**Sprint 3 Retrospective**

| **What went well?** | **1.** **Velocity of sprint**   * The team concluded once again with a relatively linear graph, indicating that the team maintained a steady effort throughout the sprint despite the prior concern identified of having other unit final assessments coming up. * This also indicates that the team was not having any empty periods of work or having to catch up on time. * This also suggests that the entire team has been able to collaborate fairly throughout the sprint, prioritising the group elements of this sprint in order to not burden any other members of the team   **Ability to maintain usable product despite changing requirements**   * The non-functional requirement which was added for the team from the previous sprint was successfully incorporated into the system through the additional layers of security * Despite not having met this requirement fully by the previous iteration, the team was still able to provide a working product to the product owner * In this sprint, we had additional functions to add such as congratulatory messages on completion of tasks, we were able to add such features without compromising the integrity of the project   **Maintained timeliness within the sprint plan**   * The team was able to adhere to the sprint plan deadlines which we set in place prior to commencing * We were previously unable to meet such deadlines however, by enforcing these dates more heavily, it urged the team to take more responsibility in finishing their individual efforts on time.   **Effective communication**   * The team frequently kept each other up to date both via stand up meetings as well as more commonly in the team’s messenger chat. * This ensured that everyone was on the same page and that we could stay connected even during this more stressful time of semester * Our product owner was unfortunately unavailable during the usual meeting time, however, several members of the team were able to go retrieve that feedback at a later date and convey that information to the other members   **Reviewing our definition of done (DoD)**   * A previous goal for the team in the last retrospective was to better evaluate our work against the definition of done outlined in the project plan * The team has on boarded this idea well in this sprint, all cross checking our completed work against the definition to ensure that it is enough to meet the requirements as desired * This has allowed for peace of mind amongst the team that the product ultimately submitted was of an agreeably high quality to the team   C |
| --- | --- |
| **What could have been done better?** | **1.** **Adapting of sprint goals**   * Prior to this iteration, the team had already struggled in clearly defining the sprint goals and the tasks that were to be prioritised however, in this sprint, the main difficulty was that our feedback was provided later and hence the sprint planning that took place prior to sprint commencement became more redundant * The team struggled to incorporate the product owner’s additional demands alongside the goals we had already set for the team * The risk of unequal workload became more evident * As these additional tasks were identified later than desired, we ended up having to rush a lot of work towards the end   **Active use of time**   * Since the previous sprints, the team has improved on having more relevant and time efficient meeting however, this meetings often centred around what tasks need to be completed rather than what has been done + issues remaining * This meant that the team often had no code review and did not cross check our work before merging * Additionally, this led to a lack of documentation, inconsistent code style and double ups in tasks completed.   **Positive feedback**   * As the sprint occurred alongside a lot of major assessments for the team, it became tunnel vision for most members to simply complete their part, merge it, and call it complete * This meant there was little recognition amongst the team about the efforts of fellow team members and led to the project feeling more like a chore * Without much recognition for team member’s efforts, everyone decided to take the bare minimum route with minimal incentive to take initiative or help each other on the more complicated tasks, which could have sped up the entire sprint process   **Handling individual roles**   * The roles that we self assigned at the start of the project have not actually been used that often * Although in a university context it may be nice for the team member to rotate and try new roles, this meant that no one was actually taking responsibility over the roles they agreed to care for. * For example, the risk manager did not actually mitigate risks when they arose but rather the product owner did and the ethics manager did not consider the sourcing of external code and how to properly cite/ credit them * If we had stuck to our roles a bit more closely, many risks would have been minimised as there would have been a person of contact in addressing these issues.   **Use of planning documents as set out in the project plan**   * The team relied heavily on direct messaging and google docs to collaborate our work whilst Trello for example, has been neglected and mainly used as a ‘showpiece’ * The documents were initially set out in that fashion as outlined in the project plan to aid the management and clarity of each sprint * By not following our own plan, the team has had a harder time tracking contributions, coordinating team efforts and clarifying the goals for the sprint as these were scattered across multiple platforms without reasoning * The misuse of these channels ultimately led to inconsistencies in the plan as well as difficulty locating important documents for submission |
| **What will we try next?** | **Fostering a Culture of Feedback**  - Despite this being the end of this specific project, the team had a takeaway that when it comes to group work, communication is key not only in delegation and planning but also in recognising the efforts of other team members  - By giving praise and looking intently into each other’s work, we can create incentive to have initiative in leading the team, helping other members and taking pride in our work  **Give leeway in the sprint plan**   * When delegating tasks, the group has tended to assign as much as possible to each team member in order to cover the largest possible scope * However, we have realised that this means there is little room for additional requirements and tasks to be added without overloading some members with too much work * By giving a buffer space of perhaps one or two tasks, each member will have the capacity to take on requirements if need be and otherwise, also alleviates the burden of a heavy workload   **Allocate time for code reviews**   * Throughout the sprints, we have found multiple incidents of bugs and errors which have mainly only been noticed right before submission. * Since the team’s meetings would go through what work has been done individually, there was little done to manage merges and accessibility on other local machines * As such, there was not any extra time to fix the bugs before the deliverable was submitted and this meant that we had compromised our product’s safety and usability * By replacing one stand up meeting with a code review, the team will be able to have a proper look into and attempt in remedying errors prior to submission   **Cross training amongst members**   * The team functioned in three major sectors, ‘task oriented’, database’ and ‘security’. * Although this allowed everyone to specialise in their tasks, each of those sectors actually coded in a different coding language which meant that only certain members were able to help each other throughout the sprint * In agile practice, being cross trained is highly valuable as it enables every member to work on every part of the project, we seek to emulate this |
| **What questions do we have?** | 1.   1. Now that the project has concluded for this unit, how should we continue to apply agile practices in the other projects we may undertake in university and in life 2. Had the sprints been longer in duration, would the team be able to delegate more tasks to members or should these tasks be delegated one and a time instead of all at the start of the plan 3. When adapting agile practices in a university setting, is it really that important for every member to have a specified role if in the end, time constraints prevent students from actively acting their role’s responsibilities 4. If in practice, if we had two members removed from the team instead of added, how would the team be able to compensate the loss of manpower, would we opt to simplify the goals or continue to plough ahead, reducing burden for subsequent sprints |