**Meeting Agenda & Minutes**

Wed 1/2/2018, 11:30, The Zone at Ellison Building

**Agenda**

1. SC to feedback as to tutor remarks on example data, employees and clarify the deadline date
2. Review, finalise and agree on Quality Document
3. Look at Thoughts and Questions document, and draw attention to its purpose (that anyone can use it) and expectations of it (drawing together of ideas into a centralised spot)
4. Discuss Skills Audit, decide on ‘technical skills required’ and set deadline for individual submissions (group submission in week 4)
5. Review the Critical Path (developed by PS)
6. Review work for tasks 7 and 8 (developed by MW/MB)
7. Review initial Class Diagrams

Attendees

Peter Smith (Scribe), Sam Connolly, Michael Bulgrass, Max Walsh (chair)

# 

**Minutes**

SC said he had to leave at 1.30

# MW was a little late again, and the group decided that they would start the meeting without him. Rather than deal with agenda related items, SC asked whether the group should move to using GitHub as the centralised repository rather than GoogleDrive. PS was reluctant initially as all of his templates and documentation was already created there and stored. It was agreed that documentation should remain in GoogleDrive for the time being while any coding would use GitHub to make use of its versioning tools. SC would look into using GitHub as a repository for documentation.

MW arrives and opens the meeting.

#1: MB was supposed to feedback with regards house standards, however a generic email had been received by all team members detailing basic house standards for Java coding.

SC has emailed the tutors with the questions regarding sample task data and deadline clarification. He is yet to receive a response, and as the information is not critical at this stage it would be followed up when more information was received.

#2: Quality document was looked at, and a number of alterations were suggested including the use of 1 tab to be 4 spaces for use in code indentations, and the use of arial 12 as document standard. There was again some discussion about the use of GitHub over GoogleDrive as the repository for all files, and MW agreed to look further into the matter and decide which would be best for the team to use.

#3: Thoughts and Comments Document was looked at and discussed. It was agreed that the document would be read through and added to by all team members, and through the use of comments decisions would be reached.

The meeting diverged from the planned agenda at this point as a number of points from the Thoughts and Comments Documents were of sufficient interest that the team felt the need to discuss them.

SC asked whether instead of a definite time scale for each task (“Must be done on a Monday, Wednesday and Friday”) that each task be assigned a priority that was flexible. Rather than have each task set for a specific day the priority setting would inform the caretaker how urgently the task needed to be done, with high priority tasks needing to be completed that day.

MW agreed and suggested that this method would allow incomplete tasks to have their priority rating raised to ensure that they were top of the list in the next day’s allocation of tasks.

SC suggested that there could be a number of triggers written into the code that would check the priority level of each task, when it was created and, if it was not completed within a reasonable timeframe, would automatically increase in priority as time progressed.

MW also suggested that each caretaker be limited to how many high priority tasks each of them had to do, to ensure that all the tasks could be completed as quickly as possible. Use of attributes such as “Duration” or “Time Required” to determine how long a task requires before it is complete would allow each Caretaker to have a personalised list of tasks they liked and disliked, were good at and could do quickly.

MW made his thoughts clear that despite the HR department wanting to empower the caretakers (as PS suggested from the project brief) that their arguing and bickering would continue with a system if they were given the opportunity to allocate tasks to themselves. Therefore, to avoid this, caretakers should not have the option of selecting their own tasks. The team supported this idea.

The content of the manager’s screen was then discussed. It was suggested by SC and agreed that the manager should have easy access to the data that they need on a regular basis (such as allocation of task/tasks pending, tasks flagged for a manager to look at and completed tasks) and that the manager could then select “further details” of what they neede to view.

MW suggested that a “refresh” or “reset” button be implemented that would recycle allocated and pending (but incomplete) tasks, and re-allocate them to to caretakers but this idea was not agreed on.

MB queried when the allocation of tasks would happen, and it was agreed that it should be a daily event first thing in the morning rather than a weekly event. This would prevent caretakers from being absent on days that they were allocated tasks they didn’t want to do, or from manipulating the system and stacking tasks so that they were redistributed amongst the other staff as they became a higher priority.

MW wanted a system whereby the caretakers would be able to view their allocated tasks and the one at the top of the list is the one that they should do next (highest priority), and there was some discussion about whether this was a firm rule or whether the caretakers could elect to ignore the suggestion in favour of doing other tasks provided the high priority tasks were completed by the deadline. MW also suggested that allocated tasks became static whereas pending and unallocated tasks could be shuffled and re-allocated as required. The team discussed having tasks regularly assigned to individuals that were both good and quick at completing them, referencing the linked caretaker “preferences” attributes that would help monitor, record and display these. MW suggested a system whereby particular tasks were allocated to particular caretakers based on their preferences, and this was agreed in theory but not fully discussed. It was left undecided how the system would implement the priority system, allowing SC some freedom to experiment and come to a suitable conclusion.

SC suggested giving each priority an equivalent value for ease of calculating, and was redirected to the previous suggestion about having duration and difficulty attributes for each task.

System integrity and security was discussed, with a mention of how the computer was networked but was physically secure and would not contain sensitive information. MW suggested that caretakers not be given the facility to create new tasks themselves, thereby preventing them from creating or altering tasks to suit their own purposes (the example given was taking an hour to wipe down surfaces which should take a minute or two at most). The consensus was reached that the caretakers would be able to create new tasks from a list of pre-determined tasks (such as cleaning or emptying of bins) and if it required a completely new task that they should be able to message the manager with the details and wait for verification. The manager would be able to add/edit/delete tasks as appropriate and could determine whether this was a new task or a part or subsection of another task.

MW also queried the method of verification of completed tasks, noting that there was reference to some tasks being completed to an unsatisfactory standard. The questions were asked who would check this and how? The group discussed and decided that some of the tasks would be flagged for managerial attention and that, once flagged, would require a manager to sign off on the task themselves once the task had been submitted as completed by the caretaker. It was commented that this would assist with annual performance reviews as well as monitoring of caretaker effectiveness and dedicated.

MW again suggested having overall efficiency ratings for caretakers, and again the team referenced back to the caretaker preferences attributes that would do the same job.

#4: Skills Audit document was looked at by the team, and it was agreed that everyone should write their own then upload it to GoogleDrive. At the start of next week’s meeting all of the skills audits are to be compiled together by PS into an Excel document, and a list of technical skills decided up and added to the compiled list.

The team held a quick discussion regarding the use of Microsoft Access as a database before MW pulled them back to the agenda items, deciding that the decision on software was not an urgent matter at this stage of development.

A slight change to the order of the agenda with #7: Class Diagrams being discussed next.

Time was spent looking at the initial class diagrams produced by PS, and immediately it was suggested that a class was missing. The task class should be linked directly with a “task state” class that would allow manipulation of a task’s state (pending, allocated, completed as well as priority levels) with ease.

It was suggested that all team members read the suggested book Design Patterns by Gamma, Helm, Johnson and Vlissides to help with the construction of class diagrams.

It was also decided that to aid the creation of the finalised class diagrams draft Use Case diagrams should be implemented. This task was given to MB.

#5: Critical Path

PS offered a brief overview of this document and how it tied in to the project plan and development. From it MW was able to determine that the earliest any of the team should be considering writing any code would be the end of week 5, giving them a further 3 weeks of design and analysis to ensure the system was robust and fit for purpose.

It was noted by PS that the Statement of Purpose had been missed out and it was decided that MB would complete this before the next meeting.

Attention was turned to the GANTT chart / project timeline in an effort to explain the critical path diagram, and team members were told that if they needed to make modifications it would be to the project timeline not the critical path document.

#6: Tasks 7 and 8

MW decided that to help with the planning for this task that a number of diagrams should be made by the group to look at what each User Interface would look like, and therefore what features each would have.

A number of quick hand-drawn diagrams were made and discussed, with a few points being raised.

SC suggested that the caretakers should have access to a way to “flag” tasks that they had problems with to draw the attention of the manager who could then review and, if necessary, re-assign the task as required. This was supported by previous discussion and agreed upon for SC to look into.

MW suggested that the initial caretaker display be a list of their allocated tasks, again with the task that they should do next (the highest priority task) at the top of the list. Reference was made to the discussion about caretakers creating and report on tasks.

MW asked the group whether caretakers should be able to see what tasks each other had assigned and it was decided that it would not happen. While it would have some benefits to having a single display with all of the caretakers and their tasks on, it might cause friction and arguments between the caretakers. Therefore the screen (and potential print-out) would only show one caretaker’s allocated tasks in a suggested order of priority. This would impact the system at the start of the day, requiring each of the caretakers to log on separately to view their rota or require that individual rotas were printed ready for the start of the day.

There was then some discussion over the flagging of tasks, and the wording used. MW had used the term flagging of tasks a number of times when he was talking about two different tasks. It was decided that “flagging a task” would mean either the manager would add a flag to the task so that they could monitor it or a caretaker could add a flag so that the task would be noticed by the manager and a decision reached. Whereas the other term would be called “suspended” rather than flagged. MW wanted a method whereby a caretaker could accept that a task was incomplete but that it would remain allocated to themselves rather than be re-allocated the next morning. There was some discussion and it was decided that this was possible but would require further looking into as it was not a priority of the system.

SC asked about how the team wanted the flagging of a task to work, and there was some discussion here. It was decided that a button to “flag” the task would be made available, and that there would be a list of generic reasons for why the task was to flagged - but that there would also be a text box for use with the “other” option, whereby more detail could be added by the caretaker. PS asked the question regarding the text box; whether the “other” option would need the text box to be filled in (verification) and whether was available regardless of the chosen reason for the flag. It was decided that the text box could be used to add detail to any flag, but that it had to be filled in if the “other reason” option was selected.

The tasks and project timeline were looked at again to decide what tasks needed to be done for the following week. MW wanted the Use Case diagrams finished, MB said that was part of his job and he would complete them.  
PS pointed out that UI design wasn’t a separate task, or linked to any one task therefore they could all contribute to that task. SC suggested that they draw out some suggested UIs and agree upon a standard design and layout when they met again. It was suggested that this would create too many different UIs, so MW and MB were to design the draft drawings.

Finally, as the meeting was drawing to a close, it was suggested again by MB that a feedback button be included in the system so that caretakers could add feedback to tasks they had completed. SC pointed out that since the caretakers would only have performance reviews a few times a year that this was a feature that could be sent to the manager and compiled, but didn’t have to be acted upon immediately and therefore the individual caretaker preferences would be created when the caretaker user profile was created, and added to a number of times a year when required.

# **New Business**

* No new business

**Any Other Business**

* Chair for next meeting will be MW.

**Action Items**

* SC to follow up emails to tutors re: deadline date and sample task data.
* MW to speak to find out about how GitHub does its versioning. Is it automatic? Does it include dates? Is it worth transferring all of the documentation from GoogleDrive to GitHub?
* SC to consider whether GitHub was an adequate method of storing documents centrally, and to create GitHub account for the team.
* Team members to create and submit individual Skills Audit into GoogleDrive ready for next Wednesday’s meeting as well as other tasks as outlined in timeline.
* MB to write a statement of purpose document.
* MW to consider a standard design layout for all User Interfaces
* MW to draw draft User Interface diagrams for screens that the manager will use
* MB to draw draft User Interface diagrams for screens that the caretakers will use
* Decide on system output - rotas for Caretakers, reports and displays for manager

**Next Meeting Agenda Items**

* MW to feedback on github.
* Compile Skills Audit and review technical qualifications / skills to finalise document
* Review UI designs
* Look over Class Diagram
* Review statement of purpose document