

Half-time Evaluation of KassIR by GruppN

This evaluation takes place during the third sprint of the project. Working with Scrum has had both positive and negative consequences.

Scrum calls for regular meetings, which means every team member is up to date on where the product stands. It also allows everyone to have a broader overview of the code, as each finished user story is reviewed at the end of the sprint.

The team and product owner also have a better overview, both between and during sprints, as to who is working on what, and what can be expected after each sprint.

On the other hand, working with Scrum has thus far proven to be both confusing and, in aspect of time and skill, somewhat wasteful. We also have had no interaction with an actual product owner yet, which drastically limits the productivity of a Scrum meeting. However, we have been discussing the product with masters students at the interaction design program.

Also, dividing the project into user stories using the INVEST model was not very easy. Attempting to make the initial user stories as small as possible resulted in very little actual work being done during the first sprint. Had we used a traditional workflow, the team could have focused on building a stable code base and shared vision, instead of essentially building a dummy prototype, with almost all the code being refactored in the next sprint.

The obsession with sprints and short-term iterations has resulted in poor code quality. It is difficult to write well-structured code when all the focus is put into breaking down the project into over-simplified, isolated tasks with no regards as to what the model will look like or how the different parts of the program will interact with each other. This was clearly evident in our project after the first few sprints.

Additionally, due to the fact that the team must deliver a shippable product by the end of each sprint, there is no room for experimenting or, again, establishing a functional code base to be built upon in the upcoming sprints.

Going forward we need to be able to establish good communication with the product owner so that we actually will be able to get criticism between sprints, thus using the strengths of Scrum to our advantage. We also need to structure our sprints better, while also having good communications inside the Scrum team. This is necessary to be able to create a better code structure and overall cleaner and more functional code.

By making user stories larger and more complex we will be able to put more effort into each user story, thus assuring better quality. This might mean fewer tasks completed in each

sprint. However, in focusing on larger over-arching user stories, it will be easier to get a view of the upcoming sprints and clear the fog that has existed in the future timeline of the project. Working with small user stories made it very difficult to picture what work would be done, say, three weeks from now.

However, we still do not quite see how we are supposed to be able to experiment with new features due to the constraints of the Scrum workflow. This is something we will have to discuss further with the examiner, if we actually can try out new features that the product owner haven't thought about, or might even be against before they see the actual implementation, or if that is completely out of the question.