Team Organization and Plan

Project 2

Team 3:
Mark Branson
Amit Mathur
Matt Roman
Mike Taylor

Team Organization Evaluation and Plan

Introduction

The team organization for project two was the same as that of project one, only different people were assigned to the four major tasks. The assignments given to each member were completed on time, unfortunately the group had a difficult time setting meeting times to test and tune the robot. Testing times were very productive but occurred too late in the project timeline to produce a highly reliable robot.

Team Efforts

The initial organization of the team was assigning each member to a major and minor task. Mark was our team supervisor and also presented the outcome of project two to the class. Amit was in charge of writing the software and supporting the testing team. Mike constructed our robot and was the key member in the testing phase. Matt completed the documentation and aided Mike and Amit in the beginning design phase.

Each member completed their respective tasks before school was back in session after spring break.

The largest potion of time spent on this project was during the testing phase. Amit and Matt did the initial testing of the hardware; this was done to calibrate motors and sensors to get a ballpark figure of how the robot would react. Shortly after all of the modules of the software were tested the robot was up and running. The next phase was to test the robot in the arena.

The robot did not function very well in the arena with the initial code. We believe this was due to the multi-process approach, the sensing time was severely limited and the robot would run into obstacles before reacting.

Amit, Mark, and Mike took charge and edited the code into a single process state based machine. The robot could avoid obstacles and follow a light reliably enough to get us a few points.

Evaluation

The team agreed that the organization was a success again, but that we need to readjust our timeline in the future to allow us more time for testing. The members have agreed that a group meeting is best when doing final testing of our robots; it reduces the time needed for debugging code because one person might spot a problem that another missed.

The supervisor was kept active when planning our demonstration times and setting up group meetings. Future projects might relieve some of this stress by allowing the member typing documents to set the demo times and relay deadlines to the rest of the team.

Future Plans

The team stated above that we would try to relieve some of the task deadlines and external team procedures from the supervisor. This will help evenly distribute the workload onto each member.

Team meetings will be held more frequently during the testing phase. This is something that we have improved from project one. A revised timeline along with a solid fallback plan and group testing will lead to a much more reliable and efficient robot.

A centralized place to meet and work on our robots will be added to our requirements. During the testing phase of project two the team met in Dr. Millers robotics lab, since Matt works in his lab the robot could stay on campus and any team member could drop by to work on it.