**IFB299 Sprint 1 Retrospective:**

**Team 44 - 5G1C Developers**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Team Member Name | Student Number |
| Harrison Perkins | n9751670 |
| Jahred Mauricio | n9740805 |
| Liam Luhrs | n9744932 |
| Noel Martinez | n10076654 |
| Wen Yang | n9345710 |

What We Did Well:

1. Overall our team’s main positive point was our communication. Mainly through a Facebook group chat, our team is always in constant communication discussing the project, tutorial and meeting attendance. The group is confident and comfortable in the chat to voice their own ideas and the team is always ready to offer constructive criticism.
2. Individual Contribution to the team was of good standard and produced quality material to help with the development of the website. When the team actually committed and tried to get work done the standard was high and the goals were completed in good time.
3. The team had a friendly and welcoming environment which allowed members to comfortably voice their own ideas and provide constructive criticism of each’s work.
4. The team had a positive dynamic in which team members gained trust and confidence between each other during the Sprint 1 phase.

What We Did Not Do Well:

1. As a team, our overall time management skills were lacking in consistency and our approach to completing tasks was rushed and improvised. The team did not set up a proper schedule and follow it to complete the goals.This often lead to tasks being completed in a shorter time then they required, which caused many of them to have diminished quality.
2. The second least well done point was the teams consistency with the project documentation and the weekly updates such as the burn down chart. The team often forgot to complete their weekly updates and mainly completed them at the end from memory. The overall quality of the teams documentation such as the sprint and release plan were also rushed and was lacking in some areas (time and story point estimates). This was simply due to lack of proactive work on the documentation and not prioritising the weekly updates.
3. Tied in with our teams lack of time management was our failure to schedule meetings outside the registered tutorial time. Team meetings outside the tutorial were infrequent and were mostly centered close to or prior to an assessment due date. This once again contributed to the lack of time management and the rushing of work.
4. While we had team members present per tutorial, the consistency of how many members were present per tutorial greatly inhibited progress of work due to key figures not being available for commentary and idea sharing.

What We Will Do Differently Next Time To Improve Team Performance:

1. Our team’s main complication was our ability to manage our time effectively. To improve our performance in further sprints we need to efficiently plan what our team needs to accomplished, how long it will take to accomplish and how much time we actually have to accomplish said goal. Improving our time management and coordination will make our team much more effective in completing our set tasks to a high quality.
2. The team will explore the JIRA software to plan, track and manage our project and help with issue and bug tracking.
3. The time estimates for tasks in our group were very underused in Sprint 1 for our team. We did not estimate time taken to complete tasks to an effective degree and also did not set a clear schedule to follow and update. For our next Sprint this will be a key focus for our teams success and will improve the quality and readiness of our assessment items.
4. To improve our performance in our next sprint the team needs to set aside more time outside of registered classes to meet as a full group to plan and complete objectives. During Sprint 1 our team rarely meet outside of the tutorial and this impacted the quality and schedule that our assessment items were completed.