Group 6 Sprint Retrospective

**What went well**

1. The team has been working very well together. We have not had any serious disagreements and whenever they have cropped up, we have been able to get everyone on the same page quickly and effortlessly.
2. The team has kept a good attitude towards the project, all members attending meetings are always enthusiastic about the work and ready to go.
3. As a team we have managed to keep a good focus on our priorities, not letting ourselves become overwhelmed by the size of the overall project.
   1. This can be attributed to the design of the agile methodology, though this was executed well by team members
4. We as a group effectively split into smaller teams to focus on specializing, using our more dominant skills to drive progress and get tasks completed.
   1. Within this, peer coding was very successful allowing for fast problem solving and rapid deployment of solutions.

**What didn’t go well**

1. *Although we have been having daily scrum meetings, they have quite unstructured which has led to some discrepancies in our collective understanding of what we are trying to achieve for this project.*
   1. This could be improved by making better user of the tasks/stories we have created on GitHub. Instead of just letting each person in the group talk about what they have been doing, the Scrum Master could share their screen and work through each of the stories being worked on and directly ask the person assigned to it how their progress has been.
   2. Adding a ‘Definition of Done’ to user stories will help to clear up any uncertainties
2. *Our product and Sprint backlogs only contained user stories so any tasks that couldn’t be turned into stories e.g., small technicalities, bug fixes etc. were not included. As such, the velocity of the team (as inferred from the sprint backlog) did not always accurately reflect the work being done by the team.*
   1. Be more fastidious with adding minor details to the sprint/product backlogs both before and during the process of completing a task.
3. *Setting up Azure to host the website took far longer than expected, resulting in a large amount of lost time to work on other aspects of the project.*
   1. Problems with Azure have since been overcome, so there aren’t any direct lessons to be learned here. However, we should be more cautious when estimating how long some tasks will take to finish
4. *Our Sprint review was essentially improvised*
   1. One reason for this is that, as mentioned in point 3, there were some technical setbacks earlier on in the week that meant we had less time than we had hoped for. Unsure of whether to prioritise finishing features we had promised or prepare a good presentation of an unfinished product, we opted for the former.
   2. Another, and perhaps more significant, reason is that none of us in the team were sure what format the sprint review would take – this could have been easily rectified by reading the marking scheme properly
   3. We should create a slideshow to guide ourselves and the client through the presentation
   4. For the next sprint review, we should form a more robust plan for who will be presenting certain features and in what order they will be presented in.