**Documentation**

**What went well:**

The documentation of the project, e.g UML diagrams, went well. Each member had was required to have at least on uml diagram done. UML diagrams was still fresh in our minds so there were no real issues that occurred that couldn’t be solved. The documentation section of the project was done relatively fast. The write up went well, everyone was able send the needed documents of their evaluation of the project on time and within deadline.

**What went wrong:**

The only real issue was having two people working on the same uml diagram when one person didn’t fully understand how to tackle the section of uml diagram they had to do. The issue wasn’t major and was easily solved

**Improvement and why:**

An improvement I think would be useful for the team would be having to make a journal report a week on what they did that week and a little summary reflecting on how it was on that week ending with a conclusion of the entire project. This would make the write up more cohesive and would clearly outline exactly the process of how the project went. With regards to the uml diagram, assigning a uml to the members strength as suppose to just giving a uml to a random team member. Every tasks given should be in the members capability and should work to his/hers strengths.

**Design**

**What went well:**

**What went wrong:**

**Improvement and why:**

**Code**

**What went well:**

**What went wrong:**

**Improvement and why:**

**Requirements delivered**

**What went well:**

Enough of the functional requirements where achieved in the making of the project to be able to present a somewhat finished product to the lectures in the presentation. For example, a user was able to register as a member and login and logout. The basic functions of the website were working and made for enough features to present for the presentation of our project.

**What went wrong:**

The focuses on one requirement would make us neglect other functional requirements. Also, non-functional requirements took priority in the project compared functional requirements outlined for the project was completed. We didn’t heavily focus on completing the functional requirements of the project, instead when error was encountered instead of diverging to work on another functional requirements, we would only focus most of our attention trying to fix one issue for the project.

**Improvement and why:**

What could be improved is focusing more on the functional requirements and making sure that the functional requirements are equally distributed to avoid everyone working on the same functional requirement when an error arises.

**Team Cohesion**

**What went well:**

When it came to decisions it was made at a reasonable time. Everyone would be required to have at least one idea in relation to the project. The idea that was favoured by most of the team would be the idea we would go with. When it came to which tasks had to be done everyone knew what had to be done and who oversaw a task. Communication was another aspect of the project that went well, issues that were talked about would be immediately worked on by other team members when one team member couldn’t fix it. We would communicate through blackboard, classes, meetings in the library and GitHub. We had many forms of communication and stayed consistent with communication throughout the whole project timeline.

**What went wrong:**

The one thing that went wrong, regarding the team itself, would be the distribution of task. One person on the team would have one or more tasks assigned to them. Another problem would be when a team member not working on the aspect of the project, they are strong in.

**Improvement and why:**

After learning more about agile we realized that although the communication was good. We should have picked up a scrum when having our weekly meeting. With scrum it enables the team to be more in sync and encourages personal planning for the individual’s interpersonal skills and for a more self-organised team. Also using GitHub to our advantage, it wasn’t heavily used too its ability. Another improvement would be assigning tasks according to team members strength and sticking to it. Which allows for a more effective process for the project.