

DP2 2023-2024
Chartering Report

Acme Software Factory



Repository: <https://github.com/rafcasceb/Acme-SF-D01>

Members:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| • Castillo Cebolla, Rafael | rafcasceb@alum.us.es |
| • Flores de Francisco, Daniel | danflode@alum.us.es |
| • Heras Pérez, Raúl | rauherper@alum.us.es |
| • Mellado Díaz, Luis | luimeldia@alum.us.es |
| • Vento Conesa, Adriana | adrvencon@alum.us.es |

GROUP C1.049

Version 1.0

15-02-24

Content Table

Introduction	5
Recruitment Summary	6
Member Information	6
Commitment Statement	7
Performance Indicators	8
Firing Conditions	9
Conclusions	10
Bibliography	11

Abstract

This chartering document outlines the recruitment process, commitments, and performance expectations of the workgroup.

Revision Table

Date	Version	Description of the changes	Deliverable
15/02/2024	V1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Document creation.• Abstract, first version.• Introduction, first version.	1
16/02/2024	V1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recruitment summary.• Member information.• Commitment statement.• Performance indicators: main indicators.• Performance indicators: rewards and penalties.• Firing conditions.• Conclusion.	1
16/02/2024	V1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Revision of the abstract, documentation, commitment statement, and performance indicators according to the professor's comments.	1

Introduction

In the context of our academic course project, centered around the development of a Web Information System for the fictional company ACME, this document assumes a crucial role in introducing our team and establishing operational protocols.

The structure of the document follows a logical sequence, beginning with this introduction and proceeding to describe the recruitment process, commitment statements, performance indicators, and mechanisms for rewarding or addressing performance. Finally, conditions for dismissal and steps to address ethical issues are presented, providing a comprehensive framework for our collaborative efforts.

Recruitment Summary

Given the history of successful collaboration among team members across various projects, an extensive recruitment process was deemed unnecessary. While initially considering the inclusion of additional members to enhance our team's capabilities, the clarification of a maximum team size constraint, set at five members, rendered further recruitment efforts redundant. Consequently, we abstained from engaging in a prolonged selection process. Therefore, the recruitment process was a rather short one, as the team was quickly composed by the manager and reached a consensus to due to prior collaborative efforts on other projects.

Member Information

Member 1: Rafael Castillo Cebolla



Corporate email: rafcasceb@alum.us.es

Member 2: Daniel Flores de Francisco



Corporate email: danflode@alum.us.es

Member 3: Raúl Heras Pérez



Corporate email: rauherper@alum.us.es

Member 4: Luis Mellado Díaz



Corporate email: luimeldia@alum.us.es

Member 5: Adriana Vento Conesa



Corporate email: adrvencon@alum.us.es

Commitment Statement


We, the members of the group, hereby declare:

1. To commit to working together on the development of this project, attending all meetings, and fulfilling the assigned tasks, except in cases of force majeure that prevent us from meeting these commitments.
2. To have read and understood the syllabus of the subject, as well as comprehending how the project will be evaluated and graded, aiming to achieve the previously agreed-upon score by the team, which is a 5/10, a passing score.

Failure to adhere to these standards and fulfill this declaration will result in the consequences outlined in the subsequent sections.

Signed in Seville, on the 16th of February 2024.

X



Daniel Flores de Francisco

X



Rafael Castillo Cebolla

X



Luis Mellado Díaz

X



Adriana Vento Conesa

X



Raúl Heras Pérez

Performance Indicators

The performance of our workgroup members will be evaluated based on several key indicators to ensure the effective completion of assigned tasks and the overall quality of work produced. The primary performance indicators are:

1. **Performance percentage:** A crucial indicator of team performance is the timely completion of tasks assigned by the manager. The time of completion for these tasks is secondary, with emphasis placed on meeting deadlines.

The following methodology can be followed to compute the performance of each member:

$$Performance = \frac{Completed\ Tasks}{Total\ Tasks} * 100$$

The *Total Tasks* variable comprises both feature and “checkup” tasks assigned to the member. A task will only be counted towards the *Completed Tasks* if the corresponding issue is closed.

2. **Number of revision tasks:** Revision tasks are those created due to feature tasks that were carried out incorrectly by a team member. The lower the number of revision tasks created, the better the quality of work performed by the member.

Thus, these standards give rise to the following definitions:

Members are considered to be **performing well** if they obtain a performance higher than 90% and the number of revision tasks created during a deliverable is 2 out of every 10 tasks completed or lower. Workgroup members who consistently yield good performance results will be recognized and rewarded by receiving support from other group members. Their opinions and suggestions will be taken into consideration when making decisions and during task-election processes.

Conversely, members are deemed to be **performing poorly** if they obtain a performance lower than 70% and/or the number of revision tasks created during a deliverable is 3 out of every 10 tasks completed or higher. If a group member consistently performs poorly, they will initially be given extra support by other members to address any possible weaknesses that may be hindering their workflow. However, persistent underperformance will result in reduced involvement in decision-making processes. Additionally, members who perform poorly will be given a heavier workload in future deliveries to compensate the part of the work that other members had to complete in their behalf.

Firing Conditions

If a workgroup member consistently demonstrates poor performance indicators over the course of two consecutive deliverables, they will be subject to dismissal from the group. This decision will be made in consideration of the impact of their underperformance on the overall progress and quality of the project. The final decision will be made by the manager in charge of that deliverable. If, however, the manager is the person subject to being terminated, the decision will be made unanimously by the rest of the team members.

Upon dismissal, the student will have the option to either continue working independently on the project or to withdraw from the assignment entirely.

Conclusions

In conclusion, this chartering document serves as the guideline for the efficient operation and management of our workgroup throughout the project's duration. By meticulously delineating recruitment processes, commitment statements, performance indicators, and firing conditions, we have established robust guidelines and clear expectations for every member. These guidelines not only ensure accountability and transparency but also cultivate an environment conducive to collaboration, innovation, and hopefully, project success.

Bibliography

Intentionally blank.