

Communication

Introduction

This document is an overview of all the communication that I had with different relevant persons during this project.

Group

During this semester I worked together in a group with a total of six persons: Matias, Adryan, Dylan, Sarah, Tessa and I. Matias, Adryan and Sarah are international students, while Dylan, Tessa and I are Dutch students. At the start of the semester we made a group contract with some basic rules for the group work, and we all signed the contract.

We communicated online via Discord. We have a Discord server with channels for attendance, general talk, files and screenshots. Every work day we tried to update each other either via an in-person or online standup, or in case this wasn't possible via a Discord message. We also have a Trello board with all the tasks that we still have to finish, connected to the persons that have to finish it.

During the semester I faced several issues relating to attendance and deliverables of other group members. The main issue (that was already present at the start of the group project) was the fact that Sarah didn't communicate if and when she would be on location on specific days. During the Dutch Design Week she wasn't with us for the entire week, without informing us as a group. Later in the project another problem came up: Dylan and Sarah were unable to finish work on time on several occasions (a test plan and a brand guide that they got a week time for never got finished completely, and a first version was only available after two weeks). These two main issues made us unable to work effectively, and both me and the other group members explained this issue to Dylan and Sarah. During the first two months of our group work we tried to give them both the chance to fix these issues, but at the end of the semester we got permission to give an ultimatum. For this purpose, I made an e-mail with all of our requirements and the consequences of not following up on said requirements. After the ultimatum, both group members either got kicked out of or left the group.

Dear Rose,
I hereby inform you about the decision our group made in regards to the work performance of both Sarah and Dylan.

After our talk today, I voiced disagreement about how the conversation with Sarah went. My goal with the conversation was to have a conversation, which in my eyes means that both parties (in this case Sarah and the rest of the group) can talk about what is going on, before any final decisions are made. I wanted to make clear what the problems are in the groups eyes, and give Sarah a chance to reflect on those problems. I also wanted to have a conversation with Dylan, as he has been working together with Sarah (and the work they did together was not on time).

As such, Tessa and I initiated a new conversation with Sarah, Dylan and Rose. The conclusion of this conversation is as follows:

Sarah and Dylan will both get one last chance to meet the group's requirements. This requirements are:

- Be on location every monday, tuesday and wednesday from 10:00 till 15:30.
- Improve the communication: give daily updates on work progress and problems. Ask for feedback. Notify the group when anything prevents you from working, and how you're going to make up for the preventions. Be consistent with the updates as well throughout the day.
- Meet the deadlines.

If any of the above mentioned requirements are not met (even once), the group member will be removed from the group. This is a last chance.

The group has agreed on this decision.

Because of this decision, the earlier decision to remove Sarah from the group that some of the group members made, has been revoked. We would like to give Sarah one last chance, as she has showed us she understands the problems and she does have concrete steps she's going to take to try to fix the issues.

Kind regards,



Robin Friesen
Student Media Design/Smart Mobile/Open Learning
HBO-ICT Bachelor

Stakeholders

Our main stakeholder was Dennis, whom we communicated with via stakeholder meetings primarily. These stakeholder meetings were updates on what has been done since the last meeting, as well as

moments for us or Dennis to ask questions or discuss topics related to the group projects. If Tessa or I had something to tell or ask him outside of these meetings, we would talk to him in the halls.

We also had contact with Steven van 't Klooster, one of the programmers of the project. He works at an external company that's developing the dashboard. We talked with him about what he was using for the development of the dashboard, as well as our ideas for the application. At the end of the semester Tessa and I give him an overview of our findings.

The third main stakeholder we had contact with was Tine Averens. She is a researcher for the University of Antwerp, where the questionnaires are being developed and tested. Tessa and I talked with her about what she found out during her testing of the questionnaires, and what we could work on best to help the project. She gave us the information we needed to start development of our application.

Our last stakeholder was Mark Klerkx, who is the lead of the project within the Lectorate Interaction Design. Tessa and I updated Mark on the process of the project and the ideas we were working on. Mark asked us if we could present these ideas and the final product at the consortium.

All stakeholders were happy and enthusiastic about the process of our project.

Other relevant parties

In November we started contacting hospitals and other healthcare providers to see if we could plan a few interviews and tests. I already had contact with two providers (Zuyderland and Kempenhaege) as my mother knows people who work there. The rest of the group went to two hospitals to try to get their contact information by explaining what our project is about and what kind of appointments we would like to plan. After we had this information, I contacted both Maxima MC and Catharina MC (either via phone or e-mail). For Maxima MC my main contact was Astrid Hoeks, and for Catharina MC my main contact was Hajar El Yahyaoui. I planned a total of 11 tests, of which 7 didn't get cancelled. All these meetings were at the start of January, as the planning took a lot of time internally (in the hospitals).

Finland internship

During Dutch Design Week, Tessa and I saw an interesting project called Spiritus Ludi: a sleeve that a user can wear, with which the user can feel each other's breathing pattern. This can be used in e-sports teams for example, where they can feel more in sync with the other team members. The project is in development at the Hame University of Applied Sciences. Tessa and I both liked the project, and we agreed that it would be cool to see if they would have an internship place available. I already mentioned at the start of the semester that I would like to do an internship in one of the Scandinavian countries, and Tessa also wanted to do an internship abroad but wasn't sure where yet.

Tessa and I got into a conversation with Brian (one of the designers) about the project. During this conversation, Tessa asked him about internship opportunities. Brian gave us the contact information of Joni, a researcher at HAMK who knows more about internship availability. After this we took Brian to Fontys TQ to talk with him about Finland and show him our building (as well as let him taste poffertjes).

At the end of November Tessa and I made an e-mail for Joni where in we asked about internship opportunities, which Tessa sent. He asked for our CV's, and after a conversation with his colleagues told us that he has an internship opportunity for both of us.