Process Report

Airell Rasendriya Bachtiar
Borek Bandell
Ismet Bilir
Tim de Lange

CB-S2-01

Table of Content

1. Work Division

We as a group have tried to divide our work evenly as possible across our members. So here is the rundown of our work division:

1. Airell Rasendriya Bachtiar
    - Documentation
    - Database
    - Making agenda
    - Majority of website
    - Export employee and product data
2. Borek Bandell
    - Minutes of meeting
    - Documentation
    - Product features
    - Application design
    - Sick day on website
    - (Export) statistic data
3. İsmet Bilir
    - Documentation
    - Scheduler features
    - Automatic scheduling
    - Spokesperson
4. Tim de Lange
    - Documentation
    - User Features
    - Employee department
    - Employee contract
    - Spokesperson

2. Personal Reflection

2.1. Airell Rasendriya Bachtiar

Throughout this project, I think all went well. Luckily I am in a group that all are active. We divided our work evenly as well so no one did all the work by himself. I think we can do better on the planning after meeting with the client. We can outline what needs to be done and what is more important to finish first.

For me, I think I can do a lot more work towards the end of the project if I haven't gotten sick. And at the beginning of this project, I worked on a part that I shouldn't touch. It was not my part to work on and I tempered with it causing a slight problem that doesn't match what the others have envisioned of their code. I shouldn't cross that line. And for pushing to git, I should make a more clear description of my commits so others will understand what addition I made. Also I

should add more comments on my code since my code is used by the others and it will make it easier to understand.

2.2.   Borek Bandell

I am generally pleased with how the project went. I think the work was distributed pretty evenly. We could probably improve a bit on communication because at certain times it was unclear who was working on what. This did improve later on. I think we also improved on code quality during the project. At the beginning the coding quality was pretty basic but later on I noticed our code was way better structured, had more clear variable naming. We also made use of different coding layers.

2.3.   Ismet Bilir

Personally, I am really happy with what we delivered as a group. The group worked actively on the project and we had a clear understanding on the distribution, everyone got a fair share of work they had to do. Initially we were all trying to figure out how to work on the project and also how to work with each other, but we continuously kept improving on this.

There are some things I wish I handled differently. For one, I wish I communicated more clearly throughout the project in regards to what I was working on and more up to date on with the project. In addition, I would've liked to be able to focus more on different features of the project, as I was mostly working on the scheduler. This made it more difficult for the others to assist me and the other way around.

2.4.   Tim de Lange

The project went really well with my group. Sometimes communication was a bit rough at the start but we picked it up quickly and everything went a lot smoother afterwards. Git has been a hassle sometimes but has gone a lot better with more experience. There definitely have been some issues but for the most part my group was always able to help me resolve the issues we had. We did have a bunch of sickness in the group all around which was a tad unfortunate but different jobs got picked up by different people to make sure in the end the program worked.
I am really happy about the project in general although in the end I will always think I should have just added 1 or 2 more features but that is just the mind being busy all the time.

3. Waterfall Reflection

Waterfall phase is a linear approach towards making a program. We have to follow steps that are pre-determine or planned in the beginning of this phase.

At the beginning of this phase we had a slow start on the project that will affect towards the end of week 6. We met new people and have to set up all the documentation for this project. We learn what the requirements needed for this project such as understanding the project, interviewing the client on week 2 and have to do URS and project plan.

The project went according to plan in our project plan but we didn't count how much to do on the implementing phase which is the coding part. Also at the beginning we are overwhelmed from the information we got and a lot of requests from our client. It's a gamble when we were making the program on whether it's the same from our client's vision of the program.

But we have a certain freedom of our deadline as a group for the features that are required to be finished as long as we are done in the 6th week.

4. Iterative Reflection

Iterative phase is where the client requests small changes and features in a span of few weeks. We constantly change and add this small improvement until the client is satisfied.

In this phase everything went more smoothly. We didn't get overwhelmed by the huge amount of expectation or requirements in the project. Beside the other external factors like another project that has an earlier deadline, this phase went well.

In this phase we have a more clear understanding about the priority of requested requirements since the client gives us requirements in small batches and it's easier for us to change it if needed and after all that has been completed we can move to the next most important requirement.

5. Comparison on Waterfall and Iterative

Waterfall and iterative have their strong points and weaknesses. But we all agree that waterfall is better for a project to start since iterative works better for an already built program so we know which features are lacking or need to be fixed. Since in waterfall we are already given the basic information and problems of the project we can make the basic program out of that without further instruction. Iterative is fully advantageous when we want to finish up a program with extra addition from the basic program until the client is satisfied with the project.