

## Iteration 3

March 14, 2016 to April 11, 2016

# Iteration 3 - Retrospective

## Retrospection and Time Analysis phase

### Retrospective/Analysis from previous iteration:

*These notes from beginning of iteration 3*

While we feel that our architecture reflects the model we've chosen well, we feel there are **architectural pain points** that can be resolved. We also feel that the project in general **lacks completed components**, a problem that was caused by a lot of spikes and preparation code that hasn't been followed through.

We can resolve **problem one — architectural painpoints** — by revising the architecture. We plan to:

1. Consider another method of passing data between activities
2. Implement additional activities to better follow the guidelines set out by Google

**Problem two — incomplete components** — will simply take developer time. As of this document writing, we have finalized our decisions on all of the remaining big user stories and have a plan to implement them.

# User Story Completion

As of the end of Iteration 3 we have completed all planned user stories and all recorded bugs have been fixed. We have met our planned goals for our retrospective activity, having moved to a Parcel based message passing system, and having activities that we believe adhere to the Google best practices for an Android app. Overall, we are very pleased with the work from this iteration.

## Time Analysis

Analysis of time taken for each task by individual.

Matthew Brzezinski:

**Initialize Alarms** ( 2 hours recorded )

**Unit Testing** ( 4 hours — unrecorded )

Bailey Shirliff:

**Revision Planning** ( 4 hours )

Paul Jarrow:

**Bug Fixes** ( 8 hours recorded — 2 hours duplicated work with Lam )

**Documentation** ( 6 hours )

Faye Lim:

**Resolve Code Smells** ( 7 hours recorded )

Lam Doan:

**Remaining Task Completion and Bug Fixes** ( 37.5 hours recorded )

Xiran Lin:

**Alarms Core Code** ( 8 hours recorded — some additional hours shared )

Some other tasks required some time from each of us:

Bailey Shirliff:

**Research** ( 8 hours spent )

This analysis does not include all project management time spent, such as meetings, setup, etc.

## Code Smells

| Code Smell        | Refactoring  |
|-------------------|--|
| Long methods      | Extract Method   |
| Duplicate methods | Created a superclass, and moved the method to superclass |
| Switch statements | Replaced with conditionals                               |

## Conclusion

This project failed to meet the testing requirements for each iteration, and that was our largest failing point. We all agreed that more developer time needed to be devoted to doing the tests, and we've all agreed that this would be the number one priority in any future project.

We also misunderstood the requirements for each iteration for the Big User stories. This was our fault, and we made our best attempt in the final iteration to complete more Big User stories from our incomplete local implementations. We managed to pull it off, but would approach this problem differently in future projects.

### **What we learned:**

- Testing is very critical and should have a higher priority on our personal work lists
- Other school work makes a project with evenly distributed velocity quite a challenge