|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **UWE-FET UFCF4L-20-2 IS Practice 2012/2013 Logbook Entry No. 0 (Practice)** | | | | | **Marks** | |
| **PROLOGUE** | Author: Robert Michael Lydon [UWE ID: 11007560] | | Project: Integration of collaborative video conferencing software for purposes of academic research | | a |  |
| Period covered from: 07/01/13 | to: 23/01/13 | Date written:24/01/13 | |
| Task: Develop 4 sections in contribution to team Project Definition Document (PDD). | | | | b |  |
| Rationale/context: In preparation for stage 3 of our project, it was necessary for us to create a PDD to allow us to carry out the practical implementations of change within our host department. The PDD itself will be used to monitor progress and orientation to goals throughout the changes that the project aims to achieve. | | | | c |  |
| **PLAN** | * Objective: To develop a logically reasonable business case with accompanying aims and objectives and criteria for success of our project while taking into account other matters which may be relevant in achieving the project goals set out in the PDD. * Success criteria: A timely (to meet January PDD deadline) portfolio of easily accessible, well presented (linguistically) contributory sections to the team’s PDD which will be logically understood by all the project stakeholders, including the host department contact, the team supervisor and the team itself. * Methods: Document processing in Microsoft Word, combined with Facebook to send text to another team member (Joshua) for formatting and contribution merging. * Resources: Meeting as a team (whole and partial) on multiple occasions to discuss the quality, appropriateness and development of PDD sections building upon our findings during stage 2. | | | | d |  |
| e |  |
| f |  |
| g |  |
| **ACTION** | * The first meeting aimed at the development of the team PDD occurred on 10th January 2013, though only Joshua and I were able to attend at this date. My main inspiration in writing the sections I had volunteered to author was based on knowledge gained from stage 2 of our project, as well as knowledge gained from the experience of group dynamics in relation to the section “Other matters”. After completing 4 contributory sections toward the PDD, including: Business Case, Aims and Objectives, Criteria for success and Other methods in Microsoft Word, I messaged them via a Facebook chat to Joshua for merging into a master PDD with aesthetically pleasing formatting. The team met approximately one week later with (as far as I can remember) 1 missing member. During this meeting, small changes and additions to my contributions were made by other team members whilst reviewing quality of work and wording. * As only two of the team members (including myself) were present, critique and observations on the initial work done in the first meeting were limited. However, this was amended in the second meeting where the majority of team members were present. Ultimately, minor adjustments to my own work as well as a few ‘bolt-on’ contributions within my leading bodies of text became present from other team members. * Working mainly with Joshua during our meeting, I typed up my contributory sections in Microsoft Word and sent them to Joshua for merging into a master PDD. This copy of the PDD was then used by Joshua later to merge every other contributing team members’ sections and points with ours. * Although we did meet as a near-whole team, it was apparent that there was a lack of commitment and enthusiasm from some other team members in contributing further to the sections I authored in a constructive manner. Furthermore, conflict in ideas as to the content and wording of my contributory business case section between myself and another team member reduced our ability to cooperate in improving the section. However, for the most part the plan was followed, with the only weak component being in that of team agreement over the sections in relation to building upon stage 2 findings. | | | | h |  |
| i |  |
| j |  |
| k |  |
| **REVIEW** | * The task was accomplished and my PDD contributory sections were modified and amended well in time for the January deadline, allowing sufficient time for both host and team supervisor approval. * While the quality of the individual contributions were satisfactory in my opinion, it may have helped if other team members had shown enthusiasm in moderating and bettering the sections I put forward. * The planned methods were appropriate considering the nature of the task at hand. It would have been inappropriate not to parallel process sections of the PDD due to time constraints, therefore merging (although via an arguably informal and inappropriate channel – Facebook and manual entering into a master document) was found to be the best overall solution in completing modules of high quality work in a timely manner. * The availability and constructiveness of supporting resources (people) in this case was limited, as there seemed to be a disagreement in the wording of contributed PDD sections. This resulted in constructive improvements and changes to be minimal. | | | | l |  |
| m |  |
| n |  |
| o |  |
| **REFLECTION** | * In the future I feel it would have been best to consult with other team members prior to writing any contributor content to ensure that everyone is happy with the representation of knowledge interpretations in the future. * One proposition that arose from this task is that everyone in the team needs to work together closely in defining the terms and objectives of the project, so appropriate compromises arising from different interpretations of past team research findings can be resolved in a timely manner. * In moving on to the next step in the project, this task has reminded me that I must be aware to other individuals’ differences in interpreting ‘what’s happening’ in the project and the exact, specific directions and wording that are to be taken. * I feel that team members who are unstable in their regular attendance and commitment to team meetings lack the foundations on which to constructively improve the quality and appropriateness of work laid out by other individual team members. This will ultimately result in conflict between team members, a polarisation of workload and ultimately disparate individual contributions and performance. | | | | p |  |
| q |  |
| r |  |
| s |  |
| **EPIILOGUE** | Supporting evidence attached: Please find the file ISP\_Logbook\_0\_Practice\_Evidence\_11007560.docx uploaded with this logbook entry. The document contains: screenshots of original (not team moderated) contributory material authored by myself for the PDD and the relevant final sections in the context of the PDD submitted for the January deadline. | | | | t |  |
| Presentation and quality | | | | u |  |
| Conclusions/other remarks:- I am concerned about the direction the team as a whole wants to take in terms of the fact that academic research material will be circulated outside the confines of UWE’s IT servers if we outsource to a Web 2.0 video conferencing, which may result in research ethics and security issues for the host department. I wonder if we will be able to effectively tailor and customise an outsourced platform to our specifications. | | | Other/ tutor points | v |  |
| w |  |
| x |  |
| y |  |
| Total /50: | 0 | |
| **\*2 = provisional mark:** | **%** | |