

# Retrospective Poster

Team I

COMP 354: Introduction to Software Engineering

Purpose

► Team motivation

▷ See how everyone enjoyed their roles in iteration 1, and if they would prefer different roles for iteration 2

▷ Understand everyone’s expectation for iteration 2

▷ Share insight into what everyone has learned from each other

► Team strengths and weaknesses

▷ Understand how everyone thought we worked together

▷ What did we do well that we should continue for iteration 2?

▷ What didn’t we do well that should be improved for iteration 2?

► Evaluation of tools used

▷ Tools/techniques that worked

▷ Tools/techniques that did not work

▷ Possible future tools that should be used that might help with collaboration/organization

Methodology

► To conduct the retrospective, everyone was individually asked the questions below.

1. What are your expectations of the team for the project? Have they changed since the first delivery?

2. What are your weaknesses and/or tasks that make you uncomfortable?

3. Do you want more tasks to help you overcome them or would you prefer to have tasks corresponding to your strengths?

4. What are some things we need to improve for our team dynamic?

5. What was your most frustrating experience in this project?

6. Describe an instance that another team member has inspired you. What did you learn?

7. Did you enjoy your role in Iteration 1? Why or Why not?

8. Would you like to contribute differently (i.e. different role, more/less programming, more/less writing) in this iteration, and if so how?

9. If you needed to redo iteration 1 would there be anything you would do differently?

► After everyone individually answered the questions, we discussed the results as a team, so that everyone within the team was aware of each other’s responses and suggestions.

General Findings

► Overall, the majority of people’s expectations for iteration 1 were met.

► The team felt as if the majority of people were adhering to deadlines

► People were good at communicating and responding, allowing for the difficulties with not meeting face-to-face being minimized.

► Individuals felt as if people were always willing to help when someone was unsure how to do something.

► Some people were initially intimidated by certain technologies that team members were using but realized that many of the team members were happy to help if questions were asked.

► Some individuals felt as if communication could be improved. For example, if someone cannot attend a meeting, that the team should be informed. Sometimes this was not the case and the meeting attendees were only discovered during the meeting itself.

► Most people agreed that it was a bit rushed in the last days, and that although we were proactive, we should try to find ways to avoid this.

Iteration 2 Roles

► Everyone seemed happy with the role they undertook during iteration 1.

► For iteration 2, some team members wanted to keep their role, while others wanted to try different roles.

► Based off this feedback, we determined the best roles for everyone for iteration 2.

Iteration 2 tool suggestions

► Kanban board

▷ This would enable us to have better visibility on what everyone is working on.

▷ If the team is aware on what everyone is working on, other team members might also be able to help.

► Automation Testing

▷ This would enable us to conduct more thorough testing.

## Conclusion

- The retrospective enabled our team to understand how everyone felt we did during iteration 1, and allowed us to come up with suggestions on how we can improve for iteration 2
- Some areas of communication we thought could be improved were mentioned, though overall the team thought that we worked well.
- In order to minimize the last-minute stress that was encountered during iteration 1, the technical writing portion should be started earlier