

Meeting Summary: Final Submission and Future Goals

Date: 27/02/24

Participants:

- Member 1 (Dylan Carter - 720007761 - dc713@exeter.ac.uk)
- Member 2 (Jamie Elder - 720011935 - je497@exeter.ac.uk)
- Member 3 (Victor Smith - 720087895 - vphs201@exeter.ac.uk)
- Member 4 (Daniel Hart - 700046191 - dh590@exeter.ac.uk)
- Member 5 (Ziyad Alrubian - 710057514 - zaa203@exeter.ac.uk)

Session Length: 1 hour

Objective:

The objective of our final meeting was to gather all necessary documents and code for our final submission, address any last details, ensure everyone understood the submission requirements, and discuss future goals for the project.

Discussion Points:

1. Submission:

During the meeting, Jamie identified the need for a requirements document to guide clients on module installation for customization, while Daniel created a ReadMe to provide an overview of the project. It was decided that Jamie would handle the final submission, as he possessed the required code and documents.

2. Understanding of Submissions:

Before finalizing the submission, we conducted a comprehensive review of the project. We have developed a functional application that enables users to play a game, create and share recipes for group cooking which saves money, time, and energy while fostering social interaction among first-year students and teaching them how to cook new dishes. We all agreed that this application was an acceptable product for this first sprint while also recognising that we could easily build on this in the future.

3. Future Goals:

Our final discussion was about what we believed our future goals could be and what we think could be achieved in our final sprint. A lot of the discussion was around an improved gamification of the application: making streaks for 'Foodle', giving users awards for meeting certain criteria, having location-based leaderboards, and so on. We also talked about creating a more extensive ingredients database and improving the

app's aesthetics. We acknowledged that the possibilities for further development were extensive, and so emphasised the importance of managing workload and setting criteria within reasonable timeframes.

Conclusion:

We concluded the meeting satisfied with the product we were submitting and optimistic about its future trajectory. As a team, we believed that we had worked effectively together, leveraging each other's strengths and fostering collaboration. We acknowledged the importance of clear communication in task completion efficiency and noted it as a minor area for improvement. Overall, we were proud of our group's solid performance throughout the software development project.


Next Steps:

1. Start of new sprint.
2. Setting new goals and refining the application further
3. Continued design refinement of the user interface.
4. Comprehensive Testing of all code.


Action Items:

1. Submission of project
2. Submission of peer review

Meeting Related Images



Above screenshot of ReadMe



Above screenshot of requirements document