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### **Lecturer Feedback and Implementation (Part 2)**

#### **Feedback from Part 1**

During the evaluation of Part 1, my lecturer provided the following feedback:

*"What you have in the documentation should be reflected in the documentation."*

This feedback emphasized the importance of ensuring consistency between the documentation and the actual system being developed. Based on this input, I made the following adjustments:

1. **Improved Documentation**: I revisited the documentation to ensure that all design choices, database structure, and GUI layout details were clearly explained and aligned with the prototype I developed. I provided additional explanations where necessary, specifically in the UML class diagram and the project plan. The database design now better reflects the relationships between claims, lecturers, coordinators, and supporting documents.
2. **UML Class Diagram Clarifications**: The UML class diagram was updated to accurately represent the system’s data requirements, including the necessary classes for claims, users (lecturers, coordinators, and managers), and documents. This refinement ensures that the diagram and the underlying database structure are consistent.
3. **Prototype UI Design**: I also enhanced the GUI layout based on the feedback. For example, I improved the color scheme and layout of the claim submission form to make it more intuitive for lecturers. This refinement ensures that what was described in the documentation is reflected in the actual user interface.

#### **Changes Implemented in Part 2**

Building on this feedback, I made sure the following improvements were incorporated into the system’s functionality:

1. **Lecturer Claim Submission**: The claim submission form was designed to match the layout described in the documentation. It includes fields for hours worked, hourly rate, and additional notes, with a clear and prominent ‘Submit’ button as recommended.
2. **Coordinator/Manager View**: A separate view for coordinators and managers was implemented, with pending claims displayed in an organized manner. This view includes 'Approve' and 'Reject' buttons, which are prominently featured for easy verification, aligning with the documentation.
3. **Document Upload**: The document upload functionality was added with clear restrictions on file types and sizes, as specified. The uploaded file name is displayed on the form, ensuring that this feature works as documented.
4. **Real-Time Claim Status Tracking**: The tracking system updates the status of each claim in real time (e.g., ‘Pending’, ‘Approved’, ‘Rejected’), which matches the description in the project plan.
5. **Error Handling and Unit Testing**: I ensured that error handling mechanisms are in place for all critical functionalities, such as claim submission and document upload. Unit tests were written to cover all key functionalities as required, further enhancing reliability.

#### **Reflection on the Feedback Process**

The feedback from Part 1 helped improve both the clarity of the documentation and the implementation of the prototype. Ensuring consistency between the two allowed me to create a more cohesive and well-rounded system. The focus on documentation accuracy also guided the design and implementation in Part 2, leading to a more intuitive and functional user interface and feature set.