**IFB299 Sprint 1 Retrospective**

**Team Number 4**

**Perfectly Unbalanced**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Student Number** | **Team Member Name** |
| n9907971 | Matthew Blundell |
| n10090932 | Luke Daniels |
| n10088733 | Jacob Coorey |
| n9880151 | Mohamed Osman |
| n10090045 | Thomas Walker |
|  |  |
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|  |
| --- |
| **What you did well? (Continue)**  The team communication through Sprint One was excellent in terms of task delegation and identification of tasks that were not originally scoped in the sprint planning. This has proven crucial in the agile adjustment of resources to achieve a working product at the end of the first sprint.  As team members, individual work was completed effectively. All members contributed to development tasks such that a clean, workable product could be delivered to the client after Sprint One.  During the weekly meetings conducted, the team was effective in reallocating User Stories from the backlog to produce a more effectively formed product after the first sprint. This showed the team’s ability to remain agile during the development of the product, managing resources in an effective manner.  The team was professional in production of highly robust and readable code, that when grouped together, was easily amalgamated into a workable product. This efficiency in programming reduced the amount of time that was required on the implementation, allowing us more time to plan out the development of the UI and plan the interconnectivity of each functionality.  **What you did not do well? (Stop)**  In assessment of Sprint One, the team has identified that the Acceptance Criteria defined for the features of the Product Backlog were not fleshed out to an acceptable standard. This has shown us that the specifications have not been identified through discussion with the Product Owner. This in turn has hindered our ability to meet the client’s needs in an effective manner.  This lack of understanding is also evident in the User Stories, which did not uniquely define each individual functionality correctly. This inability to understand the prospective end user’s use cases meant that there were gaps in taskings, which then flowed on to the product.  The members of the team did not clearly define and enforce their role responsibilities during the first sprint. The biggest factor impacting the outcome of the first sprint was the lack of Scrum Master influence. There was no servant leadership provided through a Scrum Master role which hindered the optimization of the working environment.  There was a failure to build shared accountability on taskings throughout the sprint. The culture was more focused on individual achievements rather than collaborating and building shared ownership, which would have provided avenues of assistance for members who required further assistance on tasks.  **What will you do differently next time to improve the performance of the team? (Initiate)** |

The team will need to realign our resources with the Scrum methodology. We will do this by redefining the primary roles of members in the team to increase broader coverage of the project. This redefinition will assist us in rescoping the task requirements, which will in turn reduce the possibility of identifying taskings that were not developed during the sprint planning stage.

Alongside the redefinition of roles, the team will aim to develop concise acceptance criteria that can be realistically implemented post-development of features. As explained above, the Product Owner has specified their needs, and this has not been interpreted correctly. Since Scrum provides constant communication between all parties, this can be rectified through the sprint review and retrospective stage.