

Team Kwodo Reflection Summary

1. **Did the team prepare all the documentation artifacts requested by your faculty coach and sponsor? Were these documents carefully inspected prior to delivery? How would you assess the quality of the document artifacts?**

Our sponsor, Paul, agreed that we prepared all the documentation necessary

2. **How well did the team elicit the requirements? Are the requirements fully specified at this point? What approaches were used to elicit the requirements? Were key requirements missed? What methodology was used to document and validate the project requirements?**

Scott asked us one question: What value did the previous teams work give you towards requirements?

Nick's response was: "The most valuable part was at the start of the semester where paul listed what the system does and what he doesn't like. We didn't spend much time digging through old code because he wanted to start from scratch."

3. **Did the team explore the entire design space before arriving at a final design? Have there been many errors found in the design? Was it necessary to make major changes to any part of the design? What were the reasons for the change? Do you have a complete design at this point?**

Scott: the other project teams used the phrase "Future proofing", have you done anything to make this useful outside of TTKD?

Team: We have used config files for branding and urls within the product. We need to do more work in the Spring semester to make the product easier to use by other users.

4. **How has the development and implementation progressed? What percentage of the product do you estimate is complete at this point? Is the team providing the documentation within the implementation artifacts?**

We claimed that we had completed 80% of functionality, but we want to clarify this is only 80% of the must-have core requirements. We estimate this to be about 50-60% of the entire system.

5. **What is the team's testing strategy? Has the team developed a test plan? Is the team performing unit testing? Is the team using any test frameworks, such as JUnit? What are the testing results to date? Were any major defects found during system test?**

Scott, our coach, provided us with a word of caution for usability testing, that we may need to go through the human testing office, and that this should be done early on.

6. What is your process methodology? Has this been clearly outlined to your sponsor and received the sponsor's approval? How is the process documented?

Our coach, Scott, suggested to make explicit in our process time to do transition activities and the final release. We should also account for building tests and documentation in our iterations and process as a whole.

Paul stated that the previous team had some trouble with the final release last time, and he would like to get an early start on it this time. He would also like to use the system for a little before we call it "done."

7. What mechanisms is the team using to track project progress? How well has the team tracked its project progress? How often do these artifacts get updated on the department project website?

Andrew added the following to our response: that we should establish a better view of what's done, what's left. It'd be better to see it as a list with things checked off

In addition to Andrew's commentary, Paul added that he'd like to have Andrew's proposal included in our weekly meetings as well. What is this iteration? What is next iteration? and what's the backlog?

8. Is the team conducting effective meetings? What can be changed to make the team meetings more productive?

Andrew: We have the flexible meeting time wednesday which is nice.

Nick: We often get off track during the meetings or end up on some social media sites, but we have talked about this as a team and are resolving this. Our sponsor meetings go very well and efficiently though.

Scott: is the meeting time going to change? We will still meet 4-5 but it may start earlier

Paul: I will still be good to meet 4-5.

9. Has the team met all project milestones to date? Which milestones, if any, were missed or were met ahead of schedule? What contributed to this schedule changes? What will the team do differently to ensure that future milestones are met?

We didn't correctly estimate time for iteration 5 considering our workload with our other classes and our presentation. Scott advised us against planning too much work over winter break and suggested accounting for this risk. Paul Agreed with Scott's statement.

10. In the team's opinion has the work accomplished to date satisfied the project sponsor? Were there any weak spots in this regard?

Paul was in one hundred percent agreement with our response to this question.

11. Is this an effective team? What has been contributing to and detracting from the team's effectiveness? What are the team's weak points? What are the team's strong points? What changes can the team make for next term that will make it more effective?

Andrew stated that we should test the day before our sponsor meeting, and deploy the day before that. This would shorten the development time allowed for each sprint, but would account for testing and deployments, which we currently do not sufficiently account for.

Final Comments from Paul

Paul: I have to leave, but I am really pleased, take some time to reenergize and lets plow through the remaining tasks in the Spring.