Agile Software Engineering Report – AC31007

Group 10

Miklos Mayer
Bjarne Kopplin
Daniel Denley
Harry Jamison
Patrizio Pigliacelli
Alex Storey
Alek Alexiev
Lukasz Nozewski

Introduction:
During the initial week of development, the group quickly adapted to the agile development processes, making use of peer programming and daily scrum meetings to ensure each member of the group was working on their assigned storyboard tasks as efficiently as possible. Roles of scrum master and product owner were assigned quickly at the start and remained for the duration of the project. An initial velocity was also estimated for the team after discussing individual strengths and agreeing upon the complexity of the storyboard tasks, this process was aided by methods such as voting poker to ensure decisions were done in a democratic process.

Sprint One Retrospective:
On completion of the initial week of development the team performed a sprint retrospective. This was carried out by the scrum master and each member of the development team addressed individual successes and what had gone well in development followed by issues that arose. The group also discussed are agile development methodology and the tools we used to facilitate that such as the GitHub story boarding.

As a group it was identified that the major issue impacting completion of tasks was an overestimation of initial velocity. Many group members underestimated the learning curve that came with ASP.NET core web app development and it was agreed upon that initial days of development time were spent on research and practice more so than actual project development. Whilst we identified this as an issue in our retrospective, we agreed that no actionable item would be required, the initial learning stage of the project had been completed and this issue of not accounting for it in the group velocity should not re-arise.

Another issue raised during the meeting was a concern on the specificity of group members in terms of tasks they were performing. For example, some members spent initial development time on the creation of HTML, CSS and other front-end orientated tasks, however when it came time to implement features to the front-end they struggled to understand the technology behind it, such as communicating with the database. Likewise, the back-end orientated developers struggled initially when working with the front-end developed. It was decided during the retrospective that the group would benefit with more frequent communication between team members to facilitate the transfer of skills. The action that we took during the second sprint was to implement more frequent peer-programming during development along with agreeing to be more candid with our issues and thus allowing other team members to assist as soon as possible. This is evidenced in our communication over teams were more frequent calls, screen sharing, and documentation sharing occur during the second week.

Finally, a request brought up by some members was more frequent discussions with the entire group. Many members felt like they were running into hurdles during development that could be solved much faster if the group focused their energy on them. It was agreed upon that if the group felt like issues had arose during the development day a meeting could be arranged an hour or so before development ended to share their issues to the group and have the team as a whole brainstorm and offer solutions. This was performed a few times during the second sprint and greatly reduced individuals time spent problem solving facilitated again in the sharing of expertise.

Conclusion:
On reflection we feel like the actions we took upon completing our sprint reflection helped increase our teams' velocity along with decreasing the amount of stress placed upon individual team members by aiming to focus on group responsibility. The quality and quantity of development performed during the second sprint in comparison to the first is evidence of this success.