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**Sprint Status Update**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Team name** | **Team members** | **Sprint #** |
| GLA-diator Guardians | Gian Austria; Aireen Maddela; Larilyn Taule | 1 |
| Summary of activities | | |
| During Sprint 1, the team focused on laying the groundwork for the SecureSuite platform. Key activities included:   * Creating a flowchart to guide coding efforts. * Planning and streamlining the development process. * Gathering information to integrate individual tools (Email Analyzer, File Integrity Checker, Website Checker) into a cohesive SaaS platform. * Researching and selecting Django as the framework and Azure as the web server. * Setting up a GitHub repository for version control. * Updating Trello for backlog management. * Documenting all created components. * Converting the previous term’s Python project into a web-based SaaS application. | | |
| What we learned | | |
| * Effective Communication: The team improved communication practices, ensuring clarity and alignment. * Timely Execution: Emphasized the importance of meeting deadlines. * Technology Adoption: Gained proficiency in Azure, GitHub, and Django, with Aireen and Love learning these tools for the first time. | | |
| What was delivered | | |
| **Planned Deliverables:**   * Flowchart for coding guidance. * Streamlined development process for SecureSuite. * Integration plan for individual tools. * Framework and technology selection (Django, Azure). * Reliable cloud hosting setup. * Project timeline with milestones. * Facilitated team communication and tool integration.   **Actual Deliverables:**  All planned deliverables were met, including:   * Flowchart creation. * Development process planning. * Tool integration into a cohesive SaaS platform. * Django framework and Azure web server implementation. * GitHub repository setup. * Trello backlog updates. * Comprehensive documentation. * Successful conversion of the Python project to a web-based SaaS application. | | |
| What were the impediments we faced | | |
| * External Workload: Labs from other subjects consumed time, slowing progress. * Web Server Selection: Challenges in finding a suitable web server beyond localhost, resolved by adopting Azure. | | |
| What went well | | |
| * Execution: All tasks were completed without issues. * Communication: Team collaboration was seamless, with effective use of tools like Trello and GitHub. * Technology Implementation: Successful adoption of Django, Azure, and GitHub, with smooth integration of tools into the SecureSuite platform. | | |
| What can we improve in the next sprint | | |
| * Database Enhancements: Focus on improving the database design and performance. * System Testing: Increase emphasis on thorough testing to ensure reliability and functionality. * Time Management: Better balance external academic commitments to maintain sprint momentum. * System Function and Design: Making sure the web application is working well and the design of the web application is on standard. | | |

## Marking Criteria

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| Status Update | The team completed status update per instructions, incorporating all relevant adjustments from previous sprint.  (20 p.) | The team completed status update per instructions, incorporating some relevant adjustments from previous sprint.  (16 p.) | The team completed status update per instructions, but did not incorporate any adjustments from previous sprint.  (13 p.) | The team completed status update, but instructions were not followed.  (10 p.) | The team did not complete status update.  (0 p.) |
| Documentation Update (Project management plan, backlog, etc.) | The team updated all the necessary documentation, considering all relevant feedback from stakeholders and peers. Each team member was able to account for 25 hours of effort  (10 p.) | The team updated all the necessary documentation, considering some relevant feedback from stakeholders and peers. Each team member was able to account for 25 hours of effort  (8 p.) | The team updated some of the documentation, considering relevant feedback from stakeholders and peers. Most team members were able to account for 25 hours of effort  (6 p.) | The team updated some of the documentation, but the feedback from stakeholders and peers was not considered. Most team members were not able to account for 25 hours of effort  (5 p.) | The team did not update the documentation to reflect changes in the project.  (0 p.) |
| Score (out of ) | | | | / 30 | |

**This is a group mark used to assess team’s ability to consider the feedback from stakeholders and peers, and learn from the past sprints to improve the project. The rubric will be filled out at the end of each sprint, adding the points towards a potential total of 90 marks.**