**Meeting 6 Agenda & Minutes**

Wed 28/02/18, 11.30, The Zone at Ellison Building

**Agenda**

* Review Use Case Descriptions
* Review start of UI construction
* Pseudocode algorithms
  + Task allocation
  + Password hash
  + Efficiency calculation
  + Report creation

**Attendees**

Peter Smith (Scribe), Sam Connelly (Chair), Max Walsh (late), Michael Bulgrass

**Apologies**

MW apologised that, due to the bad weather, he would be late for the meeting

**Minutes**

With MW apologising for his lateness, the meeting began without him.

The Task Creation UI was considered. Most of the changes addressed were aesthetic and included layout, increasing and improving space between fields and objects, and the size of the objects. One feature that requires urgent alteration are the names of the buttons, as “Create and Issue” sounded quite ominous and the second button “Create” being too similar to the first. SC offered an explanation as to the difference between buttons, but agreed that he needed to change them for ease of use by the user.

SC described the system in use. The manager would use the Create Task UI to add to the list of tasks to the database, and that they would also be able to override any existing task, either changing the details (including editing it so that it was no longer a task that needed doing that day) or deleting the task entirely.

MW noticed an omission from the data fields within the Create Task UI, and suggested that “Location of Task” be added. It was briefly discussed and agreed again that, rather than having that data included in the “Details” section it have a field of its own. SC said he would implement this.

**Repeating Tasks**

The topic of repeating tasks came up as part of the discussion, and there was some debate amongst the group as to how to get a complicated algorithm to work. SC suggested a different approach and, rather than have multiple combo-boxes or drop-down menus and have complex code to read and process this data, have a note in the system and make use of a manual input system for complicated repeated tasks. For tasks that are required multiple times within the same week, have it logged as multiple but identical tasks with only the date of allocation or requirement to complete being different.

MW apologised as he has completed his screen designs but did not have them with him. It was suggested that he bring them into the next seminar the group were attending, the following day, to be reviewed. MW agreed.

PS would like the group to discuss J-tables with their tutor, both the implementation and how to get them to look and work within the context of this project.

**Report Screen UI**

The group moved onto discussing the Report Screen and PS showed the UI he had put together as an example. In doing so he demonstrated the Main Menu UI he had and it caused some discussion within the group. MW became somewhat possessive of the UIs he was supposed to do, and annoyed that the prototype had been created - even one as basic as this. It was decided that only the group members responsible for the associated task should be working on the UIs, even at the level of a basic prototype to “get a feel for how things looked.” However, it did open discussion within the group as to how the UI was looking. PS had made a few example UIs and MW was conscious that these did not follow the same design that the group had agreed with. PS put forward that it was easy to follow and easy to code, however the group wanted the UIs to include basic reports integrated into the main menu for the manager and caretaker screens reducing the need to click or have multiple pop-up windows. Other things discussed was the number of buttons on each screen and their location. A “back” button was required on each window located in the top left of the window, which would close the active window and move back to the main menu. The main menu window would not close even when another window was activated.

Another suggestion was to include validation within the UIs including presence checks, ensuring that new tasks or users had sufficient information present before allowing the user to move on. And a pop-up will appear to notify the user that a new user / task has been added, including a button to cancel the pop-up.

**Use Case Descriptions**

These were looked at briefly, and some limited discussion took place. In particular the Manage Users section was checked over and the buttons “Add New User” and “Reset Password” would be added.

**Pseudocode Algorithms**

The algorithms and coding parts of the solution were discussed. It was decided not to begin the task allocation in earnest, but if time allowed MW would begin looking at the pseudocode to allocate tasks to particular caretakers.

MB has looked into password hashing and storing the passwords securely. He wants more time to make sure that he has got it right, and asked for this week to ensure it was done.

The group discussed the calculation of caretaker efficiency, used for calculating how long a caretaker would take to perform a particular task, and wanted to make it a decimal multiplier to keep the calculation simple. MW asked whether this multiplier could be used in the task allocation algorithm, and it was hoped by the group that this would be the case. There was some discussion as to how to create the data necessary for this calculation before previous meeting minutes were consulted and it was reminded that the group had decided that each caretaker would have a record of how long they had taken to perform particular tasks, and that each “task type” would have a calculation determined by a formula that divided the number of times the task had been performed by the total time they had taken. Rather than have a preference for individual tasks, it had been decided that each task would come under a “task type” or “task category” and the multiplier would be applied to all tasks that come under that type. This was more for convenience as having each and every caretaker recording every single task they did as a preference would be very labour-intensive for very little gain.

The report creation pseudocode was postponed for the time being as the actual output of the system had not yet been discussed or determined. It was decided to postpone this task until after the task allocation algorithm had been completed.

**Any Other Business**

* None discussed

**Action Items**

* SC will implement the changes to the UIs as discussed this meeting
  + SC will, time permitting, attempt to connect the UIs to the database
* MW will create the Employee / Caretaker UI
  + MW will, time permitting, begin to look at / pseudocode the task allocation algorithm
* MB will work on the password hashing and linking of his assigned UIs to the other UIs
* Group will use the previously made designs rather than the new prototypes suggested by PS, to limit the required user actions to access the basic information

**Next Meeting Agenda Items**

* Undecided who will chair meeting 07/03/2018