Process Model Report

February 12, 2018

Team 3 (Jack Taylor, Mitchel Smith, Elan Kainen, Jason Wen)

Introduction:

This report describes Team 3's selection of a software process model for its project to develop an application to connect travel buddies based on interests and trip scheduling.

Questions and Answers:

1. What primary process model does the team plan to use?

Spiral/Prototyping Model

2. What secondary process model(s) does the team plan to use?

Waterfall Model

We plan to follow this on each iteration of our prototyping/spiraling. We will also use a final waterfall approach to create our final product.

3. What project or team characteristics led to this decision?

The most attractive capability of the spiral model is its focus on prototyping. We all like the idea of getting a quick prototype together after we have become comfortable with the tools we will be using. Also, we are not yet sure of the requirements of our application. We have a solid grasp of the basic functionalities we would like to see implemented (login portal, user profiles, interactivity with Google Maps, and etc.) but could not create a complete set of requirements. This is where the spiral/prototype model will help us get a better idea of the requirements that will be necessary and possible to implement into the final product.

This model also lends itself to our plan for each team member to independently work through a set of tutorials on Xcode and the Swift programming language as this can seamlessly transition into our prototype development. A final reason we selected this model is that it will function well with our busy schedules, allowing us to meet, work on specific tasks in pairs or independently, and repeat.

4. Were any other alternatives considered and rejected? If so, why?

In selecting our process, our main focus was a to find a process that seemed natural to how we, as students, would typically approach this type of project. Some models, such as the RUP feel slightly bureaucratic and we judged that they were not ideal for us. Agile/extreme programming seemed too challenging for this application. Although it

appears to be a programmer-empowering and efficient process, it seems that it would function better in a large office rather than our 4 person group. Although the timeboxing model is an interesting one in theory, we decided that it does not lend itself to our project, as we simply do not have the manpower to achieve the parallelism it requires.

5. State the actual sequence of activities to be performed.