Executive Summary for Original Work: Reflection 2

As I continue working on my Original Work, I completed my second simulation using SimProject. For this simulation, I had to use my experience from the previous iteration as well as a few key things that Mr. Shekhar taught me to achieve better results on this simulation. All of the data gathered in this iteration shows that I did significantly better than the first iteration - which is the whole point of my ISM mission.

Original Work: Reflection 2

Date: November 29, 2020

Subject: Reflection on Second Iteration of SimProject Simulation

Reflection:

As I continue my research into Management Information Systems (MIS), I am continuing my Original Work. For my Original Work, it consists of three iterations of a simulation from SimProject to simulate the role of a project manager. Now, I have completed the second of the three iterations.

Based on my previous iteration of the SimProject simulation, I knew that I needed to make some changes to the way I approached the simulation. After meeting with my mentor to discuss the first iteration, he provided me with a new document (from SimProject) to use in my second iteration. This document has details regarding company policies, information about my resources (humans) and other pertinent details in regards to the simulation.

Looking at Weeks 1 through 4, I started out doing well in terms of quality, costs, value, schedule, and project performance - all of them were on track to the target or were close to being on target - which was the same as the first iteration. Similarly, the worker effectiveness rate was above 100% for one resource every week. I knew from last time that the worker

effectiveness rate should not be over 100%, however, I encountered a few obstacles along this iteration. First, my IT Specialist was taking too many days off - I address this issue in a later part of this iteration. Second, (in weeks 3 and 4) due to my IT Specialist's attendance issues, my other resources (a Documentation Specialist and a Network Specialist) both had extra work, but the Documentation Specialist decided to work extra hard - thus increasing his worker effectiveness. Also, the overall schedule of the project got pushed back; I didn't want to push it back, but I had no choice. The reason why I had no choice is because the same scenario came up in the first iteration (I chose to stay on schedule - this brought forth some serious and unforeseen consequences), so I didn't want to repeat the horrible mistake that set me back 11 weeks in the previous iteration. As I would find out, pushing back the schedule was definitely the safer option.

Moving onto Weeks 5 through 8, these weeks saw a drastic increase in the number of defects in the hardware and software, which increased the overall number of defects above the recommended defects (the overall quality was reduced as the number of defects increased), but the number of defects was definitely much lower than the previous iteration. I handled the issue of quality in the upcoming weeks. As for the estimated cost of the project, it continued to go down - which is good because the costs would be below my planned budget, which is vastly different from the previous

iteration. The overall project performance was definitely going well even as the quality was going down. This is also different from my previous iteration because I was able to bring the value of the Project Performance Index (PPI) down - which is ideal - unlike the first iteration, where the PPI continued to increase up until the end of the simulation. Aso, scheduling got affected again, this is a result of a domino effect from the choice I made in Week 2 of the simulated project. Due to the fact that Task 1 was delayed due to a meeting being rescheduled, the rest of the tasks were also delayed; as a result, my completion day got pushed back into a little over 12 weeks. My resources were willing to work overtime because the executive management wanted this project no longer delayed - so I let them decide how they wanted to proceed with overtime. As a result of their efforts, I was able to convince the executive management that overtime was okay for all of us. This is in contrast to the previous iteration, where I had decided not to ask my resources to work overtime - which cost me more money and severely delayed the simulated project. So, due to my choice to ask my resources to work overtime in this iteration, I was able to cut down on costs and make sure that the project would be delayed as little as possible. One more thing that I took care of was the IT Specialist’s attendance issues. What I decided to do was schedule a meeting with the IT Specialist to discuss his attendance; I found out that he was having troubles at home, so I decided to tell him to try to minimize his time away from the office. This decision was

key, because I was able to keep my IT Specialist in the office as much as I could and keep the schedule on track as best I could.

As for Weeks 9 through 11, these were the weeks that I saw improvements in some areas, while I saw issues in other areas. First, I saw improvements in quality - the number of defects declined sharply. I was suggested to take on a new task, however, I decided not to go with the new task because I saw the improvement in quality and knew that my resources could handle it. As for the cost, it continued to decline and the completion date was expected to be around the 12.6 week mark (so in the middle of the 13th week). The PPI was also declined and it stopped declining at the start of Week 10, which is good, but I could do better next time. As for my resources, they continued to work overtime and as a result, I decided to reward them with trinkets and pizza lunches to keep them motivated. However, there was one issue, in Weeks 9 and 11, there was one resource that was idle. I had learned from my mentor that if you can't replace someone just because there is no one else to do the job, then the idle worker is okay. Also, according to my records, I only had idle workers in 3 weeks (the only other time was in Week 8).

For the final weeks of the project - Weeks 12 and 13 - I completed the project. This was a huge improvement because the first simulation had

lasted 22 weeks. In these weeks, all of my resources were working on their designated tasks - which is good. However, the final records of my project indicate that I did a significantly better job with this iteration than the previous one. The reason why is because the quality, costs, and schedule were all closer to their respective targets, unlike last time. I believe that the better performance of the iteration can be credited to my use of the new document that my mentor provided me - which definitely aided me in times of uncertainty.

As I continue my Original Work, I think that next time I need to spend a lot more time thinking through the execution stage before heading into the execution of each simulated week to ensure that I can reach the projected schedule. Also, I will need to utilize what I learn from Mr. Shekhar before doing my next iteration of the simulation.