**Iteration 2 Reflection**

Commerce Bank – Group 6

Our group’s focus shifted from general introductions and team normalizations to design prototyping and formal project documentation in Iteration 2. The majority of our efforts were very productive, which will make our transition into Iteration 3 smoother.

There were several satisfactory outcomes from the combined efforts of our team. One major forward-looking outcome, from this iteration, is the encouragement and first-class feedback our group members gave to one another on their rough draft design prototypes. Together everyone created a judge free, constructive environment where all individuals felt comfortable sharing their work and receiving comments on it. Another positive was that every group member abided by our communication guidelines. During this iteration, there was no friction on scheduling meetings or delay in responses through our communication channel. This helped enormously when assessing the progress in our individually assigned tasks. Another benefit of this communication is that everyone contributed to the documentation process. All members reviewed the drafted documents by the Project Manager, expressed comments or relayed their questions, and in the end approved and agreed to all papers created. All of these characteristics combined allowed us to finish our work early and spend the extra time preparing for the mid-semester stakeholder presentation.

While the positives outweighed the negatives in this iteration, as always, there were a few gray areas the team still faced. The first issue we had was not originally addressing a backup plan for a team member if they are sick and unable to complete their task by the deadline. Unfortunately, this problem did arise, however, one of our awesome other team members volunteered to take on the workload. In the future though, we are going to establish a protocol to address this so there is a process in place and then add the contingency to our Risk Management Plan. The only other issue we had, within this iteration, was a team member missing a meeting without notifying the group of his absence beforehand. Fortunately, this did not cause any drastic issues because that individual finished their work with exceptional quality. However, it was inconvenient for the other team members on the call who wanted to plan for our next steps in the project. When it happened, we realized we also didn’t have a protocol for meeting absences, we only had a contingency plan with meeting notes incase it was missed. Therefore, we have defined that if an individual is going to miss a meeting, a notice should be sent out at least 24 hours before with a reason, and their contributions should be completed.

We avoided most of our listed risks throughout the iteration. As noted above, we will have to add a few additional risks to look out for the rest of the project. The only risk not avoided was having a team member “go dark”. While it was only for one meeting, the standard still applies. Otherwise as a group we avoided coding implementation issues, groupthink, and stakeholder dissatisfaction.