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1. Summary

In this Scrum sprint the team was tasked with completing the preliminary budget document for the Autonomous Panda System (APS). The time frame was defined to be two weeks. In these two weeks the group was committed to completing a preliminary conceptual design of the APS, parts research, and a budget estimate.

As per the Scrum process, the team divided the budget document into sections. These sections were defined by comparing the rubric, provided to us by the class instructors, and a budget document example from the team Birdinators from the 2013-2014 Senior Design Project.

Continuing with the same planning process used for sprint one, each section became a backlog item and the team utilized the website called Planning Poker (www.planningpoker.com) to characterize each item by their perceived difficulty. The higher the number, the harder the task.

The planning meeting estimations for the backlog items were as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Backlog Item** | **Estimation (points)** |
| Introduction | 4 |
| Functional Decomposition System | 30 |
| Requirements Traceability | 28 |
| Budget Decision Matrices and Justifications | 40 |
| Risk Analysis | 15 |
| Glossary/Acronyms/Abbreviations/References | 10 |

For this sprint, the team felt more comfortable with the estimation of the backlog items, in turn, each item had a good approximation of time. Learning from the last meeting, the backlog items were divided to individual team members. Items with higher difficulty level were broken down even further and divided among the team members. This created a more effective team as well as eliminating dependency between team members.

1. Log

Below is a highlighted list of the stand-up meetings performed during spring two.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date of meeting (2014) | Comments |
| September 25 | Assigned trade studies.  Kurt: Microprocessor and Cameras.  Mary: Batteries and Wheels.  Kok Peng: Motors and Sensors.  Luis: Sensors.  Merissa: Frame and arm/clam.  No problems were stated by any of the team members |
| September 28 | All team members finished researching their assigned parts.  Currently working on:  Kurt: Introduction, System Decomposition and Microprocessor Matrix.  Merissa: Requirement Traceability, Claw/arm Matrix.  Luis: Requirement Traceability, Camera Matrix. Mary: Wheels Matrix.  Kok Peng: Batteries and Motors Matrix.  No problems were stated by the team. |
| September 29 | All members have been working on backlog items.  Problems stated were:  Luis: Adding .docx files to repository. This problem was assigned to Kurt.  Merissa: Debated claw/arm being bought or 3D printed. This was resolved during the stand-up meeting.  Kok Peng: Unsure about the RPM requirements. The team agreed that he should work with Mary on this.  Mary: Problem with which part vendor to choose. This problem was resolved during the stand-up meeting. |
| September 30 | All team members have been working on backlog items and no problems were stated. |

1. Retrospective

Continuing the postmortem method used for spring one, the scrum master requested the team members to answer seven questions that described quality of the sprint. These questions were:

1. What went right?
2. What went wrong?
3. What would you do differently if you ran the same project again?
4. What have you learned from the project?
5. What hindered your progress during the project?

These answers were confidential, between the member and the scrum master, and helped start discussion during the postmortem meeting.

The team had a major shift in morale and work output. Every area of concern that arose during sprint one had been corrected. Team dynamic has improved drastically. We stayed loyal to our commitments from the previous sprint, tasks were assigned to individual group members and the work load was divided to individual member instead of groups of members. The communication between the team members was also improved which has made it easier to gauge the current progress of the project. The team included more stand up meetings along with the planning meeting and a couple of working meetings.

The methods that helped the team improve included the use of a repository for version control, and communication, as well as the assignment of backlog items.

The issues dealt with this sprint included the introduction to GitHub to multiple team members and not starting the documents earlier in the sprint. The introduction to the repository was a bit of an issue to some of the members, but training was held and that issue was corrected. Next sprint documents will be started as soon as feasibly possible to alleviate last minute rush to get work documented.

The documentation is a major part of any project. Working on version control is not only important it is useful to keep track of what each member has done for the project. The team recommends starting in GitHub from the beginning of a project and not using DropBox for keeping track of documentation. Having a repository from the beginning would aid in letting multiple members work on the same file at the same time.

The team came together this sprint and solved problems from the previous sprint. The tasks were allotted to different team members and each was given the responsibility to add their information to the repository. Both the morale of the team and the output increased this sprint.