

D1

LINUS BERGLUND¹, JOHANNES EDENHOLM¹, HUGO FROST¹,
HAMZA KADRIC¹, ERIK KÄLLBERG¹, JOHAN SVENNUNGSSON²,
RIKARD TEODORSSON², TIMMY TRUONG¹, ARVID WIKLUND¹
OCH KALLE ÄNGERMARK¹

¹*DAT255 - Software Engineering Project, Bachelor of Science programme in
Computer Engineering, Chalmers University of Technology*

²*DAT255 - Software Engineering Project, Master of Science programme in Software
Engineering, Chalmers University of Technology*

September 8, 2017

Reflections

At the first sprint, we created a simple list of things that we needed to build, which was used quite a bit during the sprint and helped us save time during the build phase. Although we had this list, feeling the pressure of time we rushed the first sprint in order to deliver a shippable product. That being the goal of scrum this led us to completely scrap what we had accomplished in the first sprint since none of it was accepted by the product owner. In hindsight what we should have done is split up in teams with clear objectives. Each objective should be completed separately, e.g. assemble LEGO pieces, so that we did not have to redo every single part. This realization led to the first strategy that we want to focus on; **delegate to sub teams**.

Before the start of the second sprint we reevaluated the velocity that we could accomplish during one sprint. Since our project was estimated to be larger than our new velocity workload, we should have split it into smaller chunks/stories which we did not do. The resource allocation ("planning poker") was integral to the success of the building, and helped us select the most optimal user story available. This is something we tried to do but did not apply it successfully in practice. Looking forward to further working with scrum, this is something we as a team need to improve at. As a strategy we want to focus on **dividing user stories** to smaller chunks/stories.

At each sprint review held with the product owner we received constructive feedback, which the team absorbed and internalized. We realized that there might be some disparity between the team's target vision and the product owner's target vision. We came to the conclusion that the user story didn't necessarily reflect the whole picture and we should've had a **closer communication with the product owner**.

Even though we were slow to build our product, we were happy with our ability to adapt to the challenges that we encountered. We were among the slow groups to gather resources and soon realized the necessity to trade or ask for LEGO pieces from other groups.

Chosen strategies and the corresponding KPI:s

Delegate to sub teams. Have small teams take on tasks together rather than individually, this allowing the small teams to work on similar problems and be able to help each other.

Will be measured on how much of the sprint backlog is completed for each sub team. The goal is to always have an empty sprint backlog after each sprint. E.g. if sub team #1 have fully completed their tasks they are given 100 points, if sub team #2 have not fully completed all their tasks they are given less points in the interval 0–99. This way the group can make changes if one sub team isn't working properly.

Divide user stories. Meaning that in a larger project smaller tasks should be defined in such a way that they could later be combined according to the definition of done of the larger story.

Will be measured on how much of the user story is completed after each sprint. Instead of going from e.g. 0 to 20%, you can divide stories into smaller tasks and make the completion percentage increase less but more often, e.g. 0 to 5%, 5 to 10%.

Continuous feedback from the product owner. To ascertain our team retains the scope and vision of the product owner. The product owner's satisfaction of the delivered features is measured on a one-to-ten scale. Updated and logged continuously after meetings with the aforementioned.