SAPM: Lecture 2
The Practical

Stuart Anderson
Overview

- Coursework is 25% of the final mark, exam is 75%
- The goal is to build a collection of software architecture case studies for the course.
- Groups of around 10 students will be responsible for developing an architecture case study.
- The goal is to develop a rich resource to support learning about SAPM
Contributions

• Peerwise questions (15%)
• Comments on other people’s contributions (20%)
• Group participation (15%)
• Wiki page(s) (50%)
• Overall you should spend 25-30 hours on the practical.
Welcome to PeerWise. Simply choose a course below to get started. If you like, you can also create a new course or join an existing course.

Your courses

You are currently a member of the following courses. Simply click on the course name to begin.

Software Architecture, Process & Mgt (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>Identifiers active</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Last correct answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12533</td>
<td>27 / 93</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1:55pm, 15 Jan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Create a new course
Peerwise

Software Architecture, Process & Mgt (2016)
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Your questions

You are currently contributing 5 questions
You have deleted 0 of your questions

Answered questions

You have answered 0 questions (of these, 0 have been deleted by the author)
You have written 0 comments about these questions

Unanswered questions

There are currently 0 unanswered questions you may answer
You are not following any question authors

Reputation score
10
Questioning: 40
Answering: 0
Rating: 0

Answer score
0

View leaderboards View my badges Provide feedback Administration
Comments and Process

• You are expected to comment on other people’s contributions. Comments will be graded and should be appropriate and helpful.

• Each group will develop a process to ensure the internal quality of their case study and links to the other case studies are appropriate. The quality of these processes will generate a group mark worth 15% of the overall grade.
Case Studies

• The idea of a case study is to demonstrate the use of the basic concepts of software architecture in a practical setting.
• This will involve you researching a deployed architecture and relating it to the concepts in SAPM and the other case studies as they are developed.
Case Studies

• Each person in the group will develop their own page(s) in the SAPM Wiki (You will have full access shortly).

• The main components are outlined on the next slide
Case Study Structure 1

• Page describing the internal and external review process (constructed by the whole group)

• Internal Review (overview of the case study plus a trail of review actions – mainly focusing on the coherence of the case study) – written by internal reviewer.

• External Review (how the case study relates to other case studies plus a trail of review actions mainly focusing on the relationship of the case study to other case studies. – written by external reviewer.)
Case Study Structure 2

- Components and connectors used in the software architecture.
- The structure of the software architecture from different perspectives (static, dynamic, deployment…)
- The attributes (or non-functional properties the software architecture is intended to manage).
- Examples of the deployment of the software architecture in practical situations.
- Strengths and weaknesses of the software architecture.
- Comparison with other approaches to the problem the architecture is used to tackle.
Timeline

• Formative feedback deadline: 2 Mar 2017 – submissions before then will get feedback from me on the basis of the final grading scheme – focus is on how to improve. This is intended only to help you improve.

• Final deadline: 30 March 2017 – your contribution up to this deadline will be graded according to the grading scheme.
Length

• Wiki page contributions should be 500-1000 words roughly and can use diagrams or any other illustrative device (video, animation, audio, ...). Think about accessibility of the material (e.g. Suppose someone is visually impaired – can they still access your material?)
Evaluation

• Each component (peerwise, comments, process, contribution) will be graded on four equally weighted factors (I will expand on this in the formal document):
  • Relevance - to the course
  • Understanding – does it illustrate your understanding?
  • Quality – is it well-structured, accurate, comprehensible etc?
  • Impact – how well you can relate your work to a practical context?