**Iteration 3 Reflection**

Commerce Bank – Group 6

The primary mission of iteration 3, for our group, was to finalize our design prototypes with the critiques received from stakeholders, organize the flow of our application, and ensure the foundation of our app was solid. This iteration was by far the most work intensive for our team to this point. We had several more individual and group assignments that needed to be completed with quality in order to have a successful mid-semester presentation.

The successful aspects of this iteration were mainly work based. We performed well with deadlines and everyone presented work that clearly exhibited intentional effort. One of our developers really stepped up and decided to not only create a low fidelity design prototype for the presentation but to also add some functionality to also showcase our plans for the future. Other members, like previously mentioned, also work very hard to deliver a quality product and communicated well using our Discord server to relay updates or clarify requirement needs. Everyone contributed to the PowerPoint presentation and created a slide to preview their work, they were also very flexible to schedule an additional meeting to run through the presentation a few times. All around, our group was able to create a productive and encouraging environment which allowed us to progress with the project in a positive direction.

The biggest issue we had, as a group, this last iteration was understanding the needs with project documentation. As the project manager, I’m slightly more aware of what is required simply because it’s been my responsibility from the beginning. While I do normally fill out all team paperwork, I did need some assistance filling out the Architecture Document because I’m not super involved with the intricate development process. It would’ve been difficult for me to create the necessary diagrams and describe the processes at hand without communicating with the rest of the team. They, of course, were all very receptive but as with any collaborated document effort, the entries made by each member weren’t consistent with the document’s styling. So a negative for me, personally, was having to go through and revise inconsistencies. The only other issue we really faced was a communication mishap with one of our members. We had previously been told they wouldn’t be present for the official stakeholder presentation because they’d be travelling. To compensate for this, we had assigned another team member to present their work. However, the teammate that was supposed to be absent decided to come to class anyway and we weren’t aware they’d be joining in on the presentation at that point. It just made it seem a bit unprofessional both because we were unaware of the sudden participation and there was loud background noise.

We avoided most of our listed risks throughout the iteration. The two risks not avoided were having a team member “go dark”, mostly not communicating their updates on presentation status, and stakeholder dissatisfaction, not full discontent but we did receive some critiques on our design. Otherwise as a group we avoided a variety of coding implementation issues and groupthink.