Personal Portfolio

A list of contributions made by Anneke Kotze to the Group project for Group 55.

All artefact evidence are in separate word documents named according to the number seen in the first column.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Artefacts | | | | | |
| # | **Release** | **Description** | **Document** | **Benefit** |
| 1 | 1 | We were struggling to get everything finished so I went and looked at Jira, our previous sprints, and the requirements document and revised the sprint 3 plan and the release plans so that they were more feasible | Artefact 1  The revised sprint and release plan with my changes shown | By ensuring that each release plan was manageable and possible to complete with a bit of commitment, it helped the team know what they were aiming for. It also made sure that we were not consistently under-performing, which would have lowered morale. It also ensured that the features we were adding had business value and matched with the original requirements. |
| 2 | 1 | AngularJS features created in both releases | Artefact 2  File listing all of the features I added and where to view them in the folders | Creating these features allowed us to add business value to the website. The AngularJS components allowed the front end to work and be viewable as well as be responsive. |
| 3 | 1 | SQL queries from both releases | Artefact 3 | NOT DONE |
| 4 | 1 | Researched framework to determine which languages would work | Artefact 4 | NOT DONE |
| 5 | 1 | Added the acceptance criteria for each story, except View Hire Requests, to PowerPoint for sprint 1 | Artefact 5  PDF containing all of the slides at the time that I finished adding the acceptance criteria | In order to show our client team what we had achieved, we wanted to remind them what they asked for and what the criteria for it being complete was. This allowed us to tell them what exactly the feature would allow them to do, as well as be specific if a feature was unable to fulfil a certain acceptance criterion for whatever reason. |
| 6 | 2 | Was sprint master for sprint 3 and 4 | Artefact 6 | NOT DONE |
| 7 | 2 | Suggested Database Table Changes to refine Database Model.  This was done as a joint effort by me and Richard. | Artefact 7  Document containing things suggested by both of us. | It reduced the complexity of querying the database from the node.js applications and made it match the use of the data in the website better. It also ensured that naming was more consistent and clear. |
| 8 | 2 | Node.js features created in both releases | Artefact 8  Document listing the node.js features I created | Creating these features allowed us to add function to the website, which in turn provided business value. The node.js components allowed the site to use data and be actually useful. |
| 9 | 2 | Set up 3 file structures for someone else to just add content to | Artefact 9 | Creating the file structure allowed us to add content only pages, which could be handled by someone without any knowledge of AngularJS and node.js. It allowed us to create more pages than we would otherwise have had, and complete those pages effectively. |
| 10 | 2 | Did burndown charts for sprint 4 – Hour and Story points  The data was gathered from Jira, where we log our time. I had to then turn that data into both burndown charts | Artefact 10  Excel document containing the two burndown charts on different sheets (hour and story point) | We needed to have a burndown chart for our PowerPoint for sprint 4 so I went and gathered the information from Jira. This meant that it was as up to date as possible as well as being accurate. It allowed the team to clearly see how many hours were put in as well as how many story points were completed. It also showed our client team that we finished everything within a reasonable time frame, rather than leaving everything to the end. |