Meeting minutes 3/29/2023

Issue: team evaluation and self-assessment for iteration 3

Attendants: Huu Quang Nhat Nguyen, Du Nguyen, Huy Le, Nhat Phan

Duration: 32 mins (9.00 – 9.32 p.m.)

Notes:

Iteration 3 self-assessment file was opened and screen shared by Du on Discord.

After serious consideration and discussion, we reached to our finalized evaluation grades to every criteria as below according to the description and the working process in iteration 3

1. **(Agile development) Maintaining a product backlog** (2pts) Github was consistently updated after revision of coding and file by Huy Le – the timekeeper in the team throughout Iteration 3
2. **(Agile development) Iteration backlog** (1pts) At the beginning of this iteration, we have a meeting to plan out to-do tasks in details with specific steps and actions to archive in iteration 3. However we minus 1 points since we did not update to GitHub issues and project
3. **(Agile development) Iterations deliver functionality, continuously** (2pts) Since several goals were set to be archieved at the end of the iteration 3 at the first meeting, We definitely get 2 pts for this

1. **(Agile development) Visible team collaboration** (2pts) Weekly meeting minutes can be found on GitHub
2. **(Agile development) Team productivity** (0pts) Since we have a lot of midterms and individual plan in Spring Break, we tried our best to maintain team productivity. However, all tasks turned to be a little bit late to the set deadline
3. **(Agile development) Standards (dev containers, actions, repo structure, etc.) (2pts)** Every codes, files and even documents used in the process are shared in GitHub with source
4. **(Documentation) Follows “just enough” principle** –(2pts) All documents on GitHub were only updated and uploaded to GitHub after revision and double check to meet the needs of the projects
5. **(Documentation) Documented code** – (1pts) We realized that some of the uploaded code was not well commented
6. **(Issues) Are clear, concise, and actionable** – (2pts) All issues were clearly explained and necessary for the project.
7. **(Issues) Resources assigned** –(1pts) We set issues and assigned those to each team member. However, since not getting too familiar with GitHub, we forget to update issues on GitHub. We minus 1 point from this
8. **(Issues) Labeled** -- We set issues and assigned those to each team member. However, since not getting too familiar with GitHub, we forget to update issues on GitHub. We minus 1 point from this.
9. **(Source Control) Effective management** – (2pts) We always used local branch to uploads codes and files then merge them into main branch. GitHub CodeSpace was also used by Nat to code and commit on site
10. **(Source Control) Single issue commits** – (-2pts) We have not did this thing goods since we just discussed the problem and coded but not updating to the issues
11. **(Source Control) Commits linked to issues** – (-2pt) We have not did this thing goods since we just discussed the problem and coded but not updating to the issues

Du has the document submitted and meeting ended.