# Spiral Application

# Meetings

Our meeting schedule for the **spiral life cycle** will consist of holding two weekly meetings. One meeting will be held at the beginning of the week which will go over the requirements that will need to be completed throughout the next week. The second meeting will be held at the end of the week to go over the team progress from the weeks work, and to plan for the next week.

**Objective meetings:**

*First of the week meeting:* *teams will be meeting to go over the requirements for the*

*next prototype. This meeting will go over the tasks for each team.*

*End of the week meeting: teams will turn in their progress, Teri will then take that data and over the next week compile it into the SRS document.*

**Risk mitigation:**

*First of the week meeting:* *teams will be meeting to go over the requirements for the*

*next prototype. This meeting will go over the tasks for each team.*

*End of the week meeting: teams will turn in their progress, Teri will then take that data and over the next week compile it into the SDD document.*

**Development/Verification:**

*First of the week meeting: the software development team will reiterate what they*

*completed in the previous week for the testing team to go over. Both teams will discuss the tasks for the upcoming week.*

*End of the week meeting: We will review progress made throughout the week and go over the plan for the next week.*

**Planning next steps:**

*End of iteration review meeting: in this meeting teams will report on progress made in the iteration. Then planning will be done in preparation for customer review meeting, this will include creation of presentation for customer.*

*Customer review meeting: this meeting will be held the customers to go over progress, and next decisions will be made for the product.*

# Documents

*SRS (Software Requirement Spec): This document will fully explain the expected outcome for the software system.*

*SDD (Software Design Document): This document will contain the prototypes and planning as it relates to the software.*

# Roles

*As owner I will act as a directing role, ensuring that teams work with each other, and that checkpoints will be reached on time. Chrissy will maintain her job as the maintenance worker. Stan and Sally will manage communication between team leaders and customer, take phone calls, and other work that secretaries work on. Ursula and Xavier will work on designing the interface. Teri will work with the leads of the two groups to write technical documents. We will have two teams of software developers. Abe and Frank will be the team leaders (teams laid out below).*

*Frank (Test): Holly, Keith, Emily, and Jack*

*Abe (Development): Britney, Clare, Doug, Grace, Ingrid, and Larry*

# Checkpoints

*Checkpoints will occur when a team starts the next phase. Each checkpoint will have a meeting that will take place instead of the first of the week meeting, in the meeting we will cover the general plan and the structure of the bi-weekly meetings for the next phase.*

# Reflection

**Strengths:**

Through each iteration on the spiral methodology we will be able to focus our attention on risks that will be concerns for implementing the connecting system, this will help us avoid future problems in the future. Prototyping will be helpful in getting a working product - that might not necessarily be full featured – that can be implemented early and tested with students. With the weekly meeting schedule that we have we can make sure that progress is where it is supposed to be at, and if there is an area that needs more attention then we can work on getting that up to speed.

**Weaknesses:**

I believe that the iteration cycle for spiral may be longer than we need for this project, the focus on risk can draw too much of our attention away from developing the system. The spiral methodology may be an over kill for this project, too much time spent in next steps and risk mitigation could be compressed and reallocated time could be focused on development.

Overall, I think this methodology could be used to complete this project, however, I feel that there are better methodologies that would be more efficient in completing this task with low risk.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exceptional 100% | Good 90% | Acceptable 70% | Developing 50% | Missing 0% |
| Accuracy 40% | It is completely obvious which development methodology is described. Any knowledgeable person would be able to identify the methodology based on this document. | There is nothing to add and nothing wrong; the development methodology is completely described. One part of the plan may be misclassified as **bold** or *red/italic* | There exists one small problem (factual error or missing component). | There exists one large or multiple small problems (factual errors or missing components). | Large parts of the development methodology are inaccurately described or missing. |
| Application 30% | It is obvious that real thought went into the application (*the red/italic part*) of the plan. | The development methodology is applied to the scenario in an uncontrived way. | Every aspect of the scenario is incorporated into the development methodology. | Large parts of the plan are overly vague, do not appear to be related to the scenario, or do not appear to be related to the development methodology. | No attempt was made to apply the development methodology to the scenario. |
| Reflection 20% | The reflection cuts to the heart of the strengths and weaknesses of the development methodology. | The strengths and weakness of the development methodology are clearly communicated. | One strength and one weakness is mentioned in the reflection. | Little thought or effort was put in the reflection part of the paper. | The reflection part of the paper is missing. |
| Professionalism 10% | The paper is easy to read and ideas are clearly communicated. | Everything is properly cited, there are no grammar or spelling errors, and writing style is "professional." | One instance of a spelling error, grammar error, incomplete citation, overly verbose, poor formatting, or poor writing. | A citation is missing where one is needed (plagiarism alert!). | Gross spelling/grammar errors or other aspects of the writing that make the paper difficult to read. |