|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date:2/10/2014** |  |
| **Time:** | 1000am – 1040am |
| **Venue:** | SIS Meeting Room 4-6 |
|  |  |
| **Attendees:** | All present |
|  |  |
| **Agenda:** | 1. Report professor with the progress for iteration1&2, deviation from plan, goals for iteration3, problems existing, roles of first three iterations and metrics. 2. Get feedback about our project management from professor. |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | **Due Date** |
| 1 | Change schedules and programming pair according to professor’s feedback | Yuxuan | 4 Oct |
| 2. | Continue debugging deployment | Yuxuan&Max | 5 Oct |

We have better understanding of project management:

1. Bug is something that is something that doesn’t meet the requirements;
2. Failure in access openshift database has critical impact instead of high impact;
3. Deployment should be done by a pair as a coding task;
4. Pplog should be stored in chronological order;
5. Javadoc should be done by programming pairs;
6. Everybody should have relatively balance commit on time with meaningful message;
7. All changes of code should be shown in pplog;
8. Strong coder must pair with weak coder, cannot have strong-strong pair;
9. Using excel sheet for testing and metric in per task basis, per iteration basis showing what is the bugs identified and what is the score for each iteration;
10. Non-programming task should be charged by only one person;
11. Nothing should be assigned during buffer time;
12. Make more use of time in the next presentation;
13. Deployment -> testing -> re-deployment(debugging task);
14. PM should allocate the task fairly and clearly for each programming pairs;
15. Plan 15 hrs when it is 15hrs of pp session

We will change our plan for iteration3 to iteration6 according to the feedback above.
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