

### **Executive Summary for Original Work: Reflection 3**

As I continue working on my Original Work, I completed my third simulation using SimProject. For this simulation, I had to use my experience from the previous two iterations as well as a few key things that Mr. Shekhar taught me to achieve better results on this simulation.

### **Original Work: Reflection 3**

**Date:** December 3, 2020

**Subject:** Reflection on Third 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 final iteration of the three iterations.

Based on my previous iteration of the simulation, I knew that I had to somewhat repeat some of the same steps to achieve (or at least attempt to achieve) a better result. After meeting with my mentor to discuss the second iteration, he provided a link to a website about the Critical Path Method; he suggested I use this method to reduce the occurrences of idle resources and to minimize the time on the overall simulated project. Also, my mentor told me to plan for a lower budget than I had in the previous iteration - as I would find out later, this made the third iteration more brutal than the second iteration.

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 2 iterations. As for the worker effectiveness, it was above 100% due to scheduling mishaps conducted by my IT specialist during weeks 3 and 4 (I address this issue in the upcoming set of weeks) as well as a meeting that got pushed back. The scenario was the same as the first 2 iterations, so I had no choice but to push back the schedule due to the meeting to ensure no detrimental mishaps would occur later in the project (as seen in the first iteration). I would later find out that these weeks - specifically certain aspects - were partially the cause of my future weeks' issues.

Moving onto Weeks 5 through 8, I knew that these weeks were vital to the success of the iteration, but guess what? It got screwed (a bit) due to complications. So, to take care of my IT specialist's attendance I set up a meeting to discuss his attendance (*twice*), and it went well both times. However, I found later that he continued to be absent - this affected the schedule since he was the project lead - and I was unhappy about this. My quality also started to diminish (the number of defects started to steadily climb). I started incorporating weekly meetings discussing the quality and the issues/risks - these didn't work quite as well as they did in the second iteration. The reason behind the increase in defects were linked back to my Software Engineer, who consistently created these software defects that were affecting the overall quality of the project. Also, the project

performance started to decline; the project performance index (PPI) was increasing and this was a bad sign. Also, another issue with this set of weeks was that my costs were estimated to go over budget - and I was unable to control it - thanks to the issues created by the IT specialist and the Software Engineer. Anyway, I continued the iteration and tried to make the best out of a bad situation.

As for Weeks 9 through 12 - similar to the previous iteration - there were improvements in the simulated project. Just like last time, the number of overall defects in the project declined - but not as sharply. Also, the PPI and the estimated final cost kept increasing (the estimated final cost continued to near the \$50,000 mark, which was well above my budget). As for the resources, they were working with lower worker effectiveness than I wanted - I wanted the worker effectiveness to be around 90%). Also, it was a relief to know that the IT Specialist was released from the project because as I manager of the simulated project, his actions were infuriating me as I was going through the iteration. One more thing that was frustrating was that I had an idle resource in these set of weeks (this was a difficult aspect to remove in all iterations).

For the final weeks of the simulated project - Weeks 13 through 15 - I completed the project. This was not an improvement compared to the

previous iteration because of the setbacks created by the resources. The project was a success - but I felt I could have done better than I did. As I continue my Original Work, I will closely examine the results of the three iterations and reflect on what I learned in this work.