Team Reflection Week 4

Group 16

Thomas Jinton	jintont
Jennifer Krogh	kroghj
Ludvig Lindell	ludlinde
Jesper Lundgren	jeslundg
Johan Nilsson	nilssojo
Emma Pettersson	emmp
Antonia Welzel	welzel

Contents

1   Customer Value and Scope

1.1   Acceptance Tests

We've decided to do acceptance tests for our tasks. This week and the weeks before. The group has noticed that it is sometimes unclear on what's suppose to be done with a task and when they are finished. To make it clear what is expected on a task, we are going to make a small check-list for each task, so the one doing the task knows when they have finished it.

1.2   Key Performance Indication

1.2.1   How many points, out of the week's velocity, did we achieve in relation to our week's target?

Our target this week was 35 hours, due to re-exams and first of May being a red day.

The number of points we completed this week was 31, but some tasks were severely underestimated and took longer. On the other hand, other tasks were overestimated and were done very fast.

1.2.2   Have we been able to improve problems we identified the week before during the sprint review? (1 - 10, where 10 is major improvement, 5 relatively unchanged, 1 is a lot worse than before)

Problems identified last week:

- Better and more clear task breakdown

- Code needs more comments

Voter Name	Vote
Thomas Jinton	7
Jennifer Krogh	7
Ludvig Lindell	7
Jesper Lundgren	6
Johan Nilsson	6
Emma Pettersson	6
Antonia Welzel	5
Average	6.3

We did not succeed as well as wished when it comes to better and more clear task breakdown. So we will focus more on that during the next sprint planning. The code commenting got better, but it is still not up to our goal.

1.2.3   How satisfied, on a scale of 1 to 10, is each team member with this week's sprint? Where 10 is very happy and 1 is very unhappy

Voter Name	Vote
Thomas Jinton	7
Jennifer Krogh	8
Ludvig Lindell	7
Jesper Lundgren	7
Johan Nilsson	7
Emma Pettersson	8
Antonia Welzel	7
Average	7.3

What people were not as happy about this week, was the lack of focus during meetings, which caused them run relatively long.

We agreed on taking more regular breaks, as well as setting a time limit for meetings, so that the effort during the set aside time increases. Furthermore, we think that the Scrum Master has to take more charge during the meeting and be prepared for what the group has to discuss during the meeting.

A cause for these issues could also be because of having to study at home and not being able to really see each other and communicate properly.

2   Social Contract and Effort

2.1   Social Contract

We updated our social contract by stating our expectations more clearly. Specifically, that we all want to focus in this course on learning about agile project management and how to make use of it effectively in future projects. We also discussed other points in the contracts, like tools and processes, but did not change or add anything.

In addition, we want more time spent on reflecting what went good during the sprint and that we discuss it together with the group so that everyone can share their opinions. By doing this, we can all learn new things and also help each other understand our working process. Our collaboration and team work can benefit from this as well.

2.2   Time Spent

We have a KPI regarding the estimates and velocity, to show a more concrete value on what we have done during the sprint. We accomplished quite a lot given the time we had and spent. Some of us spent more time than what was planned (5h each, due to the First of May), while other spent less. This is mostly due to bad estimations on tasks, but also since we had fun while working on the tasks and wanted to complete them.

Team Member	Time Spent
Thomas Jinton	4
Jennifer Krogh	1
Ludvig Lindell	7.5
Jesper Lundgren	7.5
Johan Nilsson	8
Emma Pettersson	7
Antonia Welzel	4
Total	39

We had 34 points (equal to hours for now) allocated for this sprint, but it took around 39 hours to complete all the tasks.

3   Design decisions and product structure

3.1   Design Decisions and Customer Value

This week, most of team focused on making visual design decisions to be implemented in the coming weeks. However, there is still a user story for improving the visual aspects of the website, which will have a more in-depth discussion in the future.

Part of the team also started implementing a server. The server should processes and stores information about the queue times. It should also retrieve and respond to the queue data that is sent from the website. This promotes customer value because it allows for multiple voters to vote on the queue.

3.2   Code Quality and Standards

To improve coding standards we will make sure to think about the importance of comments for every major code section. To explain what a certain code function does is good for the people in the group who have not been working with that part. To ensure that the code has comments the people who work on a certain tasks will add comments to their code after they have finished.

4   Application of Scrum

4.1   Agile Practices

4.1.1   Definition of Done

We have been working closely with improving our definition of done criteria compared to last week. That resulted in more well defined tasks and the team got a better understanding of what was expected. However there is still room improvement in the upcoming weeks.

4.2   Sprint Review

We are all product owners in this course, so we all review together what the whole team has been working on during the sprint with demos. We find them all to be very helpful and effective in getting the whole group up to speed on what is happening. However before this sprint, we had not actually specified any concrete DoD criteria. We had not yet taken them that much into consideration when working. We had also not fulfilled all of them at this week's sprint review, like merging into the master branch and writing lists for tests.

After the sprint review, we all feel that we currently have a good priority of our user stories.