

SATURDAY Aug 7 Sprint 3 Retrospective

Generally sprint 3 was way shorter than the previous sprints. The stories were assigned following sprint 2 velocity. Integration, pull request and reviews were done following CID and were smoother than the previous sprints. Travis, Coveralls, Automated deployment etc. all worked well and, in conjunction with, a consistent and unified code base to work off of meant when code was integrated, it went smoothly. The final product is not perfect due to time constraints.

JAMES:

What went well?

- The team improved with CID, pull requests were done throughout the sprint.

What went wrong?

- Time constraints, the sprint was short(3 days) due to the deadline

What could be improved?

- Improve testing and not use the live database for testing.

LUNGELO:

What went well?

- Managed to integrate everything before the deadline despite the sprint being very short

What went wrong?

- There were too many bugs to fix
- Styling is not sufficient
- Sprint was too short

What could be improved?

- More functionality could be implemented
- Test coverage could be better, covering the client side too

SINAZO:

What went well?

- Collaboration and integration was easier and smooth
- Delivered the story on time

What went wrong?

- The assigned stories were not completed

What could be improved?

- Testing could be improved

SINOKUBONGA:**What went well?**

- Was able to finish the allocated stories for sprint 3.

What went wrong?

- The socket.io bug that prevented groups from receiving messages wasn't solved.

What could be improved?

- Future recommendation would be working faster, and collaborative with group members as much as possible.

STEPHEN:**What went well?**

- Integrating the finished tasks in Sprint 3 was achieved and a functioning product was produced.

What went wrong?

- All the stories for Sprint 3 could not be completed due to time constraints.

What could be improved?

- More unit tests could be implemented to ensure proper functioning of implemented code.