

IGME 601 - Postmortem

Team A

Haoyu Guo

Jeff Bauer

Ollyting Xin

Yiyan Wang

Zheyu Zhang

- Overall
 1. What went well?
 - a. Have meetings before defining user stories.
 - b. Distribution of tasks
 - c. Substantial discussion online which supplement the short time of the offline meeting
 - d. Generally familiar with using Git and its features like branching and pull request for code review
 2. What would you do more/less of?
 - a. More regular updates on the task management tool
 - b. More playtest
 - c. More thoroughly review
 3. What would you change entirely?
 - a. The tool of task management
 - b. Make the impediments optional
 4. What would you add?
 - a. Physical stand up meeting
 - b. Detail architecture design
 - c. Each merge should have at least 2 approvals
 - d. Git branches management

- Task management
 - What went well?
 - We have meetings before defining most of the user stories so that we can make each one in our team on the same page of what we are going to do next.
 - We keep tracking of how our tasks going on by online discussions.
 - What would you do more/less of?
 - We should do more regular updates in the task management tools.
 - We should do more thoroughly code review.
 - We should have more playtests, especially after we finished a new feature so that we can make adjustment according to the useful feedbacks.
 - What would you change entirely?
 - We should turn to use another task management tool which everyone in our team can get used to it.
 - The impediment part in the regular updates should be optional, which means through the impediment is important, it's unnecessary when some periods of the development doesn't encounter with any impediments.
 - What would you add?
 - We should add a common rule for merging the branches on Github. For example, each merge should get at least two approvals before it is merged into the master so that we can check the pull request more careful and therefore keep our codes safe.
- Team communications (meetings, Slack, etc.)
 - What went well?

- We distributed our tasks at the end of each meeting so that every one of us knows what to do after the meeting.
 - What would you do more/less of?
 - We should do more physical stand-up meetings.
 - What would you change entirely?
 - None
 - What would you add?
 - None
- Version control
 - What went well?
 - We generally familiar with using Git and its features like branching and pull request for code review.
 - What would you do more/less of?
 - More review on the pull request
 - What would you change entirely?
 - We have to change the way that we manage our Git branches.
 - What would you add?
 - In order to find a better way to manage Git branches, we have to define a common rule in our team for the project about whether or not delete a branch in some situations.
- Documentation (conceptual and technical)
 - What went well?
 - We have our key features written in the design document with a well-organized manner.
 - What would you do more/less of?
 - We should do more updates in the design document so that we can keep it up-to-date and clear enough to every teammate.
 - What would you change entirely?

None

- What would you add?
 - We would like to add a much more detailed architecture design which can be helpful for each programmer to understand others scripts.
- Team organization and roles
 - What went well?
 - The self-motivated team
 - Finish tasks on time.
 - What would you do more/less of?
 - More communication
 - What would you change entirely?

None
 - What would you add?
 - sub-Meeting for a specific issue