Hi Stephen,

My name is Vinicius, Id: 14868388. I am part of the Real-time Scoreboard R&D project. I am, on behalf of my team members, sending this email as we do not completely understand the mid-semester interview feedback and seek further clarification on the comments provided. Below you will find comments to each section found in the feedback report.

**Clear evidence of progress** – “Grade C”

***I don't see a team here rather an individual who is working for them self. Stop doing that. Vague no clarity on where the SSO hours are.***

Please clarify what SSO stands for.  
Additionally, please elaborate on how you think we can work better as a team.

You mentioned there is *“an individual who is working for them self”*. Are you referring to a specific person? We believe we have been sharing the work equally.

We do share the work among us. There are several parts to this project and we must split the work in sections and assign them to individuals, for the sake of efficiency.   
We admit we could work on meeting up more frequently (this can be difficult with clashing papers and one of our members working full-time), we have organised for the second semester to have weekly meetings to get back on track.

**Well organized process** – “Grade D”

***I don't think the team is progressing well. You guys need to sort the plan and come to conclusion on one that everyone agrees on. Minutes not detailed.***

We believe that this argument comes from the fact we are behind the schedule and that our documentation was not already complete.

This is true, and we stated we were behind schedule but still making good progress given the factors listed below.

* The project requires a lot of networking knowledge, as software development students, we’re having to take a lot of information in and decipher what is useful to us.
* We were transitioning between Trello and OneNote, all into GitHub as was recommended, and took some additional time whilst trying to complete tasks.
* The feasibility study is the deliverable of importance to the client, we don’t want to short-change him by rushing it, it needs to be detailed and accurate. We have organised to meet him on the 8th of August to share our findings.
* It is also worth mentioning we had a messy start to the semester, we had no supervisor for a couple weeks, which led to meeting our client later on to gather requirements. Organising everything with shorter notice was challenging.

Also, our Proposal that had a decent grade had a few points of feedback that we addressed, so receiving such a low grade here feels slightly harsh.

Please elaborate what you mean by “minutes not detailed”? We thought we had been including enough information, so if we can improve on this we’d like to.

**Learning Progress** – “Grade D”

***I agree that this project has multiple things to learn (hardware and software), based on your log books, it looks like you are up to the challenge. Good. No evidence, relying on word of mouth.***

We have spent weeks, researching about our project that included:

* Stakeholders (includes the client, the organizer, the ASB venue, judges, scorers, markers) had to learn who they are and what they are.
* What the MATHEX competition is.
* Significant research about infrastructure (network, routers, Wireless access points and etc), being that none of the member of our group has a networking major.
* Broad research about server hardware, it includes hardware specifications, parts, types of servers, what server would be necessary, how to calculate demand, means to perform loading tests, concerns for in-house implementation, prices and etc.
* Understand, compare and choose from several providers for Paas and Saas, Cloud systems that will satisfy our project. Find out what each of them uses, how they work and their benefits.
* Find out existing technologies which already exist that could be available to our client.
* Explored different open sources licences to meet our requirements.
* Further analyses of the venue, meet stakeholder, verify acceptance to new technologies and more.

These are examples of things we have being learning from. Also, it is plausible to say that we have attended to the R&D lectures, that we have completed the Web Development paper which is of relevance to what we are proposing.

We’re confused about how we can better provide evidence of our learning progress, when there is so much information to gather. We thought the work we had been writing, and the links we provided to tutorials, or the papers we had completed were enough.

Status Report – “Grade C”

***Good. Missing the individual hours breakdown. A very detailed log book. Good.***

Here it is mentioned “missing the individual hours breakdown” when all of them were sent to our supervisor in the same week. In addition, the status report included a link for every member’s logbook section in GitHub.

There must be a misunderstanding here.

**Interview** – “Grade B”

**Needed to ask the same question 3 times.**

Please, could you further justify the reasons for this comment and grade? I think the question may have been misunderstood if it needed to be asked multiple times.

**Thank you for taking the time to read this, we don’t want this response to come off as us arguing against our feedback. We are asking for clarification on the comments and grades we received so we can endeavour to provide better work and grow as students.**