Sprint Retrospective: GotoGro-MRM

Team Details

Team Name:	MSP 14
Tutorial:	Tue 2:30 ATC325
Tutor:	Dr Kaberi Naznin

Members:	
Dylan Jarvis	102093138
Rabya Tayal	103144215
Simon Tran	103602807
Thomas Babicka	103059885
Cody Cronin-Sporys	103610020
Nicholas Dyt	101624265

Team Progress Discussion

Our working velocity according to the burndown chart showed that we were ahead in the first half of the sprint. This was because the first items in Sprint 2 were mainly feedback items from Sprint 1 and easy to implement.

By day 5 of the sprint, we were on track with the ideal burndown line, right in time for the period of lower work. According to the ideal burndown, there was time allocated for a break in the middle, which worked out well given the increasing pressure of other subjects on our work rate. Due the speed and number of items completed in Sprint 1 this Sprint had much fewer tasks, which again was beneficial in the last weeks of semester.

We had a reduced work rate across days 6, 7, 8 but were still well on track to finish everything by day 9. Day 10 was purely bug fixing, with the most time spent on implementing 100 item and member records into the table so that the reports would look good.

Different to Sprint 1, the tasks for sprint 2, while fewer, were less well defined. This was probably a product of less time spent on the planning component relative to sprint 1 and the fact that the items were not as atomic as they could have been – more than 1 task was required for each part. This was not a problem though as the vision was clear in terms of what needed to come together, UI, buttons and scripting for reports.

The only improvements were should have made was probably a clearer breakdown of exactly what tasks needed to be completed which would allow us to make better time estimates and enhance our burndown work rate.

Same as sprint 1, the team had a fluctuating work rate, but such is the nature of doing multiple subjects at the same time. On certain days team members had to do more than 2 hours of work to compensate for missed days. In the end though, the tasks were completed by the deadline and total time was achieved so it was not really an issue.

Team Process Discussion

Like sprint 1, our work process consisted of breaking every parallel task between the members with a target date by which they have to be completed in order to enable the next phases of tasks which may have to be complete in series.

Here we didn't need to be as strict with it as multiple components were able to be done at the same time. The UI for the reporting system was already in place with rudimentary code for generating something so each team member was more or less able to take on a task and start working immediately.

We decided to basically work in pairs, where one team member would be responsible for the testing of the feature while the other had the reins on implementing the improvements. This was beneficial as it fit well with having relatively few backlog items and traded quantity of work for quality.

Overall the process was successful and the product came out functional with no visible bugs.