3SPM Assignment, group collaboration

PROGRAMME: __RSDY3S1__   TUT GROUP: __G5 & G2__   ASSIGNMENT PROJECT TITLE: ___Salon Appointment System_____

Guidelines on group collaboration:

1. if there are 4 students in a group then the number of students in step 4 can be reduced to 1.

2. text highlighted in yellow must be filled by students.

2. reviewer should try his/her best to give constructive comments to group members

3. students can seek help from tutor at all steps.

ASSIGNMENT TASKS	STEP 1 **Draft 1 (ver1)** **By authors**	STEP 2 **Review #1:**	STEP 3 **Draft 2 (ver2)** **By authors**	STEP 4 **Review #2:**	STEP 5 **Draft 3 (ver3)** **By authors**	STEP 6 **Review #3**
1. Project Background	Lim Jun Wei, Yuen Yun Jia (Date completed: Week 2, day 6)	Tan Huei Qing (week 3, day 1: can explain in more detail about the development team, including each member's working experience)	Lim Jun Wei, Yuen Yun Jia (Date updated: week 3, day 1, Updated project client)	Chia Ming Yi, Ong Yi Xin (week 3, day 3 The description of the project client is not clear and it is hard to understand who our actual project clients are.)	Lim Jun Wei, Yuen Yun Jia (Date updated: week 3, day 5, Updated project client description content)	Lecturer/Tutor comments
2. Project Team Structure, Stakeholders and Communication Plan	Yuen Yun Jia, Tan Huei Qing (Date completed: week3, day 4)	Chia Ming Yi (week3, day4: The team table is incomplete and suggest to add some brief background information for each member to improve clarity on roles and individual strengths)	Yuen Yun Jia, Tan Huei Qing (Date updated: week3, day 5, updated the team table)	Ong Yi Xin, Lim Jun Wei (week 3, day 6: functional requirement format is not standardized, try to adjust the functional requirements' format to follow the format of "The system shall allow <actor> to <action>" if possible)	Yuen Yun Jia, Tan Huei Qing (Date updated: week3, day6, standardized functional requirement and elaborated purpose for communication plan)	Lecturer/Tutor
3. Project Scope, Exclusions and Software Process Model	Tan Huei Qing, Chia Ming Yi (Date completed: week3, day 5)	Ong Yi Xin (week 4, day 1: The functional requirements of each module separate based on submodule rather than just simple and unclear enough requirements.)	Tan Huei Qing, Chia Ming Yi (Date updated: week 4, day 2, Updated the separation of functional requirements based on sub modules)	Lim Jun Wei, Yuen Yun Jia (week 4, day 4: Lack of reason for software process model selection, you may provide more info regarding to the budget, manpower, user involvement factors)	Tan Huei Qing, Chia Ming Yi (Date updated: week 4, day5, Added further explanation on the reasons behind our software process model selection by considering key factors such as limited budget, small team size, and the need for frequent user involvement.)	Lecturer/Tutor
4. Project Schedule and Assumptions	Ong Yi Xin, Lim Jun Wei (Date completed: week 5, day 2)	Chia Ming Yi (week 5, day 3: Manpower distribution for tasks too crowded, some staff	Ong Yi Xin, Lim Jun Wei (Date updated: week 5, day 3, Updated gantt chart resources assignment with more	Yuen Yun Jia, Tan Huei Qing (week 5, day 4: The number of increments changed from 3 to 2, so the gantt chart duration needs to	Ong Yi Xin, Lim Jun Wei (Date updated: week 5, day 5, The number of increments of the project schedule	Lecturer/Tutor

		have too heavy tasks to handle within the same period range)	average workload for each of the staff. Also add in two more staff which are 1 tester and 1 developer for help to increase the project efficient and performance.Together with assigned the material resources such as the hardware or software and also cost resources such as the user manual to task that required these resources.)	adjust. The task is too much, 5 months might not be enough to complete all the tasks, suggesting a reduced task. Gantt chart should add in the lesson learn report)	has changed into 2. Each task's start time, end time and duration is adjusted for ensuring all the tasks can be completed within 5 months before the end of December 2025. Some of the unimportant or minor tasks have been removed or integrated with other tasks. The lesson learn report task has also been added under the "Corrective Action & Continuous Monitoring" segment in the project schedule)	
5. Quality Plan	Ong Yi Xin, Chia Ming Yi (Date completed: week 8, day 1)	Yuen Yun Jia (week 8, day 1: The definition of software attribute and description should be only for focus on availability instead of describing both reliability and availability)	Ong Yi Xin, Chia Ming Yi (Date updated: week 8, day 3, Update the the definition of software attribute and description to more focus on availability and combine all member's justification point)	Tan Huei Qing, Chia Ming Yi (week 8, day 3: the quality assessment process , post-testing should add in how to collect the data and bring in the scale formula, do an example to clearly show it)	Ong Yi Xin, Chia Ming Yi (Date updated: week 8, day 5, Update the "Now" by assuming the current value and describe how the value be calculated. Add in describe and example on how to collect the data and bring in the scale formula for the post-testing)	Lecturer/Tutor
6. Risk Table	Lim Jun Wei, Ong Yi Xin (Date completed: week 9, day 1)	Tan Huei Qing (week 10, day 4: The explanations provided for the risks are good and sufficient. However, the risk table should be updated and structured to clearly separate and include the Risk Title, Risk Category, Risk Description, and Risk Impact Description.)	Lim Jun Wei, Ong Yi Xin (Date updated: week 10, day 6, The Risk Title, Risk Category, Risk Description and Risk Impact Description have been added into the risk table when refined content)	Chia Ming Yi, Yuen Yun Jia (week 11, day 1: The risk table is comprehensive, suggest to condense repetitive examples to enhance readability, and possibly use bullet points or tables in mitigation and monitoring sections to make key actions stand out)	Lim Jun Wei, Ong Yi Xin (Date updated: week 11, day 3, the risk table's mitigation, monitoring and management sections have been refined for avoiding repetitive perspectives or points.)	Lecturer/Tutor
7. Ethics and professional conduct for project management	Yuen Yun Jia, Tan Huei Qing (Date completed: week 8, day 7)	Chia Ming Yi (week 9, day1: Thanks for updating the section, can complete 7.1 engagement strategies and include transitions in 7.2 to clearly present the disadvantages of the chosen model.)	Yuen Yun Jia, Tan Huei Qing (Date updated: week 9, day 4, complete the 7.1 engagement strategies and added transition on the 7.2 Reasons to disclose the disadvantages of the chosen model)	Ong Yi Xin, Lim Jun Wei (week 9, day 5: The engagement strategies have sufficient supporting points. However, it will be better if further describing the reason for choosing the salon owner and customers as the key stakeholders.)	Yuen Yun Jia, Tan Huei Qing (Date updated: Week 10, day 5:, Added the reason why the key stakeholder is salon owner and customer in 7.1 section.)	Lecturer/Tutor

Task Allocation Summary:

Team Member	Author	Review 1	Review 2	Total Count
Chia Ming Yi	2	2	3	7
Lim Jun Wei	3	1	3	7
Ong Yi Xin	3	1	3	7
Tan Huei Qing	3	2	2	7
Yuen Yun Jia	3	1	3	7

* Each assignment task involved all team members