IFB299: SPRINT 2 RETROSPECTIVE

SCRUMPtious (Team 72)

TEAM

Douglas Kumar: SCRUM Master
Calum Oke: Developer
Will Atkinson: Developer
Simon Scott: Developer
Ruka To: Client

Tutor
Jesse St Germain

Team Communication:

As with the first sprint, we continued team communication over two platforms; Discord and Facebook. Additionally, we started to incorporate the plans from the last sprint retrospective that included utilizing a working document to keep track of which team member was completing which tasks. This allowed for a smoother transition from current tasks to future tasks as the available tasks were easily identified.

The main issue with communication in sprint two was the lack communication in advance to inform other team members of their own upcoming events that would coincide with team meetings. Team members, in this case, were often informed an hour or two before the meeting began. This was possibly due to the fact the team became more comfortable with each other. This was not such a large issue as outside of team meetings the group worked effectively individually.

In the future, a more flexible team meeting schedule may be more constructive for our team. This means having multiple shorter meetings to discuss problems that have occurred during development and to discuss the timeline of the current tasks.

Team Participation:

Starting from day 1 of sprint 2, the team's participation levels were much stronger and higher, compared to the initialisation of sprint 1. This may have been due to the motivation of successfully finishing all the user stories specified in sprint 1, and wanting to finish the project sooner than later. Every team member attended all tutorials in the sprint 2 timeframe, with only one late attendance recorded, which is a major improvement from the first sprint where there were regular late attendances and a few absences. The team maintained high levels of involvement with the tutor and client, to fulfil weekly goals and check that the team was meeting the requirements and keeping up to date. The team recorded all feedback and tried to improve the project based on it.

However, during the mid-semester break, the team's participation levels fell and lacked in communication. This was due to other commitments during the holiday that required members of the team to be geographically separated and focusing on other commitments. Two members of the team also had lower participation levels in testing, as they lacked effort in improving their testing skills. The team accepted full responsibility for this and improved upon it after the mid-semester break.

For future applications, the team could organise around upcoming events that would interfere with project development. Some suggestions include:

- Scheduling online meetings for when everyone is free (e.g. Discord at certain times)
- Set certain project goals to be due earlier, so the project development won't fall behind time-wise
- Break up project tasks into smaller and more consistent components. That way, if a team member is absent, another member can take it and not require too much extra time
- Plan more consistent physical meetings while the team members are all available, to prevent complications developing further if a team member is absent

These methods should prevent project complications arising, and make it easy to recover if any such cases of participation levels falling occur.

Team Efforts and Quality of Project:

Improving on the first sprint, as a team, we assigned each of the members individual tasks that we decided we wanted to work on in the very early stages of the sprint. This meant that our stories would be either well into development or completed before the due timeframe of our second sprint and first release date. This gave us the necessary time leverage to configure important story-related aspects of our project, which includes various manual and regression testing, boundary cases of code logic and website look and feel.

This time around in terms of what we didn't do well, one minor aspect would be the quantity of physical or online team meetings. While this wasn't as important of an issue as we worked both independently and cohesively on our assigned stories, we made sure that if there were issues about the work we were doing we kept up to date with each other frequently in an online group chat.

For future sprints and releases, we will endeavour to maintain our velocity and proceed with the stories that we assign ourselves to expand our project to greater heights. We are pleased with the quality and standard that we have achieved as a group, and the project is a demonstration of the capability and work ethic that we have moulded as a team over the course of the release, and continue to expand and create a product that's appealing and interesting to new and current users.

Informative to Client and Tutor:

The communication between the client and the team has been very active, through group messenger, meetings, and workshops. The client was aware of the progress and everyone's artefacts most of the time, and sorting out the artefacts was not an issue. Each team member reported promptly when progress was made, so the rest and the client could test it on the project regularly. This resulted in early discovery of any errors and potential improvements and enabled the next step to be taken earlier. The communication between client and tutor has been strong in sprint2 as well. There were many things and details to make sure of with the tutor, so the client has communicated with the tutor through many ways effectively, through email, inside and outside the workshop.

The burndown chart has been updated by the scrum master and checked regularly by the team to acknowledge the overall progress. This helped to prevent the work progress to be overly behind and kept it consistent most of the time. The client consistently saw the team working together and joined the conversation regularly, to see if there was any problem that needed to be checked with the tutor.

Issues Raised and Handled:

As a team, we started to reach our peak performance and morale during the second sprint and no issues were raised at all. All members exhibited high levels of dedication to the sprint goals and actively supported their colleagues with any technical problems they had. By this time all colleagues knew each other well and were all very familiar with the ways and manners of one another, which helped the team to achieve very thorough, fluid understanding and cohesion. Communication of progress was kept very consistent through digital means, which benefited the team greatly as more time was spent working remotely on individual tasks during this sprint.

The team appeared to reach the highest level of efficiency when working together in the same location, however, these face-to-face sessions did not happen as often as what was perhaps desired. This was understandable, as all members had other commitments to manage (throughout both sprints). It appeared that a greater volume of communication within the group decreased the

likelihood that issues would arise, but the richest and most effortless communication occurred during the in-person sessions.

While no issues were evident during the sprint, a suggestion to improve the team cohesion and efficiency in the future is to hold more regular face-to-face meetings, time permitting. By doing this, a greater total time is spent with the skills and energy of all team members available to tackle issues and obstacles, whether they pertain to group dynamics or technical aspects of the project.