Group 1 Project Plan

# Organisation Plan

Team Leader: Andy Keavey

Android development team: Daniela Antonova and Andy Keavey

Amazon EC2 development team: Christos Gregoriou, Saleh Abdulqader, and Mohammad Abbas.

Division between sub-tasks is not absolute and all team members will be available to consult and perform tests on each other’s work in addition to having a familiarity with all the technologies involved in the project. Task specialists may be asked to present summary information and guidance to the group.

Details about how to use the group repository will be specified in the wiki.

The team-leader’s task will be to facilitate communication between members and monitor progress, but not to directly control activities in a traditional management style.
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Traditional Management Model

In the traditional management style the team-Leader becomes a bottle neck, and potentially a weak link. If the team-leader is absent then the developers must drastically change their working style to accommodate. In an Agile styled model, the developers are used to dealing with each other directly and use the team-leader as another resource helping to track the overall progress of the project.
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## Do and Review

Getting everything right first time is very difficult and reaching a consensus on how things should be done is very time consuming, even in a small group. Instead, the group will take advantage of the fact that it is much easier to improve a design or method than to develop one from the ground up. Therefore each team member will be encouraged to show initiative and develop ideas, but in small steps, allowing other team members to review progress as it happens. This translates into a modular working pattern with frequent commits.

# Conflict Resolution Plan

Each team member should focus on a limited number of tasks, and only a single bug or feature, assigned from the Issue tracker with the github group repository (with the exception that a single change affects more than one bug or feature). In the event that a team member is unavailable for any reason then the rest of the team must deal only with this single interrupted task, other software development flows will be unaffected. The limiting of current tasks on each individual also allows other group members the opportunity to contribute an equal amount towards the project if they wish to do so.

All team members will at some time encounter difficulties, it is each individual’s responsibility to seek assistance before project deadlines are missed. In this case, the team with the team leader may revise scheduling and resource allocation of tasks, in fact this is even encouraged as project demands change over time. However, if a team member neglects their agreed workload then peer marks will be deducted to reflect the adverse impact on the project *in addition to* low marks reflecting a lesser commitment as specified in the Peer Assessment Plan.

The penalty for failing to submit a peer assessment is 25% off the Group Mark (GM), using simple algebra (equ. 1), this can be shown to be equivalent to 12.5 Individual Peer Marks (IPM). Therefore if the group is unable to agree upon a peer assessment plan then the team-leader may adjust marks awarded, and sign the peer assessment on behalf of the group, with the following conditions:

1. Negotiations have failed.
2. The challenge to the peer assessment must specify the individual criteria under debate, as specified in the Peer Assessment Plan.
3. The team-leader is limited to deducting a maximum of 10 IPMs from any individual so that all group members receive a higher Individual Contribution (IC) than they would have otherwise if the penalty had been applied to the GM following the failure to submit the debated peer assessment.
4. In the special case where the team-leader is the individual debating the peer assessment, then a second group member must approve the mark adjustment.
5. The group will have a final chance to agree upon the original peer assessment once presented with the team-leaders adjustments.

equ. 1

# Peer Assessment Plan

The peer assessment will be judge on the following five criteria:

1. Quality of work (e.g. loose coupling, tight cohesion)
2. Contribution of software and documentation
3. Ideas for tasks, features, or more efficient working practises
4. Team-work and communication
5. Research and subject knowledge

An intermediate assessment will be submitted by all team members on the Friday of week 6 to allow time for disputes to be settled before the final deadline in week 10. Differences between the intermediate and final assessments must be accounted for e.g. X left the project in week 7.

Each member will assess the other members in the group but not themselves. The IPMs from each member, for each member, will then be summed and averaged.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | B’s score | C’s score |
| Quality | 23 | 77 |
| Contribution | 16 | 84 |
| Ideas | 13 | 87 |
| Teamwork | 31 | 69 |
| Research | 17 | 83 |
| **Average** | **20** | **80** |

A’s assessment for B and C

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A’s score | B’s score | C’s score |
| A’s assessment | - | 20 | 80 |
| B’s assessment | 30 | - | 70 |
| C’s assessment | 60 | 40 | - |
| **Average (sum / n)** | **30** | **20** | **50** |

IPMs for the group - n is the number of team members

It is important that work is made accessible to the group so that it can be counted towards the peer assessment. No marks will be awarded for claiming to have done work that is unseen by the group, therefore if work is accidently duplicated, it is strongly recommended that it is pushed to the github repository and filed in an archive folder before the relevant deadline for that contribution. Ideas generated in an alternative version may become useful later on as the project progresses.