TA Meeting #2
November 15, 2013

Team attendance: Deborah, Dwyane, Yi-shiuan
Minutes by Deborah

Progress report

Design decisions

-What are the reviews about?
      - About the general UROP experience.
      -Reflection (text)
      -Overall_Rating (integer)
      -Supervisor_Rating (integer)
      -Time_Committment (integer)
      -Recommended (boolean)
- Verification
      - Have confirmation email for students and faculty upon sign-up, no resume   required, but can fill out basic profile, like Major, year, etc.
      - Students can post anonymously, all reviews are available to students and faculty

Agenda

- Discuss items in progress report
- Feedback on design doc
      - Page flow diagram
      - Data model

- MVP status
      Deborah: sign in/sign up as supervisor or student; set up heroku app; Work on view/general UI time permitting.
      Naim: ability to submit postings, viewable by students and supervisors
      Yi-Shiuan: Application handling - students can apply to postings, and applications visible to supervisors
      Dwayne: Basic review system - students can post reviews

Minutes

Meeting is moved to Thursdays at 8 pm.

Feedback on Design Doc

General
- Avoid lengthy paragraphs because it's hard to parse important information
- Try to use bulleted lists

- Ex. Purpose, Motivation, Goals
    - split into three different sections
    - change subtitles
    - put goals in number/bulleted format
- Make sure we have everything in one design doc, including images
- Threat model in security section is missing

Design Challenges
- focus more on the pros and cons of each challenge
- put in a hierarchical format:
    - list each challenge
    - list options associated with each challenge
    - discuss the pros and cons of each option
    - make a decision and explain

Context Diagram
- lines in boxes
- lines should go from urop.io to student and to supervisor to show that students and supervisors can retrieve data from urop.io

Data Model
- arrows from student/supervisor to posting and review (reader) should be deleted.
- Does your application keep track of read/unread? If not, it does not have to be included in the data model.
- Review should have an associated (person who it is about)
- UROP will be included in the data model so that reviews can be linked to it
- The multiplicity for review and supervisor needs to be changed to has one (review has one supervisor)

Page flow
- Rethink about what the home page for supervisors should be

Risk should also include
- Application is not sufficient
- Another not-updated source?