Team Reflection Week 6

Group 16

Thomas Jinton	jintont
Jennifer Krogh	kroghj
Ludvig Lindell	ludlinde
Jesper Lundgren	jeslundg
Johan Nilsson	nilssojo
Emma Pettersson	emmp
Antonia Welzel	welzel

Agile Software Project Management [DAT257]

Information Technology
Chalmers Institute of Technology
Gothenburg, Sweden

2020-05-15
Version 1.0

Contents

1 Customer Value and Scope

1.1 Scope

We had a meeting with our external stakeholder, where we discussed the current state of our application and let the stakeholder try different parts of the product. This gave us more insight on how to change the website's features to better fit the stakeholder. We also reviewed the priority of the features to be implemented in the future, and realized that some of them were more important than we had initially thought, like implementing a map.

Even though our stakeholder was very interested in having a profile system, we decided that the time we have left to work on the project would not be enough to properly implement such a function. Instead we will focus on other tasks that we believe are more valuable and that have a higher prioritization for us. Of course we would like to have a lot of different functions in our final project but we understand the importance of prioritization and so we will have to choose what we prefer the most.

1.2 Success Criteria

In the group we have agreed on that we all want to learn some basic tools that GitHub has. This is because we understand that GitHub is an important part of creating a project and it has so many different functions that are useful for creating a perfect product. However, in this course we have more focus on the agile parts and not so much on using one hundred percent of GitHub. But by trying and using the essential tools of GitHub we can learn something new and take that with us when we have future individual projects. In addition, we can improve our own project by using more of GitHub.

Another thing the team wants to achieve is more communication and better support. For instance, if someone is almost finished with a task but have one final step that they struggle to pass then we can help that team member by discussing it during a planed meeting. By doing this we improve our communication within the team and we increase our understanding as well. We also encourage people to write frequently in our chat if they encounter problems that they need help with and then we solve it together. During the weeks that we have worked together we have seen that when everyone are helping each other with problems we mange to solve them.

1.3 Key Performance Indication

1.3.1 How many points, out of the week's velocity, did we achieve in relation to our week's target?

This week's velocity: 64 points
Completed points: 51 points.

A few of the tasks were not properly estimated, and were thus not completed. That is why the completed points are so far from the planned velocity. Next week, we plan on enforcing a stricter

deadline so that the tasks are done by Thursday (and that they meet the criteria in our Definition of Done). This will also enable us to have a code review next week.

1.3.2 Have we been able to improve problems we identified the week before during the sprint review? (1 - 10, where 10 is major improvement, 5 relatively unchanged, 1 is a lot worse than before)

Problems identified last week:

- We will create a meeting agenda and try to follow it so that our meetings will be more efficient
- Task estimation for certain tasks

Voter Name	Vote
Thomas Jinton	5
Jennifer Krogh	5
Ludvig Lindell	5
Jesper Lundgren	5
Johan Nilsson	5
Emma Pettersson	5
Antonia Welzel	4
Average	4.857

The team was able to improve estimations to a certain extent, however did not really commit to working on a meeting agenda to create more structured meetings.

1.3.3 How satisfied, on a scale of 1 to 10, is each team member with this week's sprint? Where 10 is very happy and 1 is very unhappy

Voter Name	Vote
Thomas Jinton	8
Jennifer Krogh	5
Ludvig Lindell	7
Jesper Lundgren	8
Johan Nilsson	6
Emma Pettersson	5
Antonia Welzel	7
Average	6.57

The team felt in general that the sprint was okay. There were some issues with some of the tasks, that were difficult to solve and therefore could not be finished when the sprint ended. This is the reason why some group members had a better experience, while others were not as satisfied with this week's sprint.

2 Social Contract and Effort

2.1 Time Spent

Team Member	Time Spent
Thomas Jinton	8
Jennifer Krogh	8
Ludvig Lindell	9
Jesper Lundgren	9
Johan Nilsson	5
Emma Pettersson	15
Antonia Welzel	15
Total	69

The reason why two of the team members spent so much extra time is because they encountered problems that were hard to solve, that they had to spend a lot of time on, as well as different levels of coding skills.

3 Design decisions and product structure

3.1 Design Decisions and Customer Value

We chose to use OpenStreetMap.org to implement a map on the website. OpenStreetMap was chosen because it is completely free and made by the users. Chalmers is quite well mapped, which fits perfectly with our website. To implement the map, we chose to use leaflet, an open source JavaScript library. It supported all the necessary features that we needed, and was at the same time user friendly.

3.2 Usage and Updating of Documentation

As mentioned above, we had a meeting with our external stakeholder, where we documented both changes she suggested as well as what parts of the application worked well. We also discussed some new ideas for some design changes, but decided to actually document the more concrete ideas and decisions, which we want to implement.

The team worked on improving our code documentation to make it easier for other members who are not currently working with a similar task to understand the code. In addition, if other members want to work on code that is not originally their then the comments and a good documentation will help them understand where to start.

4 Application of Scrum

4.1 Agile Practices

We have started to focus on reviewing our code in a more structured way. Some group members used Git and pull requests to try this practice on each-others code. After giving it a positive review, it was decided that for the last sprint, the whole group would try it.

Having a structured way of reviewing the code improves the code quality and makes it less likely for new features to mess up existing code. Since pull requests through Git only can be done on branches, it forces the group members to use branches instead of pushing straight to master. This will protect the master from having new code damage old code that was already working.

4.2 Sprint Review

During this week's sprint review we discussed and solved an issue that was left from one of the tasks we had. Following that, we discussed whether it was appropriate to discuss code issues on the sprint review and came to the conclusion that if it was a small issue, it was fine. We realized that some issues (like this one) could be solved in about 10 minutes when the group worked together, compared to several hours if the people assigned the task would do it alone. That lead to the decision to accept such topics to save time overall.