Areas to Work on/Aspects to Continue for Sprint 2

Sprint 1 - Throughout the 1st Sprint we had a constant channel of communication with the Stakeholders. We took advantage of this opportunity by asking frequent questions, this helped us understand exactly what the Stakeholders expected from us, and in what order they prefer them delivered in. We aim to continue to do this throughout Sprint 2.

Sprint 2 – With the completion of the 2nd Sprint, we can say that Bruce, the product owner, continued to refer to the Stakeholder Questions channel throughout the week, although less questions were asked than in the 1st Sprint. This is because a lot of the initial confusion was cleared then. This allowed us to stay on task throughout the week, and there was little to no confusion as to what the Stakeholders wanted to be implemented. We frequently looked at the channel to take into account any of the other teams' questions, which is evident by the frequent updates of our Product Backlog.

Sprint 1 – We have good cross functionality. Anybody that is struggling is able to get help with their problems. Problems were therefore resolved in a timely manner and we aim to continue this during Sprint 2.

Sprint 2 – This continued throughout the 2nd Sprint. Pair programming videos can be used for reference. The team was able to focus on individual tasks however team members stepped in whenever someone required help. Team members used many programming languages.

Sprint 1 - The 1st Sprint Review did not have a plan and thus had no structure meaning the stakeholders found it difficult to follow our Review. For Sprint 2, we will create a plan so that our Review has a clear structure.

Sprint 2 – For the 2nd Sprint, we created a video demonstrating all the new functionality alongside displaying a PowerPoint presentation. Furthermore, we had a test run of our Review. All presenting members knew exactly what to say, and we were able to gather and subsequently implement feedback on our Review before the real one. Our Sprint Review for Sprint 2 drastically increased in quality, and we are under the impression that the stakeholders had a much better idea of the progress we made.

Sprint 1 – The time management during sprint one was unsatisfactory. Our daily Scrum Meetings tend to last over 7 minutes which was the allocated time and there was a lot of downtime between the meetings and breaks. We aim to cut this down in our 2nd Sprint.

Sprint 2 - All our Daily Scrum Meetings are under the 7-minute mark so that any of them can be submitted for grading. The entire team also made the most of the time allocated. Each member was prepared to and thus spoke concisely with clear explanations. Due to our cross-functionality, there was also a lot less time where members found themselves waiting for a task to be complete, as they simply got along with another task in the meanwhile.

Sprint 1 - Our Sprint planning was not up to standard. This is because some Sprint Backlog items were vague and too long; we did not break our Sprint Backlog items into sub-tasks which would allow us to tackle them one step at a time. We also did not keep track of who was doing which User Stories and tasks.

Sprint 2 - We ensured that we were constantly reviewing the Sprint and Product Backlogs and made sure to break larger stories into more granular ones to make them more concise (this can be seen with breaking up User Story #69 into User Stories #95 and #94). We divided all our Sprint Backlog items into sub-tasks, thus making it them more granular, allowing for streamlined testing and giving us a clear starting point for each User Story (view our issues on GitHub for reference as they now all have sub-tasks with tick boxes appearing in the comments section of the issue). We kept track of who was working on which story (as seen in the "Burndown Chart - Sprint 2 - Planned and Actual" Word document).