**Project Management**

Overall our project management went well, we managed to successfully meet all deadlines to an adequate standard, this was done by a combination of methods and processes such as Agile, GIT and the division of worked based on skills. However, there were problems with our management when it came to things such as leadership and alternatives would be beneficial to improve the standard of our work.

As a team we decided early on that the best way to work would be to allocated tasks to individuals so that there was an even work load and everyone always had work to complete and was contributing. This benefited us by ensuring that we always met every deadline, had any extra work completed and we’re able to support each other if anyone was struggling.

Using GitHub allowed us to have very strong change and version control, constant access to all current and previous work as well as logging to see who has contributed what and when. This made sure that everyone had the most up to data versions of anything that they were working on or wanted access to and if errors were made gave us the ability to jump back to an earlier point in development.

A number of agile techniques were used during the entire process such as stand-up meetings which we would have every week during our tutorial hours this was to ensure everyone knew what the tasks that needed to be completed were and to inform each other on what we had personally done or found in the case of individual research. We also used MoSCoW prioritisation to rank tasks that needed to be done and determine a logical order for them to be completed.

A main problem we faced was of no clear leadership structure as even though we took an agile based approach, we did not have anyone clearly take the roles of scrum master or product owner and we each would do parts of these. However if we had clearly determined these rolls before hand and had a clear leadership structure if this was the case instead of each picking the tasks that they wanted then the scrum master could have assigned tasks and roles to those best suited to them which would likely lead to an increase in quality.

Another problem we had was quality control as this was essentially just self-reviewing work before submitting it this caused problems as you are unlikely to notice errors in your own work compared to how someone else might so this is something that should definitely be changed and it also links to not having a proper leader as this role would likely fall to them this may require some workload restructuring as it would likely lead to the leader having a lot more to do however it would almost certainly have spotted errors and things to be improved upon throughout the process which would have likely resulted in a better overall quality of the deliverables in particular.

In conclusion, our project management proved to be very effective as it allowed us to complete all tasks to a good standard and with plenty of time to spare, gave each member their own rolls and had everyone contribute evenly to the workload, have good monitoring, control and general administration. However, it was not perfect and there were aspects that we could definitely mainly in the top level group management and administration to ensure that we produce the highest possible quality of deliverables.