

Deliverable D03: Progress Report

-

Group E8.02

Github Repository: <https://github.com/JStockwell/Acme-One-E8.02>

Members:

- Gregorio Ortega Soldado (greortsol@alum.us.es) 30271286C
- Alejandro Manuel Gestoso Torres (alegestor@alum.us.es) 30260633Q
- Jaime Stockwell Mendoza (jaistomen@alum.us.es) 30696480J
- Pablo Aurelio Sánchez Valenzuela (pabsanval1@alum.us.es) 30246142S
- Manuel Cabra Morón (mancabmor1@alum.us.es) 47561328L
- Fernando Claros Barrero (ferclabar@alum.us.es)

Fecha: 24/07/2022

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Executive Summary	3
Revision Table	3
Introduction	3
Contents	4
Conclusions	5

Executive Summary

This document contains an evaluation of the performance of the workgroup members, following the criteria we have agreed in a meeting before starting the project we decided, and a description of the rewards and punishments we have agreed on.

Revision Table

Revision	Description	Date
v1.0	Sprint retrospective discussion	24/07/2022
v1.1	Final adjustments on the document	25/07/2022

Introduction

The contents of a progress report focus on the evaluation of the performance of the workgroup members, which must be computed according to the procedure on which the students agreed, plus a description of the rewards and punishments.

Contents

As we agreed during our meetings, we arrived in the conclusion that our rewards and punishments and definitions of good and bad work should be the following:

- All these conditions **must be fulfilled** for considering the work of a member as **good**:
 1. All their tasks must be fulfilled within a **reasonable period of time**.
 2. They must have a **fluid and good communication** with the rest of the team.
 3. They must **respect** the decisions of the manager.
- Any of these conditions **can be fulfilled** for considering the work of a member as **bad**:
 1. They do not respect or communicate with the other members of the group.
 2. They do not complete the tasks or achieve the specified deadlines and periods of time.
 3. They made other team members overwork because of the unfinished tasks.

As mentioned in the Workgroup report, at the beginning of summer, we will make a jackpot where each member of the group will contribute 15 euros:

- After finishing the summer, the members of the group that have performed a bad work are forbidden to use the money in the jackpot.
- Those members that have performed a good work during the sprint are allowed to use the money of the jackpot in a group meeting after our september exam.

Performance evaluation:

Member	Performance
Cabra Morón, Manuel	Good
Sánchez Valenzuela, Pablo Aurelio	Good
Stockwell Mendoza, Jaime	Good
Ortega Soldado, Gregorio	Good
Gestoso Torres, Alejandro Manuel	Good
Claros Barrero, Fernando	Good

Conclusions

This sprint was also a little bit problematic because some members could not work on their features for certain periods in the summer for the second time. But the only impact it had was that the sprint length resulted to be longer again, but we agreed that the performance of all our members was good because the communication was still fluid and all the features delays were still informed and agreed between. So at the end of the sprint we arrived at the conclusion that the performance mark of all our members was quite enough to pass our criteria, but we decided that it was crucial to solve all our technical debt in the fourth sprint.