Are We There Yet: Sprint 2 Postmortem

Planning Meeting

During the planning meeting, we constructed a back log from the items listed in the Budget Rubric. From there, we assigned a perceived difficulty on a scale of one to five with one being trivial.

Task	Perceived Difficulty
Grammar	2
Style	3
Glossary	2
Introduction	3
Acronyms	2
Appendices	2
References	1
Requirements and Traceability	4
Functional/Subsystem Analysis	4
Subsystem Decision Analyses	4
Budget Preparation	4

- From our previous experience with the SRS and Sprint 1, we found that style was not as trivial as previously thought. We increased the perceived difficulty as such
- We discussed what commitments we proposed during our postmortem. We have implemented a plan as to how we will meet our commitments.
- We discussed what we did wrong. We recognize that we need to meet more and take better notes during our meetings. We have committed to planning our meetings better so that we are not scrambling at the last minute to make sure that we are in fact prepared for the meeting on that particular day
- We discussed what we did well. We are proud of the work that we submitted. We were also proud of how well we work together as a team. We have committed to making sure the team dynamic stays as such.

Stand up logs

Date	Meeting Highlights
9/18	• Sprint planning • Every member assigned to research ideas for discussion at next stand-up
9/19	New: • Michael: Nothing noted • Alex: Nothing noted • Brian S: Nothing noted • Brian P. SRS submitted Issues: No group members reported issues For next meeting: Continued research
9/23	New: Each group member expressed their thoughts and theories on a viable design Issues: Designs still need to be refined. Designs are very rough For next meeting: Group needs to individual brain storm viable subsystems and associated parts.
9/24	Group: Subsystem thoughts expressed. General consensus to break system down into five distinct parts, one for each challenge. Issues: No issues noted For next meeting: Make initial decision matrices for movement and microprocessor systems for comparison.
9/25	Group: Decision matrices looked similar amongst all group members. Our thought process and train of thought aligns. Issues: SRS received back. Need to fix use cases and sequence diagrams. Add some more requirements. For next meeting: Group needs to produce trade studies.

9/28	Group: Trade studies very similar. Thought processes still aligned. Issues: Need to make a better system design in order to be able to better identify what parts needed where. For next meeting: • Brian S – Research into drive motors and stepper motors. • Brian P.- Research into a caser for the tail of the robot and a camera • Michael – Research into microcontroller • Alex – Research into drive wheels as well as mechanism to move arm vertically
9/30	Group: Reported findings from initial research. Issues: Need to narrow scope of products a little further. We need to pin point some more specifics of what we envision each part to do. For next meeting: Produce a decision matrix and justification for an assigned part.
10/1	Group: Presented initial decision matrix. Issues: No issues to report. For next meeting: Produce another decision matrix.

What Went Well

During Sprint 2, we managed to meet more as a group. We found that while we did meet adequately enough during Sprint 1, we certainly could have been better. By meeting more, we were better able to communicate our ideas and make sure that everyone understood the direction the team was heading in and the decisions that were being made by the team.

Our team still maintained the punctuality that brought us mild success during Sprint 1. We did not find that we had to cram everything in at the last minute, which allowed us to better focus on the minute details that may have otherwise been overlooked. As we mentioned in our

first postmortem, we managed to incorporate this aspect of punctuality into our second sprint and we will continue to strive for it in the third sprint.

Our group dynamics are still as they were. We communicate effectively and we are able to share ideas with each other, no matter how outlandish they may seem at the time. We are able to take on idea and conceptualize it as a team, which shows how well aligned our thought process is.

What Could Use Improvement

While Sprint 1 was an active learning process for us, we found that there are still some ways in which we could improve our approach to the SCRUM process as elaborated below. However, on the whole, we did find that we performed better relative to our first attempt.

While we did manage to meet more as a group, there were instances or spans of time where we should have met, but we did not manage to. As our time in capstone marches on, we cannot allow this to happen. We need to be more diligent as to our meetings.

Although none of our self-imposed deadlines were missed, some of the artifacts brought to the meeting were barely passable. We need to be more committed to bringing our best to the table, not just what is "good enough".

Our Commitments This Next Sprint

In the upcoming Sprint there are many things we will be committed to doing, while many of these items are deliverables and robot production, there are also many refinements to our SCRUM process that we will be committing to for the upcoming sprint.

As we move closer to the prototyping exercise, we need to better formulate an overall design. While we feel confident in our initial rough sketches, we need to better establish dimensions and materials so that our prototyping will run smoother.

During the next sprint, Sprint 3, we will be placing our order for parts. We need to have a better idea of the parts required as well as what their cost in both monetary terms as well as time commitment terms will be. That is to say that we need to determine how much money each item will cost, as well as the number of man hours (implementation research and actual implementation) that will be required to make the component function optimally.

As with Sprint 1, we are committed to submitting our best work on time and with a quality that we can be proud of.

Coinciding with our improvements, we are committed to meeting better as a group. By this we mean that we will do our best to meet more, but we will also take better notes. While our note taking and meetings were bounds above Sprint 1, they are still not quite where they could be. As such, by improving in the quality of our meetings, we can improve in the quality of our group.

Retrospective

Looking back on our commitments to Sprint 2, we have met most of them. We are focusing more on one specific design for the robot, which has helped to guide us towards the correct parts to use. We have also begun to assemble a more accurate parts list which will aid is in completing our budget document. We are still submitting all of our documentation on time and with quality that we are proud of. While we did commit to improve on our meetings, and we have to some degree, we have not totally met that commitment. As such, we have committed to making sure of that happening during Sprint 3.