**Retrospective**

| What went well? | **1.** **Streamlined Meetings**  - The team found a streamlined approach to meet at least once a week. Meeting notes were also taken at each one so members who were unable to attend said meeting were able to catch up on notes. Meeting topics were made clear beforehand so every attendee was up to date with what was to be said. Members were also very flexible with meeting times to accommodate for when others were unable to attend.  **2.** **Workload split**  - Rather than a first come first serve allocation basis, this time the team sat down and allocated tasks together based on comfortability, proficiency and interest. This ensured that no members felt as if they were forced to do a task based on missing a meeting or the like.  **3.** **Communication**  - The team was active over Facebook Messenger which allowed for swift resolutions to issues such as the installation of Flask for the project. Team members were able to communicate effectively and no one was left unanswered due to the ease of use for Messenger. This platform was used when issues were found outside of meeting times.  **4.** **Adjusting to the addition of 2 new team members**  - The addition of the 2 new team members allowed previous members to get another perspective on the current status of the project. The arrival of said members also posed a risk of upsetting the team dynamic, however, all previous and new team members adjusted to the new team environment well without issues.  **Velocity of sprint**   * The team concluded with a sprint velocity of approximately -7 with a relatively linear graph, indicating that the team maintained a steady effort throughout the sprint. * This also indicates that the team was not having any empty periods of work or having to catch up on time. |
| --- | --- |
| What could have been done better? | **1.** **Estimation of team’s capabilities**  - A portion of the iteration start was spent with the new team trying to understand everyones’ level and capability.  - There were issues regarding the ability to understand what the new team members would bring to the table, although this was resolved in time.  - Additionally, with the addition of Flask, the team members who did not understand the system were required to spend more time in learning,  - Due to this, our estimation scale was not very reflective of the team’s actual progress and our plans did not capture our capabilities.  **2.** **Clarity of sprint goals**  - By the time the second sprint began, the team had yet to decide which of the previous sprints’ tasks had to be continued, as well as which tasks were to be prioritised.  - A lot of the time spent on the planning period should have been delegated and/or cut down and spent on development of the project.  - There was a lack of clarity on the overall direction of the project, as tasks were listed out in a non-cohesive format, some tasks were dipping into the actions performed by other tasks, essentially creating unnecessary workload.  **3.** **Delegating tasks promptly**  - Due to the addition of new team members, the delegation of tasks was to be conducted differently compared to the first sprint. In this instance, the difference was based on how long it took to understand everyone’s preferred section to work on, which hindered the starting time.  - With no formal members assigned to a task, implementation was slow and difficult to coordinate.  **4.** **Timeliness in deadlines**  - The team relied too much on being pushed by others to enforce deadlines, rather than enforcing them themselves  - This meant that tasks were often left until the end or were completed within a day, rather than worked on consistently over time.  **5.** **Active use of time**  - A large portion of the sprint initialisation was dedicated to the adjustment of the arrival of the new team members and understanding the group dynamic from that point onward.  - This took away from precious time we could have used to settle issues regarding the previous and current iteration. |
| What will we try next? | 1. **Cross-Functional Collaboration**  - Experiment with pair programming sessions to help team members and reduce uncertainty within the team. Explore the possibility of rotating team members to different roles to gain a better understanding of each other's responsibilities and challenges.  **2.** **Fostering a Culture of Feedback**  - Encourage team members to provide constructive feedback during meetings to promote learning and growth.  Experiment with peer feedback sessions outside of meetings to address communication and collaboration improvements, this may be done in the cross-functional collaborations.  **3.** **Regularly Reviewing Our Definition of Done (DoD)**  - Schedule meetings to revisit and refine the Definition of Done based on evolving project requirements.  - Ensure that the DoD aligns with customer expectations and quality standards, and is achievable.  **4.** **Strictly writing up the team’s sprint plan [Revisit from Sprint 1]**  - Using the SMART goal method to determine the goals of the sprint, ensuring they are specific, measurable in relation to the team’s DoD, attainable within the team’s capabilities, relevant to the product owner’s demands as outlined in the product backlog and timed, noting strict deadlines which have limited flexibility.  - This will ensure that the team can rely on the plan made and have it as guidance rather than documentation.  - This will also allow the team to immediately get started on the tasks at hand rather than spending time being confused about specifications. |
| What questions do we have? | 1. How will we know if the addition of two new team members has been executed without any concerns from other members?   * Team members must ensure that any issues with the team dynamics are brought up to the team leader as soon as it is known. Bottling up emotions from the communications may lead to eventual breakdowns.   2. Will we know if the client will understand the potential issues and risks of the additions of new team members?  3. Considering the next iteration occurs during the next two weeks when other units become intense with assignments, how will we manage our time to ensure we deliver the project on time?   * Team members should discuss with each other and ensure that the setting of milestones, delegation of tasks, and setting of priorities aligns with the capabilities of the team as well as at the very bare minimum, the minimal viable product for the client. |