1. **Team Name:** !failing
2. **Team Leader for this deliverable:** Kevin Cadavillo
3. **Team Members:** Feiying Zheng, Jake Zhou, Jack Wu
4. **Meetings:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Time-date** | **Attendees** | **Agenda** | **Action Items (who will do what)** |
| 10/10/2019 | All + softineers team | Review each other’s initial specification, make revisions | Our team completed review and revisions at meeting. Kevin to type up team report |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

1. **Weekly Time Logs:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Perso Person** | **Total Time in minutes** | **Tasks Tasks** |
| Kevin | 120 | Write comments on other team’s specs, revise our specs based on other team’s comments |
| Jack | 120 | Give suggestions for other team’s specs, suggest revisions of our specs based on other team’s comments |
| Jake | 120 | Write comments on other team’s specs, suggest revisions of our specs based on other team’s comments |
| Feiying | 120 | Give sGive suggestions for other team’s specs, suggest revisions of our specs based on other team’s comments |
|  |  |  |
| **Total Total Time:** | 480 |  |

1. **Issues:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue Number** | **Discovery Date** | **Resolution Date ( Est. – Act. )** | **Responsible Person** | **Description ( Prob / Resolution )** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Files and repository locations:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FilenaFilename** | **Location** | **Comments** |
| !failing review of Softineers' initial spec | RequirementsReview |  |
| October 10 Specification (post-review) | RequirementsReview |  |
| Team Report - Requirements Review | Requirements Review |  |

1. **Plans for Coming Week:**

Learn about and discuss upcoming deliverable, figure out when we can meet to work on it.

1. **Comments:** *a paragraph from each engineer describing what they have done/learned from this deliverable*

**Engineer 1:** Jack Wu

For this week’s deliverable, we collaborated as a team to give and receive feedback from team “Engware Softineers” (great name) about our respective initial requirement specifications. During our meeting with their representatives, I played my part in offering feedback on some of the specifications that I thought were either misleading or simply unclear. I was able to identify somme recurring problems with their requirement specifications such as language that easily allowed for misinterpretation. From this exercise, I learned how differently people think. At so many points, I thought that our specifications were clear, but the other team still had trouble interpreting them and vice versa. It comes to show that specification review can be extremely helpful when done with people outside of your team.

**Engineer 2:** Feiying Zheng

Before the review meeting, I reviewed the other team's initial specifications, and determined if their requirement statements were SMART. I wrote down some ways that the other team could revise and improve their statements. I met up with my team and the other team for the review meeting, and we all went through each requirement to see if anything needs to be changed. Afterwards, I helped revise our specifications according to the other group’s suggestions. From this deliverable, I learned about what makes a requirement SMART, how to identify requirements that do and do not meet SMART attributes, and how to revise requirement statements so that they could be measured against. I learned that requirements specifications should be consistent, accurate and coherent, so it was very helpful that another team reviewed our requirements because we realized that some of our initial specifications were a bit unclear or were not measurable.

**Engineer 3:** Jake Zhou

I, along with the rest of my team, had my first experience reviewing not only our own software specifications, but the specifications of another team. I was able to apply my better understanding of SMART principles to better judge the two specifications sheets. This time, I knew that I must review the specifications in the viewpoint of someone that would actually order or use the product. I also understood the importance of making specifications as specific and clear as possible, because in a professional environment, a clear specification means a definite answer to disputes about whether a system is completed as asked for or not. I was also the member of my team to reach out to members from another team and coordinated our introduction to each other. I feel that this is a valuable skill in any professional environment, as most of the time projects are not completed by two or three or four people alone, but rather many teams that can scale up to the hundreds with their own roles.

**Engineer 4:** Kevin Cadavillo

For this deliverable, as the team lead, I communicated with the other team to figure out a good time and place for us to meet. With 7 people between us, this could’ve posed a serious challenge, though using a tool that Jake told us about (when2meet.com), it was doable. At the meeting, I gave suggestions, comments, and questions about several of the other team’s initial specification. I also wrote (along with Jake) the review report incorporating the suggestions and comments from our whole team on the other team’s initial specification. I also answered some of the other team’s questions about our initial specification and took notes on their concerns, which our team used to revise our own initial specification. From this deliverable, I learned how to politely but firmly communicate concerns about others’ requirements, and I improved my understanding of each attribute of SMART.