

Solving Pain Points with Team Alpha

Maria Augusta Vieira Nelson
Department of Software Engineering
and Information Systems
Institute of Exact Sciences and
Informatics
Pontifical Catholic University of
Minas Gerais (PUC Minas), Brazil
mavnelson@gmail.com

Mira Kajko-Mattsson
School of ICT
KTH Royal Institute of Technology
SWEDEN
mekm2@kth.se

Barry Myburgh
Johannesburg Centre for Software
Engineering
Wits University, South Africa
barrym@jcse.org.za

Cecile Peraire
Carnegie Mellon University
Silicon Valley, USA
cecile.peraire@sv.cmu.edu

Paul E. McMahon
PEM Systems
USA
pemcmahon@acm.org

Purpose of the Handout

By following this handout, you will be able to practice the usage of the Essence kernel on your own. You will continue to help a team figure out where it is.

Pre-conditions

To get the most out of this handout, you should have knowledge of the *Essence Alphas*, *States*, and *Checklists* and you should have read *Scenario on Solving Pain Points*.

When to apply

The handout describes events that occur after the first release.

Essence Scope

This handout focuses on leveraging the *Alpha* cards only. Other cards, like *Activity Spaces* and *Competencies* are not part of this scenario.

Reference Cards

The *Alpha* cards used in this scenario are part of the SEMAT kernel.

Solving Pain Points with Team Alpha: Scenario 2

Maria Augusta Vieira Nelson, Mira Kajko-Mattsson, Barry Myburgh, Cecile Peraire, Paul E. McMahon

A five-member team has been in charge of developing an online university course management system since its first release. The team was formed by the IT director, who carefully chose its members with the purpose of maximizing team productivity. Its composition was based on an optimal mix of personalities with competencies identified as crucial. The team consists of a project manager and four developers, each having the expertise and responsibility in their specific areas such as design, user experience, requirements and database.

The team feels that its size and composition is satisfactory. The members are confident that they have the required competencies to fulfill their responsibilities. They know that as the system grows in the future, the team might have to be expanded.

The team has started working on the second release. It is very well acquainted with the project's initial needs. It has collectively established its goals, mission and responsibilities. The team members agreed to mainly communicate orally and to document only the most important issues such as requirements, design, problems, test cases and important decisions and events. The team practices a democratic leadership style implying that discussions with more than one possible outcome are discussed to make sure that everyone on the team has a chance to impact the decisions.

Team members have worked well and are committed to the project. Communication is sometimes challenging but each member knows how to conduct his/her own work and is dedicated to doing it. This is how the team succeeded in delivering Release 1.

So far, the stakeholder groups that have been identified are *Administrators*, *Faculty*, and *Students*. Each group has a few representatives who are willing to collaborate with the project team. For Release 2, the team has decided to meet and interview faculty members by visiting them at the university. This would help the team to identify needs for Release 2 and observe the usage of the new system.

After the interviews, two developers were in disagreement about one significant requirement. They shared the conflicting viewpoints with the faculty involved. The faculty agreed with the first developer, and the second developer felt somewhat put out that his opinion did not seem to matter. Since this was not the first time that the second developer's ideas had not been accepted, little by little he stopped communicating with the team.