Critique of specifications for the Stall Alert System

Team C: Andreas, Călin, Jeroen, Timon

Slot 5

Team A

- Sending emails even if there are no problems is a nice touch.
- Lacks a proper DSL, there's only a GUI. And the semantics of its operations are not always clear.
- No mention of system integration and it is unclear which data is needed.
- No stall detection! Only totals, not since a certain date.

Team B

- Too much implementation focused which limits architecture choices. Specifies using ODBC, database views and even the program which should send the emails (sendmail).
- Unclear what is fixed by the specification and what can be changed. Some things turned out to be just examples.
- Only courses are taken into account, not programs. This can decrease the quality of the alerts.
- Compilation from DSL $\rightarrow$ SQL is not trivial: how do if-else statements translate to SQL? And why are they even necessary; isn't 'else' in practice always 'DoNothing'?
- Last slide makes no sense. (Stall adjustment?!)

Team D

- What data is required to be queryable from the data sources?
- Screens: implementation details.
- Overspecification: web application.
- GUI rather limited and no DSL.
- No alerts! PULL rather than PUSH system. The system should alert people, that implies PUSH. If everyone has to manually check, then why not just let the tutors read their students' grades manually.