental. Even in this case, you could have made your introduction a bit more engaging. So please focus on refining your problem statement further for writing Report 1 Full. Your glossary is very good. Although your Casual Use Cases presentation appears adequate, then in your analysis you are presenting fewer Use Cases than expected. Your Use Case diagrams are more simplistic than the complexity of the problem. And you have not even named the actors. For the fully dressed use case tables, you are only presenting half of the Use Cases. So, the section of use cases needs far more work, refinement, and updates. I would expect that when you are writing again Report 1 in Full you take this into account and you look into this issue. Your Sequence Diagrams correspond to two use cases only, but irrespective this issue, they are lacking whatsoever. So, you go to the database, you bring back the requested data to the computer, and what happens then? The data is ready to appear to the user as fetched from the data base? Any processing? Any messaging and events that can be captured by the Sequence Diagrams? Please think about this, because right now your approach is rather simplistic.

Regarding your User Interface, I understand it is preliminary work, but still I think the way you are representing concepts is not user friendly. For example, you are displaying “map”. But “map” for you captures historical data as well. Where are the available option to the user? The user may want to select a specific root based on traffic information alone, or on weather, or historical statistical patterns drawn from some time ago until now. Is there any anticipation for all these options? Your User Effort Estimation is ok.

You lost some marks from UI as well, because in your document it is not conveyed that you have placed a lot of consideration on the design. This is just a print screen from google maps without any more detail on how you will implement the additional functionalities you are proposing. How can this “map” functionality can be perceived to hold both historical data and weather information? You should change your configuration. Pleas pay attention to this issue. Your effort estimation on Software was well received.

Your domain modeling is sound and correct, you include all concepts required but your domain modeling diagram which is extremely important to include is missing.

Then, your tentative plan of work is outdated (obviously) and you have not actually updated it to reflect reality.

Overall, your report is decent, but it shows that it has been conducted in a hurry, and you could really spend some time, now that you have thought of certain things through and make considerable improvements to it. I would expect to see this for the Full Report 1 (to be submitted again).

**Points**: 8 (Cust. Reqs) + 5 (Sys Reqs) + 19 (Func Reqs Specs) + 10 (UI) + 19 (Dom. Model) + 3 (PoW) = 64/90 points

**Project Management + Individual Contribution + Table of Context**: 6/10 points

**Total Points**: 70/100

* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -- -- -

**GROUP 2:**

Excellent problem statement and adequate uniqueness report. The restaurant automation project is very extensive anyway. You have done an excellent job with the section of requirements, user stories, functional and non-functional requirements. The section appears technically sound, it is complete, and it is very organized and helpful for the reader. The same is the case for on-screen appearance requirements. Some of these requirements do cover the UI description and effort estimation for UI. I applied this piece of work there as well, so you were only penalized a little bit on my part, but you should really pay attention to the skeleton of the requested report and make an effort to fill all part accurately for next time.

You have produced a truly exemplary report and I would really emphasize to the rest of the groups to use your write up as an example for delivering excellent documents. However, there is an issue still. Some important pieces of the documentation are missing!

Moreover, you use case description, use case diagrams, fully dressed use case tables and sequence diagrams exceed our expectations! The questions is though, how much of what you are proposing will you manage to implement and demo to us? Your plan is super-ambitious and time is running out….

Your domain modeling and diagram is very good as well but you are missing a couple of items. You have extracted the concepts correctly, and you have produced a correct diagram as well, in which indirectly you are reporting the associations and somehow the responsibilities, but you are expected to include a couple more tables showing the associations and also illustrating how the responsibilities are extracted from each use case, as we have discussed in class, and as you can see in the reports produced by most of your fellow groups. So, for Report 1 Full, please take care of this issues as well, and you will have delivered a piece of excellent work indeed. Your Plan of Work is detailed and accurate as well.

Another thing missing, as in most reports, is an exact table of individual contributions. With so many actors and use cases it is impossible that you all worked on the same use case, on the same diagram. Someone must have worked on the chef, someone else on the manager, and so on and so forth. For next time we would like to be able to clearly see the allocation within your group.

Finally the User Interface Section and the associated Estimation are missing. Of course, you mostly covered this under UI requirements so I transferred some of your grades here, but please make sure for next time that you fill in every section as requested.

**Points**: 7 (Cust. Reqs) + 6 (Sys Reqs) + 30 (Func Reqs Specs) + 12 (UI) + 15 (Dom. Model) + 5 (PoW) = 75/90 points

**Project Management + Individual Contribution + Table of Context**: 6/10 points

**Total Points**: 81/100

* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -- -- -

**GROUP 4:**

Your problem statement is very comprehensive and detailed. Although you do not include 1-2 paragraphs with your incremental contribution or innovations as expected, by reading your statement, I am able to extract some points of individual contribution at least, and this is helpful for the reader. But, perhaps for the complete Report 1 you may isolate a couple of paragraphs that specifically address this issue. Your glossary of terms is a little bit lacking though. For example, it is more appropriate to provide a definition of GPS, API, DailyMile, etc rather than Activity or Diet. Your functional and non-functional requirements appear to be technically sound and adequate. Similar is the situation for your User Stories, Traceability Matrix, and Fully Dressed Use Cases. In the Fully Dressed Use Cases though, you are missing the arrows from or to the main success scenario. You are also missing the documentation on casual description of use cases. This document may appear trivial but it is extremely important, because it gives the reader an understanding and perspective of all these technically detailed tedious tables that are going to follow. Your use case diagram are adequate. The sequence diagrams are quite comprehensive. Your approach anyway is a little bit restricted and simple regarding actors and this reflects to your use cases as well. Although your User Interface is … handwritten, this is an adequate and relatively comprehensive effort, and your User Effort Estimation document is quite comprehensive.

Your work on the domain modeling is very good. It is technically sound and most of the required documentation is reported and with the necessary detail. You are only missing “contracts”.

Please try to fill in the missing documentation for Report 1 Full, because you have lost quite a few of points because of this.

Your Plan of Work is also outdated. You have not been following this to the minute obviously. And you are missing individual members’ contribution as most of the groups.

Overall, your effort is good, but you could have done better. There is some incremental contribution as far as innovation in your project. Please try to address it and promote it as much as you can. This part of report has been piled up a little bit in a hurry. Please make sure you improve it for next time. And try to focus on your demo.

**Points**: 6 (Cust. Reqs) + 4 (Sys Reqs) + 19 (Func Reqs Specs) + 12 (UI) + 20 (Dom. Model) + 3 (PoW) = 64/90 points

**Project Management + Individual Contribution + Table of Context**: 6/10 points

**Total Points**: 70/100

第一组

**Points**: 9 (Cust. Reqs) + 6 (Sys Reqs)+ 25 (Func Reqs Specs) + 15 (UI) + 22 (Dom. Model) + 5 (PoW) = 82/90 points

**Project Management + Table of Contexts**: 8/10 points

* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -- -- -

**GROUP 7:**

Your problem statement is good although your contribution is incremental, but this is always the danger with a project that has been very extensively worked on by the community. We are all curious to see how the contributions of your group will compare to Group 4. Nevertheless, you have manage to make your introduction simple but engaging, and your points of novel contribution come across easily to the reader. Your glossary is also ok, but does not contain too many technical terms.

Your functional and non-functional requirements appear to be technically sound and adequate. You are missing the UI requirements.

You have done an excellent work on the User Cases though. You are indirectly addressing the casual use cases description under the “stakeholders and actors responsibilities or functionalities description”, so you get some points for that. And you have very detailed and comprehensive fully dressed use case tables, and very helpful use case diagrams. Good job!

You have placed a lot of effort on the UI specification and UI Effort Estimation section, well done. The question is, will you get the time to implement all cases as described?

The sequence diagrams are very comprehensive and detailed, and appear to be technically sound as well.

Your domain modeling section is well organized, quite detailed, and you are very meticulous about making sure that you address every section required (as prescribed in Dr Marsic’s webpages).

You are one of the very few teams that presented an updated and honest plan of work, and I appreciate this! Thank you!

Overall, your effort is very good. Although your project does not really lend to major innovation, you have addressed all issues quite well and comprehensively, and you have managed to do a very good job. I am looking forward to your demo. Try to address a couple of minor issues discussed and sections missing for next time.

**Points**: 7 (Cust. Reqs) + 4 (Sys Reqs) + 27 (Func Reqs Specs) + 13 (UI) + 23 (Dom. Model) + 5 (PoW) = 79/90 points

**Project Management + Individual Contribution + Table of Context**: 6/10 points

**Total Points**: 85/100