Format for Inspections/Code Reviews

1. The artifact to be reviewed should be made available to the entire team at least 7 days prior to the date of the inspection. Once the artifact is complete, the author should post a link to the artifact on the "Code Review Sign-up Sheet", available on Google Sheets (link in Slack bookkeeping channel). The author should place a letter "Y" (for yes) in the column next to the artifact link. This indicates that the artifact has been made available.

2. Prior to a code review, all members should spend time reviewing the artifact and preparing 3 questions or faults that they discovered upon review. The team lead will assign each group member a section of the artifact to direct their focus, although all members should be familiar with the entire artifact.

   Note: Preparation for code review can be done in pairs to save time. A group of two may submit their questions or faults together, but this group cannot exceed two people.

3. At the beginning of each code review, the group lead will randomly choose three group members to share the questions or faults that they discovered in the artifact. Failure to provide this information will result in the attendee being appointed moderator or note-taker for the current session.

   Note: For each code review session, there is a moderator and scribe. The author of the artifact cannot fill either of these roles.

4. Throughout the code review session, the author should listen carefully to all feedback. The author should not be argumentative or defensive towards criticism, and the group members should ensure that all criticisms put forth are both constructive and friendly. If the code under inspection is unclear, the author will be asked to clarify or justify the areas of confusion. If these areas are deemed either nonsensical or unnecessary by the team, the author will be asked to restructure their artifact.

5. Solutions to problematic areas should not be discussed during the meeting. The group should direct their focus on defect identification.

6. The role of the scribe is to document the defects put forward in the session, typically using line numbers. The scribe is encouraged to participate in the review of the artifact.

7. The team should exercise respect towards the author at all times. In case of an unforeseen dispute, the moderator should step in to diffuse and mediate conflict.

8. The code review should be seen as an opportunity to openly discuss the artifact, and to improve team communication and morale. Everyone is expected to attend code reviews with a positive attitude.