

CLOSE OUT

CSCI375

Team Benz

April 9, 2018

Document Overview

In this document, we will give an overview of our projects initial objectives and discuss the final state of our project with respect to its intended objectives. This discussion, will review the features and functionalities that were changed, added, and omitted between the original idea and the final product as it stands.

We will give feedback and evaluate our team's structure, organization, and effectiveness. Will then end with recommendation for what could be done next if the project were to continue and what we could have done differently.

Project closeout

Overview of Project

o Initial Objectives for this project:

The following are five properties that we initially planned to implement and are followed with an update on each:

- (1) Create: initiated by user to create an idea.
 - This function was implemented successfully.
- (2) View Request: initiated by user to view an idea.
 - This function was implemented successfully.
- (3) Edit: initiated by user to edit content of an idea.
 - We underestimated this process and as a result ran out of time to have a completely working edit function.
 - As of today, the function populates a form with data from a certain idea to be modified, but we are not able to successfully submit modifications.
 - We thought that this would be the easiest to implement as we will only have to populate the form, make changes, then submit like we did in create. But because we are doing more than one thing at the same time, we should have divided it down into smaller subsystems, each focusing on one process.
 - We believe that this function should have been analyzed and designed in more depth.

- If we end up going back to complete it, we will spend 24 hours to try find the problem and fix it. If we are not able to, we will go back and replan it out from scratch. This time, we will divided it into subsystems. We will design, implement and test each individually, then connect it all together to accomplish the process we want.
- (4) Remove: initiated by user to remove an idea from the system.
 - This was not implemented because we wanted to get edit working first.
 - But looking back at it now, we believe that this should have been implemented first, because it's a simpler system.
 - We also tend to see application developers usually providing the create and remove functionalities in initial versions, then allowing edit in later versions. Maybe, it's for the same reason that we are faced with.
 - Therefore, if we are to proceed with this project, will first implement the remove feature before fixing the edit feature.
- (5) Search: initiated by user to refine a search for an idea.
 - This function was implemented successfully.
 - This feature was added later in the project as we analyzed the systems requirements, we realized that this feature was actually an important feature to allow users more flexibility navigating through ideas.
 - This feature was brought to our attention and recommended to us by our instructor. Seeing how we could have easily missed out on such an important feature, we'll take it upon ourselves to ask for more feedback at early stages of any project in the future.

Team Structure and Organization

- A review of our team's structure, organization, and effectiveness:
 - The team agrees as a whole, that the team's structure and organization lead to unfair distribution of work. With that being said, we believe that it was necessary and effective for our team, because of some lack of skills, time, and communication, we needed certain individuals to have more skills and spend more time to compensate for any shortcomings.

Strengths and Weaknesses

- Team strengths: Well diversified members. Mutual respect between all members.
- Team weaknesses: Lack of time to meet and communicate.
- Individual strengths:
 - Tony: Focused, organized and gets things done on time.

- Ben: Puts effort in work he does and makes sure points are clarified with there is a misunderstanding.
- Caleb: When given clear instructions, he executes them to the dot.
- Pete: Welling to put in the time to do whatever is required of him.
- Sami: Leads by example and attentive to detail.
- Individual weakness:
 - Pete: Not able to attend any meetings, therefore not always on the same page.
 - Sami: Not able to enforce fair work distribution all the time.
 - Tony: Doesn't challenge the leader as much as he should!
 - Ben: Quiet.
 - Caleb: Requires specific instructions.
- A review of team and individual strengths and weaknesses, compared to original expectations:
 - Team lacked the skills needed to fairly distribute work between all members at certain stages of the project.
 - Team was at mutual understanding throughout the project even though communication was expected to be weak between team.

Recommendations

- recommendations for what could be done next if the project were to continue
 - Expanding on the project.
 - Add login features.
 - Better interface and design.
 - Better Security.
 - We could support communication between members through the site rather than third party or email.
 - Allow commenting on the ideas.

Lessons

- a discussion of what the team would have done differently if they could do it over
 - a. Make better use of our team as a whole.
 - b. Insure everyone contributes equally across the span of the project.
 - c. Everyone should be responsible enough to take on a task they know they can handle and accomplish to the best of their abilities.
 - d. Deadline must be taken seriously.