

Project Management Plan Review

The scope of the project was well defined and outlined the beginning of the Project Management Plan (PMP), with no room for interpretation regarding the setting, purpose, and general project plan. In addition to this, a comprehensive analysis of assumptions and software and hardware constraints were outlined to assess the functional bounds of the project. One area that was missing in the introduction of the document was the addition of a references section near the start of the plan. The addition of the section could have improved the document significantly by allowing readers to reference the Software Requirements Specification and meeting minutes documents, where a majority of the Project Management Plan content originated from.

A clear definition of client expectations and goals of the project were outlined in the form of a list of all project deliverables. Factors critical to the success of the project were also outlined and discussed at length within the risk management section of the PMP, with major factors being discussed at further length. This included a comprehensive analysis of the possible risks of the project and expected avoidance strategies, which was a strength of the PMP. One strength in the risk management section was the presence of a description to outline the relationships between severity and likelihood and project impact.

The project milestones for milestone 1 and 2 were clearly identified within the first revision of the Project Management Plan. While the first milestone deliverables were defined very clearly with verifiable requirements, the second milestone deliverables were presented more vaguely, with lack of explanation of the purpose of each deliverable. The selection of milestones involved a week-long process of brainstorming, refinement, and feasibility assessment which eventually defined the protocol for approval of the project deliverables. The clear-cut definition of deliverables for the second milestone could have been developed further.

Despite having a clear definition of the roles and responsibility of all persons involved in the project team, the internal management structure was not clearly identified outside of which group members were assigned which managerial roles. However, this weakness was compensated for with an in-depth outline of the specific responsibilities each managerial role would take, as well as a statement outlining that the purpose of managerial roles: to give someone authority about a part of the project, rather than splitting work based on role. One strength was that each member had a shadow manager role which they would act on in the event of a group member being unable to perform their role.

The requirements and constraints for the software and hardware platform for the prototype rover were outlined in the beginning of the document. A strength of this approach was that the prototype requirements were comprehensively analysed and presented early on, however a weakness was the lack of extended descriptions for each constraint and requirement. Conversely, the development platform techniques and methods were defined further in the document in the work activities and configuration management sections. The advantage of this approach was similar plans (hardware/software implementation techniques for the prototype Rover and User Interface) were grouped together.

The absence of a testing strategy was one major problem with the Project Management Plan, that should have had a dedicated, well-defined section. Aside from this, the quality assurance strategies for code and documentation quality were very well-defined. The code quality assurance plan was very well documented and specified, with verifiable and measurable metrics for code quality to ensure all developed code conforms to a coding style (Google Java coding style) and design pattern. Additionally, the documentation quality was also well defined to ensure all documentation style conforms to documentation templates. The quality assurance for code and documentation was stated to be under the responsibilities for the Quality Assurance and Documentation managers (respectively), which gives a clear definition of how the plans will be executed.

One area that was comprehensively analysed was the definition and deconstruction of work activities pertaining to documentation, the prototype Rover, the user interface, and the physical A1 demonstration map. Each section had subsections that were decomposed into smaller, more specific and unique units of work. The clear identification of all work items and deliverables was a strength of the project, as the purpose of each work item was accompanied with a definition of what the work item entailed. One highlight of the PMP was the inclusion of a Gantt chart connected to all work items, outlining the potential plan for monitoring and controlling project progress. Following the Gantt chart ensures project development stays on track, and that all deliverable deadlines are not missed.

Presentation Self Evaluation

One thing I believe I did well throughout the entire presentation was that I spoke clearly and with clarity. Throughout the presentation, I utilized an appropriate range of tone, a consistent talking speed, and regular short pauses after main points to ensure that the purpose of what I was saying was clear and easy to understand and follow. I believe that these strategies were aided by the fact that the video presentation was a recorded video and not a live video.

If I did this presentation again, there are many aspects I would change about my preparation. Firstly, I would get a proper script ready beforehand and reduce this script to only the essential points in dot point form. This would allow me to rebuild a comprehensive script based on the important points and have a better idea of what I wanted to say at any point of the presentation. In my case, I extracted random review points from each paragraph and strung them together to create a script of dot points and this resulted in my having to retake the video many times. In addition to constructing a better script, I would practice more for each section and main point I wanted to talk about to ensure that I had a thorough understanding of my points such that I wouldn't need to read a script at all.

Regarding the content that I presented in the presentation, I believe that the content I provided with the audience was like what they could already find in my textual review of the document, with some added explanation and expansion on some main topics. I believe I covered most of the main topics on my textual review, with some of them being covered in more detail than others. I think that more time could have been allocated to the description of the assumptions, goals, and constraints sections of the introduction, however I did not want to spend too much time focussed on only the introduction section and hence cut these sections out.

I believe that my eye contact during the video was, for the most part, quite lacking. One of the main reasons my eye contact was lacking was that the camera location for my laptop is the bottom-left hand corner of the screen, which intuitively isn't a place that I would look when presenting something. A secondary reason to my lack of eye contact was the need to constantly refer to the notes in my presentation script to ensure that I was on track for time and that I was covering the content I wanted to cover. My eye contact was somewhat good during the introduction section of the project management plan review, however it deteriorated as the presentation continued. In hindsight, I could have memorised my presentation points for better eye contact.

During the video, my gestures and movement were quite poor. There was little to no movement or gesture use to explain my presentation points, and any movement was restricted to altering my posture or moving my head. I believe the main culprits of this are the location of my camera, and the fact that I was sitting down during the presentation. Due to the location of the camera, making gestures would have covered most of my face reducing the quality of the presentation, and due to me sitting down I was less active while presenting. If I did this presentation again, I would probably still do it sitting down due to the comfort it provides and the (still awkward) location of my laptop camera. I would however make more effort to incorporate gestures into my presentation and ensure there is enough space to be able to move around more.

Before starting my practice, I created a dot point script to use while speaking. From here, I practiced each section of my presentation, modifying the script until I was satisfied with my script for each section. Once I finished this, I started doing full takes to practice doing my full review, until I encountered a take that I had done particularly well in to use as my final review. I believe this was a sufficient level of practice. Breaking down the review into smaller sections and practicing the sections helped make the review less intimidating. Despite this, I believe I still needed more practice to prevent stumbling on words, improve eye contact and my gesture use. In the future, I would likely want to start with more discussion points to begin with, and then reduce these as I begin to identify what I want to say.

Overall, I am pleased with my presentation and believe I did a good job in getting my main points of my review across. If I did this presentation again, I would focus on improving my eye contact during the presentation by practicing the presentation more and memorizing my main points, improve my gesture use by being more active during the presentation, and better prepare my script of the presentation by creating a full script and reducing it down to the main dot points.

YouTube Link: https://youtu.be/xg_zaC1sIfE