TEAM 20

Team members: Rebecka Jakobsson, Cecilia Michelsen, Jacob Messinger, Tina Samimian, Elin Nilsson, Linnéa Fransson, Norbert Laszlo & Oscar Helgesson.

Customer value & scope

Our focus will be to create an application that gives value to the students attending the fair. So far we have not found ourselves in a situation where we need to prioritize our different target groups. When facing such a dilemma in the future we will prioritize the students' experience over the different companies and the fair-committees experience.

In sprint one we have coded in such a way that all main pages exist. The user can also navigate between these pages with a menu bar in the bottom of each page. You can also see some information on the pages that we so far have hardcoded. We chose to develop some certain pages and functions in a way that will make it easier to continue to develop them in future sprints and user stories. These functions were not hardcoded but we consider that it will bring a lot of value to us as developers in the future.

Our success criterias in this sprint were to get to know android studios, feel that it is working and get started with the actual coding and development. We feel like this is something we have achieved and we all know what we are doing and feel as much part of it as anyone else.

In this sprint we created small user stories with the purpose of having time to find a good workflow. We also did this to get to know the new environment we are working with. By doing this we will be able to work more efficiently in the future. It turned out that the user stories got too easy and that in turn gave us the wisdom to in the future complete more user stories. We believe that we have found a good work flow.

We sat together and wrote the tasks for the user stories. This was done so that everybody would have a rather good idea of what (more specific) others would do and also how they

would do it. This gave two positive consequences. First, nobody was too confused on how to begin and what to do. Second, everybody knew what was going on and hopefully didn't feel like they missed out on learning how to accomplish a user story they weren't working on. This also resulted in that it got easier to help each other, due to the fact that everyone knew what their teammates were working on.

Similarly we sat together and wrote the acceptance criterias. Our acceptance criterias for this sprint were mostly about seeing the different functions in the right place and getting an idea of how the app would look like. There was practically no code to be tested in this sprint since we focused on the design. In the beginning of the week we showed our mockup to our stakeholder and we will be "testing" the design in our next meeting with her by showing her how it turned out.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

We have decided three different KPIs to be able to monitor our progress and use them in the purpose of improving our process. The following describes the KPIs and how it went for us this week:

- **Effectiveness**: Estimated number of invested work hours VS Actual number of invested hours for each sprint.
  - We as a group make an collectrive estimation in the beginning of each sprint how many work hours we estimate the next sprint will require. (Work hours as in hours spent on the product not the entire course). We divide the estimated hours by the actual hour spent at the end of each sprint and with the help of our table below we rate the result from Good to Bad and note the percentage result. The goal is to be as close as possible to 100%.
  - < 60 %: Bad
  - 60 % - 80 %: OK
  - 80 % - 120 %: Good
  - 120% - 140% : OK
  - > 140%: Bad

- **Quality**: Test coverage. Percentage of the codebase that has tests.
    - With the help of built in functionality we measure what percentage of our code is covered by tests. We mainly measure the java classes as design documents can't be tested in the same way.
    - We do this to make sure to have a consistency in our quality and make sure to don't release any code that might have bugs in it, aswell to make our product owner happy.
- **Productivity**: Total score of points by completed user stories in a certain sprint vs. estimated total score one sprint.
    - Every user story is marked with points from 1 to 5, due to its difficulty and duration.

The three KPIs were decided on the first team reflection in sprint 1. The team didn't decide how much time each user story was about to take or how many points that were estimated. This led to difficulty in using the KPI over effectiveness and productivity. Another problem occurs for the quality KPI. Sprint one hasn't had any java code, so it's impossible to run any test. The KPIs will further be discussed with the supervision on Monday 27/4.

Social contract and effort

So far we have followed our social contract when it comes to our goals set there. As planned we started the sprint on Monday and will end it today, Friday. This is, as earlier mentioned something we will change so that the sprint is a whole week. Therefore the upcoming sprints will end on Mondays. We also had a stand up meeting in the middle of the week, which gave us the chance to check in on each other and helped us make sure everyone got the help they needed. We have shared a google calendar to make sure everyone knows when we have planned meetings. From what we've done this week we consider that we have met our own expectations of the project and we've had an open dialogue throughout the whole week about ideas and decisions we needed to make. We plan to continue working with our social contract in mind by having continuous meetings where we structure our work and discuss our ideas and thoughts.

Regarding pair coding, we worked in pairs of two. When pair coding, one of the members shared their screen and the other guided the first person with help from google to solve questions that appeared, this has been done through zoom. All the code pairs found that this method of working was a good one and that we should continue to work this way in the next sprint as well. We did however find that some improvements could be done. Coding in pairs could be made easier if we could, in the coding environment, in real time see what the other person is doing, rather than only seeing the other person's screen. In order to achieve this we will search for a software that will allow us to do this. If such software exists we will start to use it. However, if there is no such software available for Android Studios, we will continue to work the same way as we did this sprint during the next one and reflect on our work process again.

How the time spent relates to what was delivered is somewhat different between the different pairs which allows us to reflect on different mindsets. Some of the groups did research before meeting their partner in how the user stories could be implemented while others met first and then started researching. The former of the two, i.e. researching before meeting, resulted for one group in that the user story was completed quicker. However, it could also lead to less discussion within the pair that could lead to less thought-through designs. We will in the sprint-planning phase of the next sprint have to discuss which of these two routes to take in order for the team to have a unified work process that everyone agrees is the most beneficial for our project.

Design decisions and product structure

We've decided to not discuss this part for the first sprint. This depends on that we in this sprint aimed to learn how to work in Android Studios, therefore we only designed a provisional solution. We will discuss this further in the process when we will in greater depth plan the structure for the whole project.

Application of scrum

Agile practices have been used this week with a huge impact on our work. At first we structured the project by writing epics, sprints, user stories, tasks and acceptance criterias.

Then we could get an overview of the project and break down the work in small pieces. This made it possible for us to start with the first sprint and choose user stories to work with. Further the agile practices made it possible for us to divide the work within the team and work with different user stories at the same time.

We have elected to have two scrum masters in our team. Since there are eight people and six sprints, we wanted to make sure everyone in our team gets the possibility to try out being a scrum master. As this is a course in agile management, giving everyone a possibility of understanding what a scrum master does and why it is useful felt very natural.

To our understanding having two scrum masters in a team is quite unusual. We will keep this in mind moving forward and evaluate this decision in the weekly team reflections.
This week, as it was our first sprint and it took some time to get started, the role has not been able to function to its full potential. In fact, the only meetings we had where the scrum masters were in charge was the team reflection meeting and the stand up meeting.

We have chosen to have all the team members as product owners in order to create as much value for the customer as possible. Since every member is a product owner, each and every one is able to ask questions and discuss functionality with the customer in mind. In this first sprint, we had a meeting with the customer who gave us feedback on our mockup and general idea for the app. Because everyone was present at the meeting, several different ideas and discussions surfaced which may not have been raised if there for example only had been a single product owner.

Because of the fact that everyone has been appointed product owner we strongly feel that every member is more included in the process of deciding choices which affect the app as well as what creates value for the customer.