Chronological account

1. First formal meeting, first informal meeting. Plans for project plan discussed and jobs allocated. A lot of time was spent discussing hour allocation in meetings. Decisions to do with work and hour allocations were generally agreed by everyone or adjusted slightly. A lot of time was spent on this section as a group because the project had to be broken down into small chunks of manageable tasks and assigned to member(s) who were the most suitable.
2. Deadline for project plan (D1). Appointed time manager as a solution to making sure deadlines are being stuck to and hours worked is being recorded in a universal format – this format was presented in the Project Plan. Appointed document manager to ensure work that we hand in as a group reads consistently and uses a uniform house style. The Project Plan was handed in promptly on the morning of the deadline day. It was proof read in whole by three members of the group the day before the hand in and printed by the document producer as agreed. The hand in was not a rush; as a group, we felt like it was a polished document and were satisfied with the process we went through in producing the work for this hand in.
3. Established a proper folder structure for SVN. Working pairs was appointed: Kelvin and Oscar on Model, Kristian and Edward on View and Brian on Controller. Architectural design and HCI design was discussed in formal and informal meeting as a group. UML work begun. Working pairs meeting up separately to discuss and design their parts to encourage progress. Not a lot of communication to do with the design of the inner workings of Model or View between the working pairs was happening at this stage. The progress of the design for Model and View was reviewed but not communicated much in the formal group meeting at the end of the week.
4. Coding begins on Model and View by each working pair separately. Communication and discussion between the pairs about the design of their parts is still small. Formal group meeting reviewed progress on the code. A small demonstration of what the Model and View code was capable of was presented in the formal group meeting. Each working pair continued to discuss/design/code separately. Brian the Controller person helps out with View offering design consultancy as View is highly tied with Controller and not much can be done in terms of writing Controller code can be done at this stage as interfaces were not defined between Model, View and Controller.
5. Discussion of ideas for D2 begun. Prepared code and presentation for D2. UML diagrams were finalised. A long library group meeting was held on the Sunday afternoon for this work to be done as a group because the presentation will be presented by the whole group and needs to be dynamic and flows nicely. This meeting included designing and making a draft version of the slides and rehearsing it for the first few times. The group dynamics were relaxed but productivity was high in terms of the amount of work produced and how far we got in preparation. There were small conflicts in the design and ordering of the slides but it was resolved quickly and everyone was happy. This was also a point where we discover who needed to sharpen up their presentation skills – group members were helpful in offering critical but constructive opinion on others who fell short of expectations and everyone showed patience and persistence in rehearsing the presentation multiple times until everyone was at a satisfactory level.
6. Code freeze. Final rehearsal and presentation of D2. Final rehearsal was done in an informal meeting an hour before the presentation so everyone knew what they are presenting and were fresh with the presentation in mind before the presentation.
7. Reviewed coding progress. Work begins on D3. D2 marks were received and met with approving nods all round from members of the group. Controller code begins. Confidence level was high.

\*\* Easter vacation: no work was done. \*\*

1. Splitting /src folder into model and view was no longer a good solution as controller is starting to be developed more. /src was refactored and everyone was informed and adapted in good time. Discussed the plans for D3, D4 and D5. Code review.
   1. Lesson learnt: be more specific at the planning/design stage: define folder structures for paper work and also define packages for coding.
   2. Lesson learnt: discuss plans for looming deadlines earlier to prevent coding or documenting rush.
2. Not establishing interfaces well enough made programming Controller hard. Brian had to communicate frequently with both Model and View groups to get an idea of how those components work. Edward decided to make interfaces which needed another informal meeting to discuss with Brian. Rush to code up solution.
   1. Lesson learnt: be more specific in the Design stage: define interfaces well before coding begins.
   2. Lesson learnt: code review meetings need to be stricter about the amount of work done; not let other course works derail progress. Need to improve time management on an individual level.
3. Hand in for this document.