

FIT2107 Assignment 1

Fagan inspections

Worth 15% of your final mark

Instructions

Summary

In this assignment, you will be developing checklists for a Fagan Inspection, conducting a formal Fagan Inspection meeting, and write up a report. The software for this assignment is a Mobile Application for a Hotel Booking System. This assignment has 5 parts as follows:

- **Part 1 (Group Assignment - Week 4 Workshop):** Create 3 Checklists for a Fagan Inspection (25% of the assignment mark)
Due: No later than 72 hours after the conclusion of your Week 4 Workshop
- **Part 2 (Individual Assignment):** Identify quality issues of the artifacts based on the Part 1 Checklists (35% of the assignment mark)
Due: Before the start of your Week 5 Workshop
- **Part 3 (Group Task - Week 5 Workshop):** Fagan Inspection Meeting (no submission)
- **Part 4 (Group Assignment):** Reports (20% of the assignment mark)
Due: No later than 96 hours after conclusion of your Week 5 Workshop
- **Part 5 (Individual Assignment):** Wrapup Report (20% of the assignment mark)
Due: Week 6: Monday 5PM

Groups

Parts of this assignment will be done in groups of four people. Your team should be made up of people from the workshop that you regularly attend. If the numbers don't quite work, you should form groups of three or five. Please note that you will be required to work with different team members for Assignments 2 and 3.

The week 4 and 5 workshop classes have time set aside to allow you to work on these group activities, but you might need to do a small amount of extra work as a group. You will have to do additional individual work outside class time.

Working as a Group

On the group tasks, you are expected to work as a group on this assignment, and contribute very close to an equal amount of work. In most cases, if this is followed, students will receive equal marks on those aspects to their teammates.

If your group members are **not** doing their share of the work, and this cannot be resolved, please contact the head tutor and the lecturer. The head-tutor/lecturer *will* act - including by

adjusting marks - if somebody is not pulling their weight.

Marking Criteria

Your submissions will be marked on the following criteria:

- Appropriateness of checklists, including clarity, and appropriate balance between comprehensiveness and usability.
- Completion of individual inspection preparation notes.
- Completion of group inspection reports.
- Identification of issues in notes.
- Clarity of description of issues.
- Reasonableness of recommendations for improved checklists after inspection.
- Analysis of value from in-person, group inspection process.
- Analysis of value of including fixes in group inspection process.
- Clarity of presentation of all documents.

Academic Misconduct

Sharing copies of the submissions with other groups or friends who haven't submitted their assignments will be considered **academic misconduct!**

Special Consideration

If a student faces exceptional circumstances (e.g., serious illness or injury, family emergency) that prevent them from completing the assignment, they may apply for special consideration according to the policy and procedure on the Faculty website:

<http://www.infotech.monash.edu.au/resources/student/equity/special-consideration.html>

Other Late Submissions

Students must contact the lecturer if they do not submit the assignment by the deadlines. Penalties will apply.

Assignment Forum

You can ask questions on the discussion forum, which the teaching team will monitor and respond to daily (and at least once on weekends). All students should monitor this forum - the teaching team may clarify aspects of the assignment on the forum and any such clarifications are considered "official".

Artifacts

You will be provided with a brief Mission statement for the app (i.e., the Software Requirement Specification), which has already been agreed with the project manager. You are not expected to review the SRS document, but you are expected to use it to assist you in reviewing other artifacts.

In this assignment, you will be provided with a zip file which contains three artifacts related to a software development project.

- The **first** set of artifacts is a set of **user interface mockups** for the proposed application.
 - The **second** artifact is a **conceptual class diagram**. Students should make sure that the class diagram is suitable *for that purpose*, not that it is ultimately ready as a basis for implementation.
 - The **third** artifact is some Python 3 **source code** that implements a small part of the functionality required for the app. It is being used to test initial concepts and is intended to be added to as the system becomes more feature-complete. Students have to review the code and functionality.
-

Assignment 1

Part 1 (Group Assignment): Create 3 Checklists for a Fagan Inspection (25% of the assignment mark)

Based on your experience with past development, material discussed in the course notes (NOTE: additional independent research is considered a feature, not a bug!), the suggested checklists in the Eclipse OpenUp archive (the archive is on the FIT2107 Moodle page), and your common sense, **create three checklists** for conducting a Fagan inspection of the following artifact types:

- UI mockups.
- A conceptual class diagram.
- Python code.

Note that there is no existing formal coding or stylistic standard for any of these.

Submission Instruction: Agree a checklist between the groups and upload a copy of your consensus checklists (in a portable format such as a text file or PDF) to Moodle **no later than 72 hours after the conclusion of your lab**. For example, So if you have a 9AM Monday lab (which finishes at 11am), you have until 11AM Thursday to submit your checklists. You will have the Week 4 workshop to work on this as a group, but you may need to schedule some extra time.

After you submit on Moodle, please email your demonstrator and let them know, and they will let you know the password to decrypt the artifact zip file located on Moodle.

Part 2 (Individual Assignment): Identify quality issues of the artifacts based on the Part 1 Checklists (35% of the assignment mark)

After generating inspection checklists (Part 1), please review the artifacts individually based on your checklists to identify any potential quality issues with the artifacts. Make notes (electronically). Do *not* share these notes with your group members before the meeting.

Submission Instruction: You must submit a list of quality issues as a pdf file to Moodle *before* your regularly scheduled week 5 workshop, where you can work on part 3.

Part 3 (Group Task): Fagan Inspection Meeting (Week 5 Workshop, no submission)

You can *start* these in the Week 5 workshop, but you may need to schedule additional time.

Make sure you have submitted your notes to Moodle before you start the meeting.

For each artifact, conduct a Fagan inspection as described in the course notes (and, as far as is practicable, Fagan's paper). You may use the screens in the lab to present the artifact if you wish.

For each artifact inspected, a moderator should take notes. Again, each person should take turns acting as the moderator.

There is no written submission from this part - you will do that in part 4.

Part 4 (Group Assignment): reports (20% of the assignment mark)

As a group, write up report of the results of the inspections of each artifact

Your report must indicate:

- the time of the review meeting(s).
- who was present.
- a summary of defects identified, if any.
- recommendation for approval without changes, minor revisions (which would, in theory, go back to the moderator for approval), or major revisions (which would, if this were done for real, require the meeting to be reconvened). The recommendations should be *per artifact* not per defect!

Submission Instruction: One member of your group must submit the group's report on Moodle by **96 hours (exactly 4 days) after the conclusion of your lab**. For example, if your lab starts at 9AM Monday, you have until 11AM Friday of week 5 to submit your reports.

Part 5 (Individual Assignment): Wrapup report (20% of the assignment mark)

Each group member should write a short report (no longer than 2 pages) covering the following topics:

1. Suggest changes to the checklists based on your experiences conducting the inspections. Provide a brief rationale for each change.
2. Based on your experience, analyse what, if anything, the process of the in-person inspection added to the process of identifying faults, compared to doing so as an individual in your own time (as you might do for a Gitlab merge request). Do you think you would adopt this kind of inspection process for each kind of artifact in future software development projects? Briefly explain why.
3. The rules for Fagan inspections state that you should only identify defects, *not* propose fixes for them. *Based on your experience in this assignment* as well as your reading, discuss the merits of this rule. Would you keep it for your own projects?

Submission Instruction: Upload your individual report to Moodle before Week 6: Monday 5PM.