SEPR Assessment 1 Feedback

Team Name: No-One

Requirements [14.5/22] **Process [3.5/5]** **Specification [11/17]**	Overview of requirements approach shows some good insight, particularly with reference to similar games, but how this information is used is not always clear (i.e., how did it help you elicit/analyse requirements?) There is a clear overview of the approach but not why it was chosen. Use of referencing and website is very helpful. The requirements table makes use of a sensible format that is well justified. The requirements as specified are not always precise (e.g., environmental assumptions - how is framerate calculated?) but this is a minor issue. Many useful user requirements have been specified. Some of your "meta-constraints" (NFRs) are actually constraints on the *project* not the software, and as such are not best expressed here, but in your project plan. The map NFRs are either expressed poorly, or are instead capturing design characteristics or possible even functional requirements. These should be re-evaluated. There is too much design polluting the specification of F5 and F4. There is also a missing assumption around F7 - you need disk access (either local or on a server). **Marks lost:** some imprecision in requirements, some unnecessary project constraints in requirements, some design pollution. Better explanation for why the requirements approach was chosen is needed. **Marks gained:** some good research in other games; a sensible requirements table format. Some clear capture of user requirements.
Architecture [20/25] **Conceptual [12/15]** **Justification [8/10]**	Appropriate justification of the selected modelling language (UML) and tool. Some key attributes would be useful in the class diagram. The use of a sequence diagram (e.g. as opposed to an activity diagram or a flowchart) is not justified on page 2. The architecture justification appropriately refers back to requirements. The classes are discussed in sufficient detail but there's no discussion on key properties/operations.

	Marks gained: justification of modelling language and tool, traceability
	Marks lost: missing key attributes/operations and justification

Methods [15/20]
  SE approach [8/10]
  Team [3/5]
  Plan [4/5]
	The explanation and justification for methods chosen is clear and shows good analysis; it could be more concise and focused on what alternatives were ruled out (and why) but overall this is done well. There is good explanation of how Scrums have been tailored. (Minor comment on tools: SVN supports branching.)
	
	Team organisation explanation is fairly clear but there is no acknowledgement of risks associated with postponing the decision on which roles to assign and why. Some reflection on this would be sensible at this stage. Also, some clarity as to whether the choice of Trello influenced team organisation (or vice versa) would be helpful. The explanation around Scrum master is helpful.
	
	The plan is complete on the website but some mention of this in the report would have been helpful. Some brief commentary on how the plan was designed and how risk management will be accommodated would be helpful.
	
	Marks gained: generally a solid report, with good justification and some excellent reflection in all parts.
	
	Marks lost: some reflection on team organisation and risks would improve this section.

Risks [16/20] **Format overview [4/5]** **Specification [12/15]**	Appropriate justification of the risk classification scheme. Clear risk monitoring process. Color-coding risks would have been useful. **Marks lost:** well thought-out risks; risk monitoring **Marks gained**: no colour-coding of risks; no risk ownership
Website [3/3]	**Comments** Website is fine, meets all the requirements.