Notes from the mandatory meeting with TA on 21.02

16:45 - Beginning of the meeting

The meeting was postponed for 3 minutes because of a slight late-coming from one of the team members, which was properly notified on our WhatsApp group.

16:48 - Postponed beginning

A question was raised about whether there are any objections about the agenda and the team proceeded with the meeting almost immediately.

It was suggested to discuss the backlog more in-depth in TA’s presence.

TA’s response: Make more specific points in the agenda and the Code of Conduct with a particular focus on handling the conflicts and reformulating the meaning of the majority (explained later).

16:49 - Discussion about the Code of Conduct

The team asked about the components of the Code of Conduct and how they are related to the whole document.

TA’s response: While discussing certain parts of the Code of Conduct, we should keep in mind the learning goals of the course.

In the Product section, we should go more in-depth and provide a detailed explanation. We ought to elaborate more on that area by explaining the process behind obtaining the product and the product itself throughout its development.

We can add things like the technology used, and the purpose of certain elements in the project like JavaFX or REST API, etc.

Look at the Git README.md file!

Next week’s meeting will be the last opportunity to get feedback on the backlog draft (according to the website, the submission deadline is 24th February).

Question from the team: How to determine and measure commitment?

TA’s response: We should specify how to review the commitment or work of others, in particular how to define the quality of code and other work provided by team members. In addition, we should codify these terms to avoid confusion and resolve disputes.

We currently lack guidelines and definitions of chairs and minute takers, which should be added to the Code of Conduct. Even though we explained how they are chosen, we could explain more how more precisely they’d rotate.

Oral feedback on the Code of Conduct

* Explain why we chose a particular grade, whether some team members object to it and why it is the grade that we expect
* Aside from outlining what we define as improper behaviour, we should also assign particular consequences to them
* We should be more specific about instances that might cause stalemates in relation to the Code of Conduct, e.g. how to handle situations in which the majority agreement cannot be reached

Written feedback on the Code of Conduct (called Tops)

* Good Shared Team Values
* Precise information regarding who is responsible for submissions
* Product section specifies where the project and other files are found
* Good division of tasks
* Communication part is good
* Decision Making is fine but could be more clear
* Dealing with Conflicts and Guidance are good
* Evaluation Criteria are good

Seemingly, there weren’t any major cons (at least not in the feedback I’ve seen)

16:58 - Discussion about the Backlog

Due to technical issues, some students weren’t granted access to GitLab, which we checked with the TA - GitLab is working for everybody from the group.

For future reference, we should put all files and documents (including those posted to Mattermost), as well as the feedback from TA, on our GitLab.

We can also start working on individual assignments.

There is no need to do the backlog in Git and mockups are not necessary for it. The backlog should include four types of features - *musts*, *shoulds*, *coulds* and *wants*, depending on how we evaluate their significance in the project. Those can be explained solely by User Stories.

The Q&A sessions will be tomorrow (Wednesday) and on Monday.

We can send the draft version of the backlog until Monday in order to receive early feedback for it.

The backlog has a separate grading rubric - the grading is based on the official backlog but our team backlog might impact the grade. More specifically, decisions like classifying *shoulds* and *coulds* as *musts* will influence the grading. *Wants* are detailed features that are not so impactful, e.g. where particular data is stored.

In principle, the backlog highlights the team’s hierarchy of features and how they are prioritized, which will be graded.

Details that are not explicitly explained in the assignment should be resolved during Q&A sessions as the client (the lecturer) specifies.

The official backlog will be available after the final deadline for the group’s backlog, at an early stage of the coding part of the course.

17:07 - Questions after a planned discussion

As the team didn’t have any questions after the planned discussion, we proceeded with our tasks under TA’s supervision. Ultimately, we have decided to finish the Code of Conduct with fresh ideas received during the discussion earlier.

Changes were made in the following sections based on the suggestions from TA:

* Assignment description
* Target or ambition level
* Behaviour
* Commitment: As discussed with the team, the code shouldn’t return any Checkstyle errors as they are crucial to not failing the pipeline (TA). The code should contain clearly recognizable and understandable elements paired with explanatory Javadocs. Tests should cover the majority of the methods.
* Commitment: Chairs should upload the agenda at least 24 hours prior to the mandatory meeting and minute taker should upload notes (that are clearly understandable) at most 24 hours after the mandatory meeting.

We have discussed the possible changes in the Code of Conduct and have the following noteworthy information:  
TA’s response: Checkstyle fails the pipeline with only ONE error! Therefore, we can’t allow any with respect to how strictly we define the quality of code. Moreover, code testing coverage is important but it’s not decided how it’s going to be graded specifically.

Team: We should have clear code naming, thorough Javadoc, removal of unused code snippets and files, and detailed code review.

Due to a lack of time, we decided to finish the remaining points of the Code of Conduct during a supplementary meeting this week.

TA’s response: The essential part of the Code of Conduct is that we attempt to prevent people from not following its rules in an effective (and maybe friendly) manner. Here, the example of providing snacks to the group during the next meeting was given.

Despite not being part of the grade, using markup files in GitLab is highly appreciated because that allows people to preview the documents inside GitLab instead of downloading them.

A question about Gradle was raised later.

TA’s response: Students only have to know Gradle is used but on a superficial level. In addition to that, knowledge of how things, like the pipeline, work is welcome.

17:24 - Choosing the roles for the next meeting

Vlad - minute-taker for the next meeting

Georgios - chairman for the next meeting

In addition, we have touched upon the topic of extracurricular meetings and decided upon a couple of changes:

* Additional meetings will be held on Thursdays instead of Fridays at 5 pm on Google Meet, in accordance with a previous agreement.
* Mandatory meetings will be preceded by a group meeting approximately an hour before the scheduled mandatory meeting. That time can be spent doing assignments or discussing the content of the agenda before the mandatory meeting.

TA’s response: Chairperson could engage team members in the discussion more in case of big discrepancies in activity.

At the end of the meeting, there were no questions asked by the members or the TA.

17:30 - Closing of the meeting

In the concluding discussion, the team has agreed to arrive before the mandatory meetings in order to prepare for them.

TA’s concluding feedback: During mandatory meetings, it’s best to ask questions and ask for feedback regarding the assignments, progress in the course and processes during the mandatory meetings instead of doing the actual assignments. A chairman should guide the discussion and keep track of the agenda. The times included in the agenda are only approximate and should be followed within reasonable limits. The group should also give themselves a lot of time ahead of the mandatory meetings in later weeks due to the greater workload. Students don’t have to facilitate the entire 45 minutes of the mandatory meeting with the TA.