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Retrospective

The objectives for Blink 192 include to: work successfully as a team and capture a sense of shared purpose, support every member’s ideas throughout the project and generate a sense of trust and confidence between members, share tasks equally, and complete work to a high level.

# Objective 1: Work successfully as a team and capture a sense of shared purpose

## What you did well?

Overall, the team worked reasonably well throughout Sprint 2. The project was performed by following the Scrum methodology. “Scrum is an agile way to manage a project, usually software development... The Scrum model suggests that projects progress via a series of sprints. In keeping with an agile methodology, sprints are timeboxed…” (Mountain Goat Software, 2018). In this task. The group regularly conducted Scrum meetings which were recorded using Google Docs. The Scrum document includes: the details of the meeting (time and date), the Scrum master, absent members, the items discussed, what was completed during the meeting, any pending questions for the workshop, and what was to be completed by which team member. This document laid out the expectations of each group member in a clear format that enabled the team to have a clear understanding of what had been completed and what needed to be completed for each sprint. This provided each team member with a sense of purpose. Submitting the final product (the Release Plan) was rewarding for all team members. This enabled the group to collaborate effectively and submit the Final Release Plan for the Car Rental Company (CRC)

## What you did not do well?

After the submission of the first sprint, a group member’s work commitments increased and because of this they were unable to attend meetings and workshops for the rest of the semester. Although this was a set back for the group, communication channels remained open and the development environment had been established. There was ample opportunity for all members to remain engaged in the project, however unfortunately, these opportunities were not utilised.

At the time of submission for the Final Release, only one group member had a working development environment. Two developers initially had their environment operating, one had significant system issues and could not establish the environment, one did not require the environment, and the other did not attempt to establish the environment. Members of the group attended STIMulate (a student support service offered at QUT), however the system issues were unable to be resolved. This greatly affected the group to work effectively and efficiently on the project as the majority of code had to be written in a static environment and was not testable until it was committed to Github and pulled by the developer with the working environment. Although the situation was not ideal, the team worked extremely well to attempt to complete user stories and test them in a working environment.

Unfortunately, due to the issues encountered establishing the development environments, the group was unable to complete the majority of tasks in Sprint 1. By the end of Sprint 2, there were only 9 tasks remaining, as opposed to the original 23 at the beginning of Sprint 2.

The group’s commitment to learning Django was extremely lacking. One developer became solely responsible for the implementation of code in Django. Although this was mainly due to the development environment being inoperable by the majority of the group, greater individual understanding of Django would have made implementing various pieces of code much simpler.

## What will you do differently next time to improve the performance of the team?

In future, development environments will be established in a SCRUM meeting to ensure that all team members are able to create a working environment. Individual knowledge of the stack will need to be increased in order for the team to operate with greater efficiency and implement code effectively. SCRUM meetings and team planning standards will be upheld, as these methods work well for the group.

# Objective 2: Support team members throughout the project and generate a sense of trust and confidence between members

## What you did well?

Communication between team members remained constant. The group connected via Facebook Messenger to clarify tasks from the scrum meeting, propose changes, provide feedback or receive help from other group members. Each group member dedicated time to assisting with tasks that were not specifically delegated to them. This supported members who were having difficulties with specific tasks which enabled the group to perform to a high standard and deliver all tasks assigned to individuals on time. The team also met regularly outside of the workshop. The group began meeting early in the semester and established a sense of trust. The group was confident that all members were capable of completing tasks to a high standard. This level of communication and support will continue in future projects.

## What you did not do well?

As identified in the Sprint 1 Retrospective, there were issues with individuals completing tasks on time. The team came to understand that, given team members’ unfamiliarity with Django, that some tasks will take longer than expected as issues will need to be troubleshooted in the development environment. The team’s understanding of this was excellent, however, more reasonable expectations could have been set by the team and the individuals completing the tasks, by communicating more effectively with the group.

Another difficulty that arose is that there is a clear difference between the capabilities of IS students as compared to CS students. Our group maintain the view that IS students were less capable of completing certain elements of the task and required much more support than CS students. This placed an unnecessary burden on CS students. At times, CS students may have felt unconfident in the abilities of IS students.

## What will you do differently next time?

In future, the group and individuals will communicate to establish more realistic expectations of tasks to ensure that all group members are comfortable with the given time limits and feel that the task can be completed in the specified time. IS students will be encouraged to attend STIMulate for additional IT support. These initiatives will be implemented to improve the performance of the team.

# Objective 3: Share tasks equally

## What you did well?

All tasks were delegated fairly equally across team members. IS and CS students worked together on various aspects of the project (e.g. creating models/diagrams, working on software engineering components such as code, testing, prototyping and databasing) in a positive and professional manner. This will continue in future releases.

## What you did not do well?

Understandably, group members have personal and work commitments outside of university. However, it is still necessary for members to attend meetings and communicate effectively in order for the project to progress efficiently. Unfortunately, the majority of the team missed an occasional meeting due to other commitments. This has hindered the development of the project as some of the meetings missed were imperative to the development of the application.

The group also overestimated how much work could be completed in Sprint 1. The issues that the group encountered were relative to the establishment of the development environment on each user’s computer. The actual work needed to be completed could have been finished in the time stipulated, however, as the group had not worked with this web framework before, setup and implementation became the most onerous process and inhibited the commencement of development.

Although tasks were delegated equally, they were not completed equally, and other group members had to fill this gap. There were various instances where a group member was asked to complete a task, but only submitted a rough draft that had to be edited by another group member. This caused disruption to the team environment. The team did not address this issue early in the project.

## What will you do differently next time?

Next time, the team will address when a task has not been completed. Likewise, group members will be encouraged to raise any concerns when they believe a group member is taking on too much work. The group will continue to adjust the estimations and team velocity to accurately reflect the time required to complete tasks. To improve the operation and performance of the team, a meeting will be conducted to ensure that all development environments are operable and connected to local databases. Team members will be informed that any future meeting attendance breaches will be communicated to the group’s tutor and the issue will be escalated.

# Objective 4: Complete work to a high level

## What you did well?

Throughout the course of the project, many activities were completed well. The team received a grade of 21.2/25 for Sprint 1. Overall the feedback was highly positive. The team correctly applied the principles of INVEST and each story was a clear expression of a single idea. The stories represented a range of features that had a balance of moderate to challenging business value. The stories had acceptance criteria that provided a clear understanding of the client’s goals and a clear boundary of scope. The acceptance criteria can be implemented as tests. The Release Plan had a well-established backlog and the client can understand the schedule when features will be delivered. The Sprint Plan contained almost no dependencies. The group clearly has a high understanding of the task and will maintain the current work ethic for future releases.

## What you did not do well?

The team did not correctly prioritise all user stories according to the MoSCoW technique. Also, the team did not address this issue early enough after receiving this feedback. What was also not performed well was determining what artefacts to submit as part of the individual portfolio. A Google Doc was created to display the artefact list for each group member. Throughout the course of the assignment, many Google Docs were created which made it difficult to easily locate a document. Initially, the group believed the artefacts were also to be submitted as part of the Final Sprint. The group also believed that most artefacts were to be shared amongst the team. A FAQ’s document and Advice document were posted to Blackboard in the lead up to the submission for the individual portfolio. This stated that ‘shared artefacts are limited to 2 people and limit shared artefacts to 2-3’. The artefacts in the Advice document were more difficult and required much more work than initially expected. This caused distress to group members as we were left with three days to update our artefacts.

Unfortunately, due to the development environment issues, the group determined that the work submitted for the final release was adequate, by their standards. Had the development environment issues not occurred, a more refined minimum viable product could have been produced and given the client, CRC, a better user experience and understanding of what had been developed.

Some group members were unfamiliar or unsure of the content covered in lectures which made it difficult to understand task requirements. Another difficulty was that IS students had very limited non-discipline related skills (e.g. software engineering and CAB subject experience). Even though Information System (IS) students have completed IFB130 and IFB104, they found it difficult to retain knowledge from that course and implement it into the sprints. Overall it was unrealistic to expect IS students to deliver professional and high standard code without the assistance of CS students in a framework that neither of the majors had any exposure to in their course.

## What will you do differently next time?

Next time, the group will ensure that any issues (e.g. MoSCoW prioritisation) are addressed as soon as identified. The group will also gain a clearer understanding of a task before attempting to complete it by confirming the requirements of the task with the tutor during workshops and externally via email. The group will also better organise the IFB299 folder in Google Drive to make it easier to access documents.

When difficulties arise (e.g. for IS students to complete non-discipline related work), it is recommended that the student attend STIMulate to access assistance to be able to complete a task. All group members will be encouraged to watch and discuss the lectures to be able to fully understand the task requirements and plan for the Final Sprint. These initiatives will improve the performance off the team in the Final Sprint. Overall, the group worked very well together.
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