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1. **Introduction.**

A TSPSM Checkpoint for the AIM project was conducted the week of 5 April 2010. This checkpoint was a limited analysis of the following:

* Interviews with team lead and individual team members
* Data from each individual workbook
* Data from the team’s consolidated workbook
* Other artifacts from the shared network drive

The purpose of the checkpoint was to assess the use of TSP and the organization’s internal processes, document findings from reviewing team and individual data and from interviews, and to provide improvement recommendations. AIM consists of a team leader, planning/process manager from the Process Group, and five additional team members.

Script CHECKPOINT was followed in conducting this checkpoint. The checkpoint process used consisted of the following activities:

* Individual and team data was reviewed
* Feedback was given to and obtained from each individual team member
* Team performance was discussed with each individual and suggestions for improvements were elicited
* A draft report of the findings and recommendations was developed and sent to the team members for review
* Findings and recommendations were discussed with the team
* The results of this checkpoint were documented in this report[[1]](#footnote-1)

This report will be delivered to the AIM team and organization’s process group. It is recommended that the content of this report be discussed and process improvements be identified, evaluated, and incorporated based upon individual, team, and organizational goals and objectives.

1. **Planning and Planning Performance Analysis.**
2. Data Gathering. As in computing, garbage in equals garbage out. For checkpoints, or any other kind of review to be meaningful, the data gathered by the team members must be consistently and accurately reported. The AIM team appears to be consistently gathering data in real time. The data provided for review for this checkpoint appears to be both consistent and accurate.
3. Plan Tracking. Detailed plans and data gathering are intended to help understand the project and its status. The essential elements of tracking team plans are task hours, earned value status, milestone status, and quality status. (Humphrey, TSP(sm) Leading a Development Team, 2006, p. 56)
   1. Task Hours. Team time on task has fallen short of the plan. This is common as most developers are naturally optimistic of what they can accomplish and how much time they can spend on task. Figure 1 – Cumulative Planned and Actual Hours per Week shows actual hours have fallen short of planned hours. At present, the team has worked 94% of the hours allocated on their plans. This is offset by a decrease in planned work of 15.3%. A few tasks were deleted as it became obvious they were not needed. In other cases, time on task required was overestimated. At present, AIM has been achieving more time on task each week than planned. If work and time on task continue as expected, it appears that the tasks will be completed by the required dates.

**Figure 1 – Cumulative Planned and Actual Hours per Week**

* 1. Earned Value Status. Even though the team has averaged working only 94% of hours they planned to spend on task, they are ahead of plan in achieving earned value. Figure 2 – Cumulative Earned Value points out that the current earned value exceeds the current planned value. The ratio of planned earned value to actual earned value is 0.925. Figure 3 – Earned Value Trend shows that overall the team has been consistently achieving more earned value over time than they have planned, as the earned value trends toward the ahead of schedule portion of the graph.

**Figure 2 – Cumulative Earned Value**

**Figure 3 – Earned Value Trend**

* 1. Milestone Status. Of the milestones the team has identified, 6 out of 7 of those most closely related to the completion of the project are predicted to be completed as planned. The consolidated workbook shows that the other milestone is expected to be completed the following week. Looking at the work that needs to be completed, and the other tasks being performed by the team, the team should be able to complete each of these internal milestones referenced by their original planned dates. Based on the same data it does not appear that work could be completed sooner than planned.

Milestones should provide meaningful markers of project progress. Some of the milestone dates in the plan appear to be arbitrary. It may be beneficial to develop one or more strategies to identify meaningful milestones.

* 1. Quality Status. In general, the team is finding more defects than would be expected based on their quality plan. Personal reviews are being conducted. Checklists are being used to perform reviews. Defects are being entered into the workbooks and fix times recorded. In some cases rates of review were significantly less than planned, but may have been appropriate. Additional analysis by both individuals and the team would be needed to estimate if the review rates can and should be improved. This analysis could be and is recommended to be performed by the team as part of a future cycle or project post mortem. For more information on quality topics, see paragraph 3, Quality Performance Analysis.

1. Team Feedback and Communication. Communication is important to the accomplishment of any team task. Without effective communication, teams become disjointed and unproductive, morale suffers and rework becomes the norm. In terms of team feedback and communication, the AIM team appears to be doing very well. The team members and team leader have open communication with each other. Team members are comfortable communicating with and working with each other. When issues arise, they consistently go and find the right people to talk to in order to take care of business. One area for improvement is communication flow between upper management and the team. The team appreciates that most members are not encumbered by many meetings. They would, however, appreciate receiving more communication from upper management.
2. Dynamic Load Balancing. A common trait of any team is that each member operates at his or her own pace. Combined with estimation accuracy and other factors, it is inevitable that some members will complete their tasks ahead of others. While developers may tend to hold on to tasks that they have agreed to perform, it is in the best interest of the team and the organization to re-distribute the work among team members so that each member can continue to contribute to the effort and the team can complete the tasks in an efficient manner. Thus far, AIM has already performed some workload rebalancing. As it becomes apparent that additional balancing is needed, it is expected the AIM will continue to balance their work and perform efficiently to accomplish tasks in a timely manner.
3. **Quality Performance Analysis.**
   1. Issue Fixes Process – Latent Defects. Of all of the custom processes developed by the AIM team, the Issue Fixes process has had the most practice. There is more data available for the planning of time in phase, defect injection, and defect removal rates for this process than any of the other processes. As would be expected, the percent of time in each phase expressed as a percentage of the time spent in CODE appears to closely follow the plan. A comparison of the planned and actual time spent in each phase of the Issue Fix process expressed as a percentage of the time spent in the CODE phase is presented in Figure 4 – Issue Fix Process Time in Phase as a Percentage of CODE, Plan vs. Actual. As stated previously, more defects are being found than predicted by the quality plan.

**Figure 4 – Issue Fix Process Time in Phase as a Percentage of CODE, Plan vs. Actual**

* 1. New Technical Document Process. Part of the work this cycle includes is the development of new technical documentation. This includes a high level design document, and some requirements and test documentation. Some of the development work and review activities have not been completed. Thus the picture presented here is incomplete. The overall trend is that less time is being spent in design and review activities than was planned when evaluated from the viewpoint of the percent of time spent in each activity phase as a percentage of the coding/development time for the documentation. The plan appears reasonable. Defects removal rates appear to be higher than or equal to the planned defect removal rates. Due to these and other factors, there is considerable ambiguity in making improvement suggestions. Continued refinement and institutionalization of using checklists for personal and peer reviews, and inspections should offer the most long-term benefits in terms of removing defects. On-going data collection and subsequent analysis of defect remove rates as compared with review rates could offer insights into where to look for future improvements.

Another aspect of this process is that most of the defects listed are editorial in nature. It is desirable when performing peer review and inspection activities to look at the big picture, as these types of defects historically exhibit a much greater cost to fix the longer they remain undetected. Though it will take some thought and consideration, it may be beneficial to consider if there are big picture items that could be added to review checklists to increase the percentage of big picture defects found. The current development is expected to be “throw-away” code, built for a prototype application with an anticipated follow-on longer term new development. Assuming the project moves into new development of long-term solutions, well thought out high-level review items could bring a significant benefit to the organization long term.

**Figure 5 – New Technical Document Process Time in Phase as a Percentage of CODE, Plan vs. Actual**

* 1. Effective Yield. An evaluation of effective yield was not performed. In general, an equivalent or greater number of defects are being found as a result of combined review activities compared to what would be expected based on the quality plan. Why is this? Checklists are being used. Time is being spent in review activities. It appears the team is consistently applying the process. One reason for finding more defects may be that the team is getting better at finding defects. Another potential cause is that some of the estimated defect insertion rates may be too low when considering the work of the team as a whole. This should be evaluated during the Post Mortem to determine if a different rate would be better for planning purposes in the future.

1. **Process Performance Analysis.** In addition to the discussion above, the following areas relating to the execution of the process were analyzed.
   1. Organizational TSP Process Asset Library. Some material in the TSP Process Asset Library is being used as written. Where there are deviations, AIM has often developed their own team scripts to perform these activities. A review of scripts and forms usage is shown in Appendix A – AIM RSIM. Deviations were found in the following areas:
      1. Requirements Development. Script ANA and REQ are not being used. This kind of work is being performed but these scripts are not being used. The Issue Fix and New Features scripts include some of this work.
      2. Configuration Management. Forms CIBPS, CIR, LOGCCR, and LOGCI are not being used. It is believed that their function is essentially being replaced and performed by using Tool X.
      3. Implementation. Script IMP and IMP6 are not being used, but have been replaced by the AIM Issue Fixes and AIM New Features processes. The Issue Fix and New Features scripts cover most of this work.
      4. Test. Script TEST is not being used as it was replaced by an AIM version of TEST. The team has started looking at potentially using the baseline TEST, TEST1, TEST2, and TEST3 scripts and what changes to request to make the scripts more compatible with the work being done by the team.
      5. Deviation Process. Form LOGSPDR and SUMDR are not being used. The organizational process which describes how to request and who is authorized to provide approval for deviations is being developed and is planned to be released soon. These forms may be replaced when the new process is released and implemented. No evidence of any request for deviations was found.
   2. Process Improvement Proposal. The team has many different opportunities to utilize the PIP process. Each of the deviations mentioned above are known by various team members, including the need to update a subset of the scripts referenced. At the same time, no PIPs had been written this cycle as of the date of this checkpoint. It appears there is a need to develop and enhance the current culture to reinforce continually looking for and documenting ways to improve the process.
   3. Relevant Stakeholder Involvement Matrix. AIM has adopted much of the TSP technology. As part of the review of the execution of the TSP and the usage of the scripts and forms, the usage of each script as documented on the current RSIM was evaluated. As mentioned in 4.a, a significant number of updates are needed to complete the customization and institutionalization of organizational TSP scripts and forms. A summary of these findings is presented in Appendix A – AIM RSIM.
2. **Recommendations.** The following is a summary of the recommendations made herein.
   1. Request approval to deviate from the TSP Process Asset Library or adopt the organizational standard as appropriate. If deviation requests are rejected, then begin using the organizational standard.
   2. Periodically analyze work product review rates and defect removal rates to determine and implement appropriate ways of increasing quality efficiently.
   3. Update and improve checklists used for individual and peer reviews.
   4. Continue to monitor and re-balance workbooks as needed.
   5. Use the PIP form/tab to document process improvement opportunities as they arise.
   6. Develop and use strategies to implement meaningful milestones.
   7. As an organization, develop guidelines to specify when to use Form PIP and when to use the PIP tab in the consolidated workbook.
3. **Conclusion.** AIM is actively using TSP. They are using TSP scripts, forms, and the overall TSP process. They are following the plan they developed during the launch, maintaining the plan, and currently appear to be on track to complete their major tasks as required to satisfy customer and management requirements. Based on the current data, they are finding more defects in their work products than expected. This is probably due to following a defined process to remove defects as work products are created. Lacking knowledge of some of the TSP baseline scripts and forms, they created custom scripts and are actively using these processes to complete their tasks and work the plan to produce the product. As of this checkpoint, they have already started to look at some of the previously unused TSP scripts to determine how they might be used, or tailored to perform the contractual work. Part of the work going forward will be to continue the current process focus, working through deviations, and adopting and refining the TSP baseline material so that every portion of the TSP process used is following the organizational standard practices or using a documented approved deviation.

The following table displays the Relative Stakeholder Involvement Matrix as it applies to AIM. The only roles analyzed for the purpose of this checkpoint are the ones shown below. The types of documents are categorized as either a Script (S) or a Form (F). Involvement types for the RSIM consist of Responsible (R), Accountable (A), Consulted (C), or Informed (I). Scripts/Forms that did not contain an “R” for any of the roles are shaded in grey. “R” indicates responsibility for performing the activity or producing the deliverable associated with that particular script/form. The color coding was used to indicate whether each particular script or form is being used (green), not being used, but has an approved deviation request for an alternative practice (blue), unapproved deviations being used possibly indicating need to update organizational baseline (yellow), or is not being used and no equivalent was found (red).

| **Roles** | | Management | Team Lead | Customer Interface Manager | Design Manager | Implementation Manager | Planning Manager | Process Manager | Support Manager | Quality Manager | Test Manager | TSP Team | Used,  Approved Deviations, Unapproved Deviation, or Not Used |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scripts, Forms** | **Type** | Comments |
| ANA | S | I |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | UD | ALT: SCRIPT AIM Document-New Technical. ANA has good detail and should be updated to fit our organization. |
| CCR | F | I |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  | I | UD | Tool X |
| CHECKPOINT | S | I | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |  | Used by Coach |
| CHECKTMDR | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Used by Coach |
| CIBPS | F | I |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  | C | UD | Tool X |
| CIR | F | I |  |  |  |  |  | A | R | A |  | I | UD | Tool X |
| CMAUDIT | S | I | C |  |  |  |  |  | C | R |  | I | U |  |
| DEFECT | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C | C | I | UD | Tool X |
| GOAL | F | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | U | GOAL Tab in Consolidated Workbook. Assumes TSP Baseline Redlines are approved. |
| HLD | S | C |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | UD | ALT: SCRIPT AIM Document-New Technical. HLD has good detail and should be updated to fit our organization. |
| IMP | S | I |  |  | R | R | R |  |  | R | R | C | UD | ALT: AIM Issue Fixes and MLCS New Features Scripts. IMP has good detail but needs to be updated to fit our organization, and consider updating existing code as well as new code. |
| IMP6 | S | I |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | R | I | NU | Not used. Portion of work included in AIM New Features Script. Recommend review to update for our organization. |
| INS | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  | R | UD | Used, but alternatives are also used. INS may need to be tailored. An intermediate script is probably required to bring in INS and an alternative PEER REVIEW script as appropriate. |
| INS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  | R | U | When Script INS is followed, Form INS is used. Alternative for PEER REVIEW may need to be defined. |
| INV | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | NU | Not used. Should it be? |
| ITL | F | I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | U | RISK TAB in meeting log. Assumes TSP Baseline Redlines are approved. |
| LAU | S | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | U | Note: All launch scripts are getting updated. |
| LAU1 | S | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C | U |  |
| LAU1A | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  | Never used, no leadership team |
| LAU2 | S |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | U |  |
| LAU3 | S |  | R |  | R |  |  | R | R |  |  | R | U |  |
| LAU3A | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  | Never used, no leadership team |
| LAU4 | S |  | R |  | R |  | R |  |  |  |  | R | U |  |
| LAU5 | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  | R | U |  |
| LAU5B | S |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  | I |  | Never used, no planning manager team |
| LAU5C | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  | I |  | Never used, no quality manager team |
| LAU6 | S |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  | R | U |  |
| LAU6B | S |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  | I |  | Never used, no planning manager team |
| LAU7 | S |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | U |  |
| LAU7A | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |  | Never used, no leadership team |
| LAU8 | S |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | U |  |
| LAU9 | S | A | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | U |  |
| LAUm | S | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |
| LAUPM | S | I | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | U |  |
| LOGCCR | F | I |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  | I | UD | Tool X |
| LOGCI | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | I |  | I | UD | Tool X |
| LOGD | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  | U | LOGD in workbooks. Assumes TSP Baseline Redlines are approved. |
| LOGPIP | F | I |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | I |  |  |
| LOGSPDR | F | I | I |  |  |  |  | I |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOGT | F |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  | U | LOGT in workbooks. Assumes TSP Baseline Redlines are approved. |
| LOGTRNM | F |  | I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Professional Development Coordinator. TSP Baseline updates needed. |
| LOGTRNR | F | I | I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Professional Development Coordinator. TSP Baseline updates needed. |
| LTL | S | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No leadership team |
| LTL1 | S | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LTL2 | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LTL3 | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LTL4 | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LTL5 | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LTLPM | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAINT | S | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | UD | Team is basically doing this work but not by following this script. Unapproved deviations are being used. |
| PIP | F |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | C | U | Form PIP has been used. TSP Baseline needs to be updated to include both FORM PIP and TAB PIP. |
| PM | S | I | R | R | C | C | R | R | R | R | C | R | U | PM report as evidence |
| POPS | S | A | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |
| POPS7 | S | A | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PREP | S |  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | UD | Team is basically doing this work but not by following this script. |
| PREPT | S | I | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | UD | Team is basically doing this work but not by following this script. |
| PREPW | S | I |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PSSPE | S |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | C | NU | Has not been used |
| REL1 | S |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C | U |  |
| REL1A | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |
| REQ | S | I | R | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | UD | ALT: SCRIPT AIM Document-New Technical. REQ has good detail and should be updated to fit our organization. |
| ROLE | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | U | Role tab in workbooks. Assumes TSP Baseline Redlines are approved. |
| ROLEMX | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | U | Used during launch on Presentation Paper. Not captured on smaller word document or letter size. |
| RSIM | F | A | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C | U | Note: RSIM needs to be updated |
| RTL | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None of these scripts are used in this scope. |
| RTL1 | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RTL2 | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RTL3 | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RTL4 | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RTL5 | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RTL6 | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RTL7 | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RTLPM | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SCHED | F |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  | R | U | Schedule tab in workbook. Assumes TSP Baseline Redlines are approved. |
| SPDE | F | A |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | C | NU | Not used. Alternative may be based on CMMI OPD/OPF? TSP Baseline probably needs to be updated. |
| SPDR | F | A |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | C | NU | Not used. Alternative may be based on CMMI OPD/OPF? TSP Baseline probably needs to be updated. |
| SRAM | F | A | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C | U |  |
| STATUS | S | I | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | U | Documents status in form MTG. Assumes TSP Baseline Redlines are approved. |
| STRAT | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | U | This was performed using paper/whiteboard but this form was not used nor was the information captured in the tab of the Consolidated Workbook. Could be used. If we want this artifact, coaches should have planning manager fill out during the launch/relaunch cycle. |
| SUMDI | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  | R | U | Contained in SUMP in workbook. Assumes TSP Baseline Redlines are approved. |
| SUMDR | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  | R | U | Contained in SUMP in workbook. Assumes TSP Baseline Redlines are approved. |
| SUMP | F |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  | R | U | Form SUMP in the consolidated workbook. Assumes TSP Baseline Redlines are approved. |
| SUMPD | F | I |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | I | NU | Not used. Alternative may be based on CMMI OPD/OPF? TSP Baseline probably needs to be updated. |
| SUMQ | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  | R | UD | Quality plan (O drive), actuals derived from SUMS. |
| SUMS | F |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  | R | U | SUMS tab in workbook. Assumes TSP Baseline Redlines are approved. |
| SUMT | F |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  | R | U | Contained in SUMS. Assumes TSP Baseline Redlines are approved. |
| SUMTASK | F |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  | R | U | Contained in SUMS. Assumes TSP Baseline Redlines are approved. |
| SUMTRNS | F | I | I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |  |  |
| TASK | F |  | R |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  | R | U | Task tab in workbook. Assumes TSP Baseline Redlines are approved. |
| TEST | S |  |  |  |  | R | R |  |  | R | R | R | UD | ALT: AIM TEST Script. TEST has good detail and probably should be updated to match our organization. |
| TEST1 | S |  |  |  |  | R | R |  |  | R | R | R | UD | Not used. AIM does this kind of work but is not using this script due to creating their own TEST script. |
| TEST2 | S |  |  |  |  | R | R |  |  | R | R | R | UD | Not used. AIM does this kind of work but is not using this script due to creating their own TEST script. |
| TEST3 | S |  |  |  |  | R | R |  |  | R | R | R | UD | Not used. AIM does this kind of work but is not using this script due to creating their own TEST script. |
| TESTD | S |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | UD | Not used. AIM does this kind of work but is not using this script due to creating their own TEST script. |
| TESTLOG | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C | I | UD | Not used. AIM does this kind of work but is not using this script due to creating their own TEST script. |
| TOPS | S | R | R |  |  |  |  | d |  |  |  | R | U | Work is being done in this manner. |
| TOPS4 | S | R | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | U |  |
| TRNM | F | A | A | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C |  |  | Training related activities are handled by the organization’s training department. TSP Documentation should be updated accordingly. |
| TRNOJT | F | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TRNR | F | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TRNSI | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TRNSUR | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TRNWR | F | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WEEK | S |  | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R |  | U | Needs to be updated |
| WEEK | F |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  | R | U | Week tab in the workbook |
| WEEKL | S |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Part of Multi-Team |
| WEEKLR | S |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Part of Multi-Team |

1. SM Team Software Process and TSP are service marks of Carnegie Mellon University

   Results of team member interviews are included only if reported by multiple team members [↑](#footnote-ref-1)