📝 Feedback from Sprint 1

The feedback provided by the teaching team can be summarised into two main areas: strengths and areas for improvement. As we moved into Sprint 2, we continued doing what worked well and made meaningful improvements based on the suggestions provided. 👣

✅ What We Did Well

- **Project Background & Scope**:
  Our project background was clear, well-structured, and easy to follow. We maintained a professional yet approachable tone throughout the documentation.
- **User Stories**:
  We provided detailed user stories with well-justified story points and priorities. These were thoughtfully grouped into epics, demonstrating a strong understanding of the project structure.
- **README**:
  The README was clear and helpful for new developers. We continued to enhance it in Sprint 2 by:
  - Gradually updating the file as the project progressed.
  - Including technical requirements and specifying both development and deployment environments.
  - Breaking the setup into small, easy-to-follow steps to support future developers and users. 🛠️
- **User Story Mapping & Sprint Backlog**:
  Our mapping and backlog were logically structured with clear task breakdowns. We carried this clarity into Sprint 2 planning as well.
- **Video**:
  We included real user scenarios and feedback summaries. For Sprint 2, we recorded a new video featuring our client's live reaction to the completed work—providing a transparent and authentic look at the impact of our progress. 📽️ You can watch the video here.
- **Overall Documentation**:
  We maintained consistent documentation practices into Sprint 2, continuing to prioritise clarity and helpfulness for all stakeholders. 📄

🛠️ What We Improved

- **Technical Requirements Section**:
  Previously, our technical requirements read more like a summary of the tech stack. In Sprint 2, we made several improvements:
  - Updated the Project Overview to include a clearly presented table of technologies used.
  - Added a detailed analysis in the Technical Requirements section, elaborating on why we chose each technology, and their characteristics and strengths. 💡
- **Sprint Backlog**:
  We revised our backlog in Sprint 2 and planned Sprint 3 using more refined user stories (rather than just epics) to increase clarity.
  - Each task now includes **priority** and **dependencies** to support better sprint planning and tracking. ✅

- **Video/Prototype Enhancements**:
  In our latest client meeting, we showcased the results of Sprint 2 and clearly explained the features we had implemented.
  - This gave the client a direct comparison with the initial prototype, making it easy to see what had changed and improved—even without knowing the detailed user stories or technical background. 🧠

👷 Supervisor Feedback Summary

- **Progress**: Our team is on track generally and the client is satisfied. We were advised to stay within the agreed scope and carefully evaluate any new feature requests, declining additional features due to time constraints and clearly communicating the project scope. The client appreciated our transparency and better understood our development plan.
- **Technical**: We were reminded to inform the client that Cloudinary, our chosen storage solution, has a usage cap and may incur costs beyond the free quota. We clarified this during our meeting, noting the 5 GB free limit and the current usage (~90 MB for the longest video), which reassured the client. She is also now able to upload directly via the Cloudinary GUI.
- **Project Management**: Code review practices are on track. We were encouraged to keep the GitHub board regularly updated and to log blockers without altering original user stories. We've applied the same structured approach to Sprint 2 documentation and continue to track progress via GitHub.

By taking the feedback seriously and implementing changes thoughtfully, we believe we've improved both the quality and clarity of our work in Sprint 2. We look forward to continuing this momentum in Sprint 3! 🚀