

IFB 299 – End of Sprint Peer Review

The peer review is an opportunity for the client team to provide constructive feedback to their developer team. This feedback will be on the quality of the user experience demonstrated in the current version of the system and on the technical work completed so far. The client may also provide feedback on the developer's team process as seen from the perspective of the client.

To allow the client to provide this feedback the developer team will do a quick, informal, demonstration of all the stories they have completed so far. This should be in a form that allows the client to easily verify for each story if it passes all the acceptance criteria. During this demonstrate each member of the client team should be making notes of points that should be raised in the feedback. Once the developers have completed the demo they should allow one or two members of the client team to use the system for their own exploration.

Developers will also give their clients a short description of their system architecture and their rationale for choosing this architecture.

Clients will provide formal feedback to their developers in the form of a business letter. This will be a **single** letter produced by the team based on the notes taken by **all** team members. The required content and structure of this letter is described at the end of this document. **The client will email this letter to their developers and tutor by the close of business three days after this workshop.**

Clients are reminded that constructive feedback should include both positive and negative points and should be written in a professional manner.

In the case where a developer team is unable to conduct a demonstration of their working system they must provide a thorough explanation of why their system is not working. They must then provide a visual walk-through of the stories that were meant to be completed. The walk-through may include screenshots showing the client what the interface is meant to look like and explaining how a user would interact with the system. The walk-through may also be done at a whiteboard drawing rough representations of screens and explaining how the system is going to be used. Clients will then provide comments on the developer's processes based on their explanation of problems and will also comment on their view of the suitability of the design.

The following aspects should be considered in your peer review of the development team.

Preparedness

- Was the team prepared for the demonstration?
- Were they able to demonstrate their product? If not you will be required to discover the issues in a non-judgemental manner of why a demonstration was not possible.

Expectations

As the clients, you set and agreed to the general expectations for the end of the current sprint.

- Did the team deliver the user stories agreed to from the sprint plan?
- Do all acceptance criteria for all stories pass? How confident did the team appear that the criteria would pass? If some acceptance criteria didn't pass did the team claim that the story was done or not?

- Were there at least some stories that passed all of their acceptance criteria?
- If there were deviations from the sprint plan, did the team provide clear explanation of their reasons for deviation? Did the team communicate the potential for these deviations prior to the end of the sprint?
- With respect to the product being developed, does the product developed so far deliver business value?

Technical

- Was the presentation made at the right level for the stakeholders?
- Is the system architecture suitable for the product being delivered? Was the developer team able to clearly articulate the system architecture and their rationale for choosing it?
- Were there any technical difficulties in the product demonstration? If so, were they able to continue to demonstrate other capabilities of the product?
- Were any defects in the product detected during the presentation on which feedback could be provided?

Professionalism of the Presentation

- Was the product presentation clear and coherent?
- Were explanations of the product clear?
- Did the product presentation appear to have been prepared in advance or did it appear to be an ad hoc presentation?
- Was the demonstration confidently performed? If problems were encountered during the demonstration how smoothly did the team recover?
- Were questions confidently answered?
- Did it appear as if all members of the team were involved in the project?

Peer Review Report

The report on the team being reviewed should include the following structure and discuss each of the aspects listed above. This report should be a **maximum** of **two** pages.

- Review team details (Team number, names, student numbers)
- Development team and project details
 - Team number
 - Project under development
- Introduction
- Discussion of Demonstration
 - Preparedness
 - Expectations
 - Technical
 - Professionalism
- Conclusion