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| Meeting Purpose: | Weekly status report to the Client |
| Meeting Date: | *03/23/18* |
| Meeting Time: | 11:00 |
| Meeting Location: | Trottier 4100 |
| Meeting Facilitator: | Prof. Lowther |
| Attendees: | Prof. Lowther, Luka Jurisic, Bryan Jay, Patrick Ghazal, Tianyi Zou, Enan, Volen. |
| Minutes Issued By: | Luka Jurisic |

| **Next Steps:** (Task, Assigned to, Checkpoint Date) | **Owner** | **Due Date** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Implement LDD design; **Enan, Tianyi** | Prof. Lowther | **03/29/18** |
| Software completion for Beta Demo; **Volen, Patrick** | Prof. Lowther | **03/28/18** |
| Test documentation to be corrected and improved for future; **Luka, Tianyi** | Prof. Lowther | **03/29/18** |
| Work delegation to be less sequential moving forward; **Team 11** | Prof. Lowther | **Project Completion** |

| **Decisions Made:** (What, Why, Impacts) |
| --- |
| 1. Gantt Chart needs to improved    * Extend Gantt Chart texts when running rate instead of shifting forward( unless started late) 2. Final Design must be finalized and built on LDD    * Design should have been finalized already. 3. Documentation improvement    * Tests presented this week were poorly done, and they need to be perfected. Moving forward, test procedure needs to be clearer. 4. Sequential system slowing the team down    * A parallel team process needs to be implemented going forward. |
|  |

| **Discussion:** (Items/Knowledge Shared) |
| --- |
| **1. Hardware Documentation/ Design**   * + During the meeting, the hardware design was detailed and physically exhibited. Our design was very liked due to its uniqueness. However, the progress seen has not been properly reflected in the hardware document. This situation is identical to the previous weeks meeting.   **2. Timesheet Errors**   * + Some team members recorded inconsistencies regarding their timesheet logging. Also, Tianyi Zou has recorded more than 10% fewer hours than the team average, and is in danger of receiving a lower overall grade.   + Once a week of work has been recorded, it is frozen. No alterations can be made, thus errors can only be cut out moving forward. The team needs to ensure that they log their hours correctly.   **3. Gantt Chart**   * + Following the criticisms from the first and second meetings, necessary improvements to the Gantt Chart were made, however, since our team is behind schedule, this needs to be properly represented by extend Gantt Chart texts when running rate instead of shifting them forward.   4. **Why is the team behind?**   * + Prof Lowther discussed in some detail the reasons why our team is behind schedule. Our processes all appear to be very sequential, and as such there are periods of stagnation where many members do nothing while they wait for someone else to complete their task. A much better method of carrying out tasks would be through a parallel process which would serve to eliminate individuals doing nothing for periods of time,   5. **Test Documentation**   * + Test documentation is poor as of its current state. Words such as “stopper” are used in test reports that have not been defined previously.   + Similarly, objective definition is ambiguous on some of the tests.   + the tests. Essentially, the test reports should be self-sufficient; another team could look at the report and immediately understand how to repeat the test. This needs to corrected on the current tests and heeded for future tests.   **PARKING LOT**: |
|  |

| **Miscellaneous Items:** |
| --- |
|  |