

IFB299 Sprint 2 Retrospective
Queensland University of Technology
Semester 1, 2018
Pink Spoon, Team 15



Submitted: 1st June 2018

Tutor: Andrew Carr

BitBucket: <https://bitbucket.org/ifb299group15/>

Team Member	Student Number	Role
Emily-Jane Deering	n9722351	Product owner
James Uprichard	n10077596	Developer
Michael Bell	n9487921	Developer
John Santias	n9983244	Scrum master

Emily-Jane Deering

This sprint was a positive and productive experience for our team as a whole and each of us individually. We analysed and addressed how our last sprint went, what was done well and what could and should be improved on this time around. With the last sprint being very overwhelming for all members. This was in terms of the number of tasks that needed to be completed in such a short time frame, therefore, we put plans in place to avoid that.

We found that this sprint would be much busier within a shorter time frame. The group had decided to increase the number of meetings to three times a week, manage the time more efficiently by allocating specific times to complete the task, and help each other when needed. This made the final sprint a lot easier for the team as a whole, as we were on the same page. In retrospect, we did struggle more so with meeting times in the beginning and end of the sprint. As the semester progressed it became busier for all members of the group balancing work and university and finding a block of time that we were all available, amongst our varying schedules. To limit the problems caused by this we communicated to each other our schedules and tried to schedule meeting times during the tutorials when we were face-to-face. As this proved to be the most effective way to schedule. As whole team meetings were not always possible we opted for the idea to do some split meetings when required. This was so that all team members had equal opportunity to understand where we were all at and what was yet to be completed. However, we tried to ensure any major design or development decisions, were made when all members were present. This was to ensure any dispute over these decisions was resolved almost immediately if there were any.

Throughout sprint 2 we continued to work well as a team supporting each other and keeping one another accountable when required. Our successful teamwork in Sprint 1 helped us to continue to trust and have confidence in each other throughout Sprint 2 as well. In Sprint 1 we were not nearly as collaborative in terms of CS helping with IS and IS helping with CS. However, we placed much greater emphasis on doing so in this final sprint. In retrospect the ability to collaborate more resulted in a stronger team morale and increased productivity. Despite all this further and more detailed planning of meetings and tasks could significantly improve how smoothly each sprint ran. At times we also did not sufficiently communicate what had to be done and what that required, therefore, there were instances where members could not work on a task immediately. However, those were minor issues which were easily resolved and used as learning tools for other problems that were faced throughout the sprints.

Michael Bell

Throughout the second sprint, our team has worked well to encourage each other in various aspects of the project. Through maintaining our regular meetings in the second sprint all team members have been up to date and actively involved in different areas of the project. Team members who have not previously been heavily involved in programming tasks are now becoming more confident in their contributions to this area. This improved collaboration created a greater sense of shared purpose among the team members. Perhaps an area we did not perform so well was the preparation for the sprint. This lack of preparation resulted in some confusion about the tasks that were still remaining and how best to complete them. In future sprints, the overall performance could be greatly improved by prior planning and preparation.

To maintain a sense of trust and confidence among team members, extra one on one meetings were held whenever a whole team meeting was not possible. These types of meetings allowed for greater productivity in more technical areas of the project development. One on one meetings allowed for activities such as pair programming to complete more difficult tasks. Perhaps what we did not do so well is plan out meetings early enough so that all members could attend. To improve this in future sprints greater communication needs to be made between members of their availabilities and meetings need to be planned earlier to ensure all members can attend.

James Uprichard

Learning from the mistakes made in sprint 1, the team was able to progress beyond all the targets set in sprint 2 & 3. Having finished the project with one week to spare I believe that our teamwork and time management has been the things we as a team have done well. In the first retrospective, we put time management as something the team needed to improve on in this sprint. To come up with something to improve on for the next sprint is more communication or clarification with the scrum master. The team was able to meet up to update each other on their own progress but there were times some members would get confused and lost as to what was happening. This is due to some members not listening to the scrum master when he was talking directly to just one person. Most of the meetings were online, but next time we should try to get everyone's attention, make sure to get the scrum master to ask each member to recap the meeting or even put the webcam on.

What we didn't do well throughout sprint two was getting the meeting minutes up as soon as the meeting was finished. Within our meeting minute documents, there were tasks listed for our team and details about the discussion. By not having the document, the members couldn't check what was to be done nor remind their selves what to do.

John Santias

The team was able to capture a sense of purpose throughout sprint two. The team was able to have a meeting every two days to inform and update each other on the progress of the assigned tasks. Learning from sprint 1, communication was the key to capturing the sense of shared purpose and we continued it throughout sprint 2. Communication was very essential for the development and the management of the project. The team was also able to develop a sense of trust and confidence among members. This was found by assigning the tasks matching the member's skills. Learning from sprint 1, we assigned tasks not matching the skill set or experience of the member. This caused in ability for the members to complete the tasks within the time frame and was pushing two stories to the second release. From these mistakes, we were able to work better as a team and form a better team dynamic with confidence to complete the tasks in a timely manner by distributing the tasks that matched the member's abilities and experience.

What we did not do well was pushing code into the Bitbucket repository. This is because each time a member pushed to the repository it would merge with some files or overwrite few lines of a file. This would later force a member to redo the work that they have done. Even so, it would create errors on the server. For future improvements, we should inform each other before pushing to the repository thus we can organise our code in a well organised manner without losing anything.