
Evaluation of the Project

Presented by: Oliver Gibberd-Thomas, Joel Holmes, Ruben Jardim, Michael Louca and Christopher JOnes

[company name]

[Company address]



Project Evaluation Report

May 13, 2017

Our team first began working on the R&D side of the project where we started gathering relevant data to find our correct target audience. We did this by using Google Trends and our Survey data to gain a greater knowledge on what our user requirements are for this product.

After the R&D stages, we started working on the design of the system where we created screen designs that were minimalistic and accessible for users of all IT backgrounds. Alongside the screen designs, our team then created a flowchart of the completed monitoring application that shows the functional logic of the application.

Once every member of our group was happy with the design of the system, we all began working on using HTML and CSS to create the first prototype of the website following the design plans. Once we were content with the basic look, we begun implementing functions using JavaScript as well as touching up on the visuals of the prototype.

We feel that the management and structure used over the project as well as the overall communication helped us complete this project to a standard we are pleased with.

Evaluation of the Process

During both the design and implementation stages, we believed that every member of the team had to work an equal share of the project. Because of this, we thought that the best methodology to use for this project was a chief programmer/egoless methodology.

This was beneficial for our team as we feel working equally we could assign each other tasks based off what strengths and weaknesses everyone possessed. We also allotted extra time to for each person to assist other members of the team in their tasks when necessary.

Evaluation of the Team Performance

As a team, we completed the project to the best of our ability. There was some sort of communication every day, whether this was in person or VOIP. This was so that everyone was engaged in the project and everyone was up to date with what tasks need to be completed. When members of the team had completed the allocated task, they offered help so that more complex tasks could be completed.

Due to the time constraint in which we had to complete the tasks, prioritisation was necessary. This lead to some elements being hurried and partially complete. As an improvement for future projects a prioritising plan such as MoSCoW should be implemented so that each task gets the right amount of focus needed as well as clarity of how important each element is to the project.

Evaluation of the Project Performance

We firmly believe that the methodologies we adopted for this project enabled us to produce high quality individual work. The egoless/chief programmer combination allowed us to work to our skillset, whilst continuously collaborating as a group. This means that our work is consistent in terms of design and quality, adding an overall professionalism to each section of the documentation.

Our system performed the required functions and our presentation was concise, but detailed. We could deliver a professional description and demonstration of our system, whilst answering questions with precise and informative detail.

We stuck to the schedule that was indicated in our plan by the Gantt chart, and the quality assurance was sufficient to ensure that every section of the system was without errors. We also felt that the research we performed prior to the implementation of the system was satisfactory, and enabled us to get a clear idea of what functionality we wanted. The fact that we did not have to rely on our contingency plan, should show that there were no compromises to the system what we set out to create.

Conclusion and Recommendation

In conclusion, we feel this project has improved our skills in teamworking and overall provided us further deeper understanding and knowledge in important and necessary methodologies and project management skills needed in the professional industry.

Although we had our weaknesses as mentioned before, we feel these have helped build our abilities and focus on our strengths as both individuals and as a team. Predominantly we feel we have performed well as a team and created a project that we are proud of.

**APPENDIX**

**TEAM MEMBER EVALUATION FORM MAY 2016-17**

**Team Number: 4C Team Name: Order66**

**To be completed, agreed and signed by ALL members of the team.**

**List names of all team members and agree the percentage contribution to the whole project (including both PMT deliverables and route-specific tasks) made by each member. Please scan the signed form and submit it together with your post mortem analysis (Deliverable 2c).**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Member Name** | **Percentage**  **Contributions**  **(should add up to 100%)** | **Notes/Comments** | **Member**  **Signature** |
| **Christopher**  **Jones** | **20** |  | **https://lh4.googleusercontent.com/IgMLJTdYnXFwljDJdpWhx0TmBc5BGcUYlW0Xw4-1bxK95inN9f8g99qkXqAUU5wM2VkMLUK7fCRsw0FPJuUR_HaKKAD0ZlZwkXC2OM8cjJYEFFQiyXIHNqeN-ZHvY4tlIAaLc38q** |
| **Oliver**  **Gibberd-Thomas** | **20** |  | **https://lh3.googleusercontent.com/cjEuUFruSweJsoITKmpS1ke9S64xUwQeLglALcNglifwA2XMN13CXWdiDtO0DbYpRs59aUS3uKSK5MYewPQ-0pgOYNWV_J7g1Lo8P-xmukHp3WgKRRz7t4bUb0nTaq7gVg2GZEbi** |
| **Joel James Holmes** | **20** |  | **https://lh5.googleusercontent.com/8pUSCUPGrOLsar3rBZppwoiqAkrxqDVn0IawkZ09B3QZi1PdWx-OrQfg8Jhiv0UoaUyyvNjInC0SwMSZek5whjGozCkkLzqfYguhpX5PCyxN_UFbgXhCA00o2JbSwe4PBMR2s-wU** |
| **Ruben Jardim** | **20** |  | **https://lh6.googleusercontent.com/e1kvuCHJ3zihLZ-h4CqqiNevi8KKRfAlqDrjCaXi8JnBGwIHPyB-2aqJTokokMPuFo5fBYNVDo8utDyEPIX6eo3Za5FzZg80mqWGiH2L_ibVa_pMsrAf50_FVXsftuX2CFOsCYVD** |
| **Michael Louca** | **20** |  | **https://lh5.googleusercontent.com/k4uqQfaOBpoTrF5G06WO00k-h44eTyctDKNB9qIXy1avVwnW3VzFGcUA9it_jcZoIPRUNIm6CuLjjoDKvpC-xABWFmMe74mkAnHlxetNu50xWmBzlFm-ohZIHjIyiatkNPr3JK0R** |