Project Name: **A Mobile Application to Support First Year Seminar/First Year Experience**

Report Preparer: **Tim Krause, PhD**

Date: **16 February 2016**  
Report Interval: **120**

---

1. Briefly recap project objectives. Have implementation tasks to date caused any meaningful adjustments to the project’s original objectives?

   We have not made any adjustments that have impacted the project’s original objectives beyond what was reported in previous report intervals. Implementation tasks have also not changed. However, due to our challenges with staffing, we have meaningfully changed how some of the work will get done.

   The revised project objective remains to create an Android mobile application that will help students determine what campus activities interest them, and use the application to find other UW-Stevens Point students with the same interest.

2. What is the status of in-progress project tasks?

   All of the “views” for the application are complete. We have a placeholder page that ties everything together while we complete the navigation for the application. We are also using test data so that we can simulate the entire application’s functionality. In some respects, it’s fair to say that we have a working prototype (as promised), but not to the level of specification that we had agreed to deliver.

   We still anticipate, with the extended deadline, to be able to complete user testing, revisions and bug fixes this semester. User testing will include students enrolled in First Year Seminar (FYS) and will be coordinated by Dave Chrisinger (lead) and Ron Strege.

3. Compare the current status of the project with regard to scope, schedule and cost with the original submission. Please also describe the cause for any significant variance from the original plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Proposal</th>
<th>Actual Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>All of the views are built and now need to be wired together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project should be completed, tested, revised and ready for consideration as part of our Capstone course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Completed the equivalent of three sprints. See below for note on switching to two week sprints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of all five, three week sprints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Approx. $17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$8,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Risk Assessment**

   a. Describe any significant new or anticipated risks to the project’s successful outcome with regard to scope, schedule or cost.
The team lost one designer to graduation and full-time employment. The original commitment was to continue through January, but that obligation was not honored. The remaining two students have met with the rest of the staff and given a very non-committal 5-10 hours/week to finish the project.

b. Describe the mitigation strategies to address these new or anticipated risks.

First mitigation strategy, in our 90 day report, we noted that:

> The second mitigation strategy is literally a function of the calendar and final deadline for the project. The vast majority of the team (with limited availability from our designer) is available for a significant portion of January. The team expresses confidence that we’ll be able to use the time to still deliver our project by the February 1st deadline.

See note 4a regarding the lack of availability of our lead developer. Our designer chose to take 6 credit hours during Winterim and was largely unavailable. Our third developer, with out some strong direction from our lead developer was unproductive.

**Mitigation Strategy One**: George Heeres is now taking the lead on wiring the views together. For the time being, our remaining two students have some smaller tasks in terms of finishing up a couple of Web Services that we need, as well as some minor UI tasks that need to be cleaned up.

**Mitigation Strategy Two**: Some of the team made significant attempt to not follow our Agile Sprints. We’re switching to two week sprints, and scrums are already scheduled for the semester.

**Mitigation Strategy Three**: Although I’ve emailed a number of students to invite them to the project, I’ve received no interest. I’m now reaching out in person and hoping that a more direct and personal invite will do the trick.

**Mitigation Strategy Four**: We’re also being more clear about who needs to attend which meetings of the team. In hindsight, I missed this one: the group was too large for any kind of regular meetings.
Executive Summary

Purpose and Objectives
The goal of this project was to address a significant retention issue facing UW-Stevens Point: the acknowledgement that First Year Seminars/First Year Experience (FYS/FYE) programs are a high impact practice that positively impact retention coupled with the reality that they are expensive programs to run. This project was designed to create a mobile application that would help relieve some of the expense and burden association with FYS/FYE.

The project would primarily serve traditional first year students, though we anticipated other audiences might find it a useful application (prospective students and non-traditional students most notably).

Because this was originally a problem lacking a solution, the team agreed in the original application to conduct a variety of focus groups with first year students to confirm that our idea for a mobile application “scavenger hunt” kind of game would help to introduce students to the resources, activities and events that they could avail themselves of as students here.

Organization and Approach
The team’s first task was to use a variety of focus groups to confirm the scavenger hunt approach. Although a more qualitative task, four (4) focus groups were completed consisting almost exclusively of first year students participating in First Year Seminar Courses. Chrisinger and Strege were able to reach out to approximately eighty (80) students, although direct participation varied from class to class.

In focus groups, students identified a variety of revisions and enhancements that were deemed not practical in 120 days. They were crystal-clear, however, in not being interested in any kind of scavenger hunt, but instead in determining their own agenda for how they interacted with their peers and around campus.

Analysis and Findings

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. $15.00/hr was not realistic in the current market. Stipends for faculty/staff were either delayed or sacrificed to raise the rate to $20.00/hr, which is competitive. However, I suspect students saw this work as more transitory than long-term part-time and internship opportunities. We attracted three students: 1) excellent student, who graduated in December and was no longer available; 2) excellent student, who chose to
take six credits in Winterim and was effectively unavailable in the time we agreed we would make up for some lost time; and 3) a student who continued to struggle to contribute.

2. 120 days is not a realistic expectation when working with student developers.
   a. The team lost the following time due to the following reasons:
      i. 1 Week Low hourly rate (see 1)
      ii. 1 Week Thanksgiving Break
      iii. 1 Week Week before finals
      iv. 1 Week Final exams
      v. 2 Weeks Holidays before Winterim

3. The team stringently resisted the agile methodology described in the original proposal. This made it very difficult to move out of analysis into design and development.

4. Even at $20.00/hr we struggle to find students interested in completing this project.

Appendices

Appendix A – Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Krause</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Strege</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Hourly (Progammers)</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$3,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablets for testing</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching funds</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,380</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B - Team

Krause, Tim  Principal Investigator  
Chrisinger, David  Focus Group Lead, FYS Advocate  
Heeres, George  Development Mentor  
Strege, Ron  Focus Group Lead, User Advocate  

Leaf, Kierstan  Design Lead (Student)  
McDowell, Ben  Technical Lead (Student)  
Strey, Scott  Developer (Student)