Peer Review: Workshop1

When starting interpret this domain model it is very easy to get along which means it gives a good overview, showing the associations clearly. But it looks a little bit messy with association names and multiplicity used on every single association which I believe is not needed. As Larman states "Simple association names such as "Has" or "Uses" are usually poor, as they seldom enhance our understanding of the domain" [1, p152]. However the other association names follow a good standard based on a "ClassName-VerbPhrase-ClassName" format and make good use of reading direction arrows when needed.

This domain model shows the classes Treasurer and Fee which shouldn't be part of this iteration. The reason for not trying to model all classes at once is mentioned by Larman -"Avoid a waterfall-mindset big-modeming effort to make a thorough or "correct" domain model—it won't ever be either, and such over-modeming efforts lead to analysis paralysis, with little or no return on the investment."[1,p133]. This cite looks a bit harsh which is not the meaning, I think the part looked good but the biggest reason to strip it is that the assignments description says that the analysis should include only the following requirements…..

In my opinion it is only one not technical thing that doesn't apply to the requirements. It's the fact that the secretary doesn't seem to be strongly associated with either Berths or the Boat, specially the Berth since she is the one responsible to book a Boat or possibly a Member to a Berth. One could argue that in the new system the boats will be assigned to berths automatically, but still in the requirements the secretary need to approve the layout of berths to members which also should mean that she preferably should have the possibility to change assignments manually in case she is not happy with the computer generated proposal.

Another thing I notice when study the model is that Treasurer, Secretary and Member are all associated to Role by a "is a" name. Larman states that this is one of 2 rules for having a conceptual subclass. [1, p507] The other rule is the "100% rule" which means that all the subclasses need to share all the superclasses attributes and associations. In the model the Role which would be the conceptual superclass has no attributes and is associated with Person and System. Therefore I think the Role should be a superclass and have the arrow notation to show that.

The use of description class (Boat Details) is encouraged by Larman [1, p147-149] and I think it is the right choice to apply that to the model.

Overall I think it's a good model showing the needed association for a developer to start designing. Some strong points of the model is that it uses the "think like a map maker" principle, it has good naming of the classes and good readability. Most of it is also easily understandable by a domain expert. However the secretary would probably wonder why she isn't connected to the berths.

I think it's already a good model that should have a passing grade, however with the changes that I pointed out in this review I think its would become an excellent model.

References

1. Larman C., Applying UML and Patterns 3rd Ed, 2005, ISBN: 0131489062