

# Team Contributions: POC

## Software Engineering

Team #18, Gouda Engineers

Aidan Goodyer

Jeremy Orr

Leo Vugert

Nathan Perry

Tim Pokanai

This document summarizes the contributions of each team member up to the POC Demo. The time period of interest is the time between the beginning of the term and the POC demo.

## 1 Demo Plans

- **Front End:** A front end web app will be created for the demo to provide query access to users. They will be able to filter their queries to some extent
- **Back End:** The back end will take inputs from the front-end and use it to query data from a Microsoft Access database schema which contains all of the metadata related to each rat trial session. This metadata will be served for the user and will also be used to connect the metadata to the actual trial data objects (Video files, Track files etc...). Whether or not we will be able to serve these actual data objects is both time permitting and depends on our FRDR API access ticket being sorted out.
- **Natural Language Integration:** Our first integration for the project, we will use natural language input as a means of filtering the data and providing queries to the back-end. For PoC purposes, this will likely just be a ChatGPT wrapper.

## 2 Team Meeting Attendance

Student	Meetings
Total	12
Nathan Perry	12
Leo Vugert	12
Jeremy Orr	12
Aidan Goodyer	12
Tim Pokanai	12

## 3 Supervisor/Stakeholder Meeting Attendance

Supervisor's Name: [Dr. Henry Szechtman and Dr. Anna Dvorkin-Gheva ]

Student	Meetings
Total	5
Nathan Perry	5
Leo Vugert	5
Aidan Goodyer	5
Jeremy Orr	5
Aidan Goodyer	5

## 4 Lecture Attendance

Student	Lectures
Total	13
Nathan Perry	6
Leo Vugert	10
Aidan Goodyer	5
Jeremy Orr	4
Tim Pokanai	7

## 5 TA Document Discussion Attendance

TA's Name: [Tiago de Moraes Machado]

Student	Lectures
Total	3
Nathan Perry	3
Jeremy Orr	2
Leo Vugert	3
Tim Pokanai	3
Aidan Goodyer	3

Jeremy missed one meeting due to a mistake regarding what time the meeting was at (He was literally sitting outside waiting for our meeting to start while we were in it).

## 6 Commits

Student	Commits	Percent
Total	218	100%
Nathan Perry	81	37%
Leo Vugert	25	11.5%
Aidan Goodyer	38	17.4%
Tim Pokanai	40	18.3%
Jeremy Orr	34	15.6%

## 7 Issue Tracker

Note that despite what the template says, this table denotes the number of opened issues (issues created) in the second column and the number of closed issues in the third column.

Student	Authored (O+C)	Assigned (C only)
Nathan Perry	70	40
Leo Vugert	1	15
Aidan Goodyer	1	23
Jeremy Orr	52	33
Tim Pokanai	1	22

Nathan specifically offered to be in charge of creating issues for each action item of each new deliverable. Jeremy provided him assistance for the SRS explaining the big skew in authored issues.

## 8 CICD

CI/CD will be used via GitHub actions. This includes automated checks that check our code compiles without errors and passes our created suite of tests. Additionally, specific project standards will be enforced with these GitHub actions such as sufficient code reviewers as well as code documentation standards. These checks will all be done as our development branches get merged into main.

## 9 Team Charter Trigger Items

### 9.1 Trigger Items

1. Team member misses meeting without providing notice or reason
2. Team member misses meeting without providing an acceptable excuse
3. Team member's contributions do not hold up to the scrutiny of a peer review
4. Team member's contributions do not hold up to the team's final document review
5. Team member's attitude during meetings or discussion is detrimental to the team environment
6. Team member does not contribute their fair share of issues in the Kanban board

### 9.2 Violations

Refer to above section for corresponding trigger items. The violations will be summarized anonymously.

1. 1 violation. Meeting with TA
2. 0 violations
3. 3 violations. Missing parts of sections, corrective feedback given in branch review.
4. 1 violation. Team-wide, missing reflection for VnV
5. 1 violation. Lack of seriousness in internal meeting, causing unproductive discussions and going over meeting time.
6. 3 violations. Contributions to the SRS were fairly uneven, this was resolved through team discussion.

### **9.3 Violation Plan**

Refer to above sections for violation and trigger information

1. No plan needed. Genuine timing mix up, simply be more cautious when identifying meeting details.
2. N/A
3. No plan needed. Branch review requirements are already in place that resolve these issues.
4. Look through deliverable rubric when creating issues (The problem was caused because no reflection issue was made in GitHub). This will ensure that all supplementary parts are accounted for, not just the main document.
5. Communicate with team members about meeting expectations. Meetings should be taken seriously, otherwise we are just wasting each other's time.
6. A plan for issue creation and division of labour before starting each deliverable has been implemented. This provides a framework for what is expected from everyone and still allows for things to be switched up later if need be. This issue has been resolved and is no longer a concern.

## **10 Additional Productivity Metrics**

[If your team has additional metrics of productivity, please feel free to add them to this report. —SS]