May 2, 2003

Robert Moe
John Zumwalt
Rama Krishna Pantangi
Vitaly Marin

TEAM 7

PROJECT 3

TEAM ORGANIZATION EVALUATION AND PLANS

In this document we are going to evaluate our team organization for project – 3. This is a compilation of all the personal opinions of all the group members about our team organization.

Robert Moe

The team organization plan in my opinion went very well. We got off to a later start than what was on our timeline, this however was not due to the fact that anybody dropped to ball or missed a deadline but instead due to the fact that we had a new team and were set back in the rhythm and system we had set up before. But after we got our schedules and gears organized we were able to successfully work as a group and accomplish the task of the project.

The team division again worked out well with 2 in hardware and 2 in software. We were lucky that the 2 new members of our team had never done hardware before and I and john have both done some of the hardware on the previous 2 projects. So the division of work was made pretty easily. The hardware team took the hardware at the start of the project and built a good design for the robot. It was then given off to the software that Friday before it was due for testing and calibrating. However because it was the weekend and our connections were not as great, the software team ended up making some changes to the hardware such as motor switches and other things that arose during the initial sensor/motor checks. In doing so there were changes made when rebuilding, one due to the fact that we did not remember exactly how it went and another because we have had a lot of experience previously with building Legos that we tended to use our structure.

I believe that the team division worked out good, there were ideas from both sides of the project to build a robot that would accomplish its task had we had a bit more time to perfect the turns both with the hardware encoders and the software adjustments of the system.

John Zumwalt

I think this team experience was as good as to be expected, given that it was made up of fragmented groups. It's kind of difficult to get new team members mid-stream and take on the most complex project of the semester. However, we did fairly well. I think all parties involved tried to be easy going and not make things more difficult than necessary.

The team division worked out nicely and didn't mess up the rotation of the two sub-components. Vitaliy and Ramakrishna had both done software and not hardware and Robert and I had

both done hardware and software once. Thus, splitting Vitaliy and Ramakrishna into the hardware team and making Robert and I the software team was a good arrangement. This maintained the two sub groups and kept the "newness" some what limited. We all were allowed to work closely with someone with who we were familiar. I think this promoted productivity of the group. However, I think there was a tendency to stay within these groups and violate the boundaries. Robert and I made several hardware changes without the hardware team. This wasn't done because they did a bad job. Rather, the changes were made in order to save time and promote the success of the project. Most of these changes were very minor and didn't require much time to implement.

Rama Krishna Pantangi

I think our team organization worked out very well for us. We did not face any problems during the project. All the tasks are well distributed and well accomplished. Since Vitaliy and I did software in the first two projects and John and Robert did hardware and software in the first two projects, it was easy for us to split the tasks among ourselves. That is Vitaliy and I in hardware and Robert and John in software. Also, it is always difficult to start off well in a new group because of different natures and different opinions. But, I can say that we overcame all those petty matters and performed as a whole to achieve the objective of the project.

Also, anyway there are no projects left in the course. But still I like the distribution of tasks as we did in this project and I want to follow this kind of organization for any future group projects that I probably do. It gives scope for more than one person to be responsible for all main jobs. That means no body can be blamed easily for any task, which is actually bad and also nobody can be held individually responsible for the failure to achieve the objective. Also, even in case, if any member for that task is not available, other member can carry on to maintain the deadlines.

Vitality Marin

When we discussed about the team organization evaluation, every body's opinions matched exactly with that of others', which is positive only. This indicates everybody's satisfaction and having no friction in the group indicates the success of the team organization. With two people in the hardware and two in software, it was possible for us to split the tasks among the group members very easily.

I think there are various particular reasons for the success of our team organization. There was at least one person, from each sub-team, available when any crucial decisions regarding hardware/software were made. In case one of the sub-team member was not available for the allocated task the other person would carried on to meet the required deadline/modification. Since there are two people in each time, it was possible to divide the tasks between the two, which reduced the burden on each person.