The various roles in the Scrub-Agile team played their own respective parts in the sprint. The use of the product owner to properly convey the product requirements was imperative to defining the path to completing the sprint. The Scrum Master oversaw the conversion of product requirements into sprint backlog items while also creating and leading the sprint events. The development team worked on completing the sprint in an efficient and productive manner.

The Scrum-Agile approach allowed us to develop product requirements from the User Stories provided by the product owner. The product owner went out to field test and get feedback from the users, this feedback was then converted to user stories. The user stories were then implemented into the user backlog by Scrum Master. The backlog items were then implemented by the development team. The result makes the product more competitive because it considers what the user wants.

When the product owner presented the need for a directional change in the final product it caused some disturbances in the development team due to disregard for the previously implemented work. The product owner informed the team that the new direction of the top five destination list would change from user preference influenced locations to all locations being focused on rehabilitation and getaways. This change caused all the previous code written to define influences and how they changed the top five destination list to be rendered useless. The new requirements were successfully implemented, and the changes were discussed in the sprint events to allow for the development team to fully understand the new product requirements.

The primary ways of communication have been through sprint events and email. The team has effectively communicated concerns and progressed through the two main methods of communication. An example of this communication can be seen by looking at the email from one of the development team members expressing the need for more transparency in what the user wants versus what the shareholders want and understanding what really dictates the product requirements. The sprint events also allowed for an open space to immediately discuss any concerns about how the product should work and how to collaborate best between the team. The use of collaborative software such as Azure Boards allowed the scrum master to communicate the sprint backlog to the development team and allow the team to see how to collaborate based on the priority and size of the items on the sprint backlog.

The organization was led primarily through the use of the sprint backlog. The sprint backlog allowed us to prioritize the items by importance and in an order that allowed for the most effective development strategy. The use of the backlog also allows us to see what is currently being worked on to allow for parallel programming that is functional due to directing done via the backlog. During the sprint events we used the three-question method to lead the discussion in daily Scrum meetings. The three question method required the development team and including the Scrum Master to answer three important questions. The first question is “what did you do yesterday?”, This question is useful for two reasons first it holds the speaker accountable by asking them to define what work was completed yesterday, second it is used to find setbacks and try to fix any concerns that would not allow the team member to complete more work. The first question also helps the development team to have a more transparent relationship with the Scrum Master because it lets them know when the Scrum Master is attempting to alleviate concerns and create the best possible environment for the development process. The second question is “What am I going to do today. The second question is important because it states and defines the workload for the day while also informing the rest of the development team which backlog item you will be working on while also creating a proportionate workload to be accountable for. The third question really is an open statement asking for any questions or comments to the rest of the development team and Scrum Manager. The use of planning strategies though must start with an initial sprint event where the sprint log is defined by the development team and the Scrum Master. The way the backlog was defined was using the Planning Poker method where the development team individually agree on backlog item workloads. The planning poker method also allowed us to immediately address initial concerns regarding the time and workload amount per backlog item.

The Scrum-Agile approach to the SNHU travel project was necessary. The rapid change in direction was more easily addressed using the Scrum-Agile approach compared to how it would have been handled using another approach such as the waterfall method. Due to the use of the Scrum-Agile approach the development team were able to work more closely while also allowing for parallel programming that sped up the development process. I believe the Scrum-Agile approach was the best approach due to how easily the direction of the product requirements could change because it allowed for on the fly change instead of having to wait till a final product was made and then revisiting. Even in the situation of a big change not all the code had to be disregarded and only a small portion needed to be rebuilt.