CSC3600 Final Report



By

USQ Learning Emporium

Richard Dobson, Jesse Hare, James McKeown, Vincent Roberts, Ryan Sharp

Examiner

Dr. Xiaohui Tao

 $Senior\ Lecturer\ (Computing)\ -\ School\ of\ Sciences\ -\ PhD$ QUT

Project Supervisor

Assoc. Prof. Stijn Dekeyser

Associate Professor (Computing) - School of Sciences - $PhD\ Antwerp$

School of Management and Enterprise

Due: Friday 18th of October 2019

Contents

1.	Executive Summary	2
2.	Methodology	2
	2.1 Methodology Statement	2
	2.2 Justifications	2
	2.3 Discussions	2
3.	Project Process	2
	3.1 Team Organisation	2
	3.2 Team Structure and Roles	3
	3.3 Communication and Meetings	3
	3.3.1 Effectiveness of Communication	3
	3.3.2 Team Meetings	3
	3.4 Documentation	4
	3.5 Process	4
4.	Project Report	4
	4.1 Project Outcome	5
	4.2 Cost of the Project	5
5.	Professionalism and Professional Ethics	5
	5.1 Professionalism	5
	5.2 Professional Ethics	5
6.	Contribution Distribution	5
7.	Conclusions	5
Re	Reference List	
Aj	Appendix	

1. Executive Summary

This report provides an analysis and evaluation of the development stages completed for the harvest metadata.

2. Methodology

Lorem Ipsum

2.1 Methodology Statement

Lorem Ipsum

2.2 Justifications

Lorem Ipsum

2.3 Discussions

Lorem Ipsum

3. Project Process

3.1 Team Organisation

There were a total of 5 members in the USQ Learning Emporium team. As this project was initially designed for teams of 3, the team needed to strategise ways in which to divide the work evenly between members. The first solution was to divide the main project task into 2 sub teams; a back-end team (3 members) and a front-end team (2 members). Within these teams each member had different roles.

From these sub teams, each had their own Facebook Messenger group and their own Slack channel for discussing specific project tasks. This stopped unnecessary information from being communicated between the sub teams, i.e. the back-end team didn't need to know the specifics of the front-end and vice versa. Within these messenger platforms, jobs were distributed and agreed upon between members.

3.2 Team Structure and Roles

As stated above, the group was divided into 2 main groups; a back-end team (3 members) and a front-end team (2 members). The back-end team consisted of: James McKeown (Team Leader), Richard Dobson (Programmer) and Vincent Roberts (Programmer). The front-end team consisted of: Jesse Hare (Team Leader), Ryan Sharp (Programmer).

James McKeown and Jesse Hare both lead their respective teams. This allowed for better and more effective team co-ordination. It helped all members stay on task and stopped individual team members from deviating from the plan and doing their own work. Both of these members (James and Jesse) took on the most technical aspects of the project, especially in regards to the planning the project (in terms of coding). Other members then utilised this research to program their respective tasks within the project.

3.3 Communication and Meetings

3.3.1 Effectiveness of Communication

Communication between members was very quick and effective. The team decided to use a private Facebook Messenger chat as the primary point of contact as each member regularly used this application. This made it easier to notify team members of urgent matters. In addition to Facebook, the team decided to use a Slack channel for more technical and project specific subjects. Slack was new to all members and was therefore not utilised to it's full potential.

The main problem faced with the Facebook Messenger chat, was that the information couldn't be organised. It would have been better to use Slack as the primary messenger application as it was more suited to this type of project; especially because we had 5 team members and 2 sub teams. In future projects organisation of information needs to be a higher priority.

3.3.2 Team Meetings

Team meetings were run through the Zoom video conferencing application. At least once a week the whole team would meet to discuss the progress of the project. Meetings for the back end and front end team were often held more than once a week to discuss new ideas for their respective tasks. These meetings were highly effective as each member could screen share what they

were working on and clearly communicate that with the team.

These meetings could be improved by having a set agenda before each meeting. Occasionally the meetings started slow as we all had to organise what we were going to discuss. It would also be ideal to have one member as the designated scribe to take notes for each meeting and relay this back to the team.

3.4 Documentation

The activity log sheets, task summary sheets and meeting minute documents all assisted in tracking how the project was developing. The activity log sheets provided a good point of reference each week in deciding what tasks needed to be worked on next. It also helped ensure that each task was completed. Without the activity log sheets and task summaries it would have been difficult to keep track of the progress of the project. However, it was often the case that some weeks would be forgotten and team members would need to go back and fill in the information. This was obviously not ideal, but did not have a noticeable effect on the productivity of the team.

The meeting minutes documents were essential for the project. Without them, members of the team would forget what was discussed in each meeting. This would result in a massive amount of lost time as information would need to be repeated. After each meeting with the project supervisor (Stijn Dekeyser), the team would stay back and document what had been discussed in these meetings. This helped tremendously when working on specific parts of the project. This is because we now had a reference to look at, to see if certain features needed to be implemented. These meeting minutes can be found attached to the bottom of this document.

3.5 Process

3.5.1 Overall Process

The team (and it's sub teams) decided on using the agile methodology for the project. Each week a meeting was held between members to discuss what tasks needed to be completed that week. Every 2 - 3 weeks a meeting was held with the project supervisor to discuss improvements that needed to be made. These improvements (as tasks) were added to the list of tasks to be completed.

3.5.2 Difficulties Encountered

asd

3.5.3 Beneficial Strategies

asd

4. Project Report

Lorem Ipsum

4.1 Project Outcome

Lorem Ipsum

4.2 Cost of the Project

Lorem Ipsum

5. Professionalism and Professional Ethics

5.1 Professionalism

Lorem Ipsum

5.2 Professional Ethics

Lorem Ipsum

6. Contribution Distribution

7. Conclusions

Reference List

Appendix