|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Weekly Team Task Report** | **Report #8** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Team: LabRats** | | | | | **Date: 2018-11-16** | |
| **Project Title: Environmental Laboratory Informatics and Management System** | | | | | | |
| https://lh3.googleusercontent.com/L_-EAAmjNTfARiVXAIzZE9rPc0mmkvl3lhSakQbB_th027oG_ZnT9QhMK8IUkih6bxE2JiGU9VyjqZTm2_1wMWBfWq0JpQUsJdH2qIpVFs4Tpdy3pbfovaH8dyDzBmamgbD_HAB4 | **Julian Bell** | https://lh5.googleusercontent.com/ADCzD4j13NjELoKqGMMS8L6Uo2Nj9hCgZSZXC8P-0JdXxgivDvDlJuqOXnY4TBqofM58h0rZ_KV7GlGs1Vp4JJN9i7hptQWmmtRr6NUjF2czNgpDkyjdhkY1k0pzW_nh4GKCDF2r | **Remy Brandriff** | | | |

### **Recent Meetings:**

* **Tuesday, 5:15pm:** We met briefly after our capstone lecture this week to discuss the design review, which we started after the class and worked on throughout the week. We don’t have a meeting with our mentor this week as we work on the design review and requirements draft, but we are in contact.
* **Thursday, 4:30pm:** We met for about an hour to work on the design review and discuss the next week. We also invited our sponsors, as well as everyone involved with the project to attend the design review, which we expect will give us great insight into anything we need to change for our requirements document. We both continued to work on the design review after the meeting.

### **TASKS COMPLETED since last meeting:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Title:** Design Review I Presentation | **Task Initiation:** 2018-11-02 | **Orig. Due Date:** 2018-11-16 | **Status:** completed |
| **Who (%):** Julian Bell (50%), Remy Brandriff (50%) | | | |
| **Description:** We completed the presentation for the first design review, which we will be presenting next week (11/20) in class; we’ve invited our sponsors, Terry Baxter and Mick Kelly, to attend, as well as the other people involved in the project. We’ll do a dry run with our team mentor today, and make any adjustments over the weekend so we’re ready and prepared to present. Julian did most of the writing for the presentation, while Remy did most of the design and graphics. | | | |
| **Expected Outcome:** Following the dry run, we’ll make any adjustments, and we’ll create note cards and rehearse the presentation over the weekend. We will present at the design review on 11/20, in a room to-be-determined, and hopefully feedback from the review will help us finish our requirements document. | | | |

### **This week’s Tasks: Work plan for coming week**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Title:** Requirements document draft | **Task Initiation:** 2018-10-29 | **Orig. Due Date:** 2018-11-23 | **Status:** in progress (50%) |
| **Who (%) tentative:** Julian Bell (50%), Remy Brandriff (50%) | | | |
| **Description:** We have created a detailed outline of our requirements document, and begun to flesh it out. We have our table of contents and title page, as well as sections for ‘Introduction,’ ‘Problem Statement,’ ‘Solution Vision,’ ‘Project Requirements,’ ‘Potential Risks,’ ‘Project Plan,’ and ‘Conclusion,’ as well as subsections and a place for a glossary and appendices as necessary. We have started writing the actual document, with most sections partially completed, and will continue to work on this throughout the week; we expect the feedback we get from our design review dry run and actual presentation will be extremely helpful. | | | |
| **Expected Outcome:** By the end, a document for the project specifying the contractual requirements and what is to be expected from the end result of the project as a whole. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Title:** Peer Eval #3 | **Task Initiation:** 2018-11-16 | **Orig Due Date:** 2018-11-20 | **Status:** In progress |
| **Who (%):** Julian Bell (50%), Remy Brandriff (50%) | | | |
| **Description:** Our third peer eval of the semester is due 11/20, after out design review. Before then, both of us will complete our evals of ourselves and each other, taking into account the design review and any progress since the last eval. | | | |
| **Expected Outcome:** We will each add to our existing peer evals and turn them into our team mentor following the design review. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Title:** Tech Prototype Plan | **Task Initiation:** 2018-11-16 | **Orig Due Date:** 2018-11-23 | **Status:** In progress (10%) |
| **Who (%):** Julian Bell (50%), Remy Brandriff (50%) | | | |
| **Description:** We have started planning our prototype, and will create a fully fleshed out plan beginning this weekend to be approved. After the plan has been created, we’ll write the memo (see below), which we’ll send to our mentor for feedback. | | | |
| **Expected Outcome:** A fleshed out plan of what our prototype will be, so that we can demonstrate proof of concept and begin further development of our software. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Title:** Tech Prototype Memo | **Task Initiation:** 2018-11-16 | **Orig Due Date:** 2018-11-23 | **Status:** In progress (0%) |
| **Who (%):** Julian Bell (50%), Remy Brandriff (50%) | | | |
| **Description:** After writing the plan for our prototype, we must send our plan to our team mentor in a memo to be approved. | | | |
| **Expected Outcome:** We’ll send our mentor the memo, get his feedback, and then schedule our prototype demonstration. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Title:** Requirements Document | **Task Initiation:** 2018-11-29 | **Orig Due Date:** 2018-12-04 | **Status:** In progress (20%) |
| **Who (%):** Julian Bell (50%), Remy Brandriff (50%) | | | |
| **Description:** We’re working on the draft for the requirements document, and once we finish that, turn it in, and get feedback, we can apply that feedback to the final requirements document that we’ll review with our sponsor, revise, and repeat until our sponsor agrees with it. Then the sponsor will sign it and that will be the official document that we use for the rest of the capstone to guide our project development, and protect both us and the sponsor. We’ve technically already started it, because of the draft, but we have a long ways to go before we have a final document. | | | |
| **Expected Outcome:** A complete, thorough requirements document that is signed by both ourselves and our project sponsor that will be used as a guideline for the project for the rest of the year. | | | |

### 

### **Upcoming Tasks: Planning**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Title:** Tech Prototype | **Who (%) tentative:** Julian Bell (50%), Remy Brandriff (50%) | | **Rough Due Date:** 2018-12-11 |
| **Description:** Right now, we intend our prototype to just be the request system; we don’t intend to implement the sign in, inventory, or administration portions. But the request system will hopefully be functional, wherein a user can fill out the form and attach their project plan, the data will get sent to our database, and then sent on to a designated recipient; in the final software, that recipient will be the lab management, but for now will just be one of us. While this prototype is not extensive, it is proof of concept, gives us experience in .NET core and the development, and will be proof that we can implement many of the features that will be used throughout the project--the web app itself, web forms, integration and data processes, the SQL database, and sending and receiving data from the web app. All of this will be necessary and valuable experience for when we implement the full software, when we intend to do using the evolutionary prototyping method, where we turn our prototype into the full software. | | | |
| **Expected Outcome:** We should have a functioning request system and database that we will use as proof of life for the software and the concept, as well as a starting place for continued development into the full software. | | | |