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SP2

**Impact map**

*What was good:* All redundant parts have been removed.

*What was bad:* The map has been splitted into two goals, and for both of them it is not stated explicitly how they conform to the SMART criteria. Moreover, possible negative impacts, such as cheating students, are not covered in the map.

*Suggestions for improvement:* Write explicitly how the goal conforms to the SMART criteria and include negative impacts to the map. During development you have to design a system, which not only maximizes positive impact, but also minimizes negative. For instance, student may try to cheat, which impacts negatively on the goal, so during development you should emphasise on preventing students from negative impact. Second example is professor or teaching assistant, who may not want to spend time on using your system, so you should make it as intuitive and automatized as possible.

**INVEST table**

*What was good:* The scales were unified and mixture of numbers and letters in the scale is now substituted by numbers only.

*What was bad:* Nothing.

*Suggestions for improvement:* None.

**Product backlog**

*What was good:* Initially, product backlog lacked a number of user stories. The team did well with creating missed user stories.

*What was bad:* The team did not provide INVEST criteria for new user stories.

*Suggestions for improvement:* Include new user stories estimation to the updated artifact.

**Acceptance criteria**

*What was good:* All criterias are well-detailed

*What was bad:* The user stories do not comply with given-when-then format

*Suggestions for improvement:* Change the format of criterias.

**Definition of done**

*What was good:* Product owner’s opinion was considered: a feature has to be approved by PO. DoD enhances team communication - team members should be aware about changes made.

*What was bad:* In the criteria on unit testing, “where needed” part is quite ambiguous - all features are supposed to be tested. It is quite unclear what is implied by “configuration of changes”. From description it follows that it is not about whether a feature is done, but something regarding sprint backlog. “Implemented” criteria is redundant since not implemented features cannot pass acceptance criteria.

*Suggestions for improvement:* Remove “where needed” and “Implemented” parts. Instead of notifying all team members about changes, it is better to have criteria “Code reviewed by other team members”.

**Did the team miss any questions or overlook any ambiguities?**

* Mostly, all ambiguities and questionable parts have been updated and refined
* Estimations of user stories in the project management tool

**Are there missing stakeholders (actors)?**

* No

**Is the backlog logically consistent and modified to the last Sprint?**

* Yes. All backlog items conform to the sprint goal

**Are there well-formatted columns and items in project management board?**

* Yes. All product backlog and sprint backlog items are properly placed in the management tool

**Are there reflection materials about the last Sprint?**

* Yes. The team provided thorough report where they described received feedback, what they learnt from it and what changes to the deliverables they made

**How provided increment of the product (based on demo) correlated with planned user stories to implement in the Sprint? What was wrong/nice?**

During sprint review, the team did not provide us with their sprint backlog and sprint goal, which is definitely a weak side of the presentation.

Sprint goal was to prepare back end and set up development environment. The team managed to reach the goal.