
Team Reflection Week 7

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
2020-05-22
Version 1.0

Contents

1	Customer Value and Scope	1
1.1	Scope	1
1.2	Success Criteria	1
1.3	User Stories	1
1.4	Key Performance Indication	2
1.4.1	How many points, out of the week's velocity, did we achieve in relation to our week's target?	2
1.4.2	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)	2
1.4.3	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	3
1.5	Acceptance Tests	3
2	Social Contract and Effort	4
2.1	Social Contract	4
2.2	Time Spent	4
3	Design decisions and product structure	5
3.1	Design Decisions and Customer Value	5
3.2	Technical Documentation	5
3.3	Usage and Updating of Documentation	5
3.4	Code Quality and Standards	5
4	Application of Scrum	7
4.1	Roles	7
4.2	Agile Practices	7

4.3	Sprint Review	8
4.4	Best Practices	8
4.5	Relation to Literature and Guest Lectures	9

1 Customer Value and Scope

1.1 Scope

A: The project's aims to deliver a platform that allows students at Chalmers to more easily see information about the pub crawl. In particular, it aims to provide a way for students to see where pubs are, some additional information about them and how long the queue to enter is.

The priority is to make it possible to see the pubs and their queue status. This includes some method of ensuring that the queues are accurate and up to date. Afterwards features such as pub content and various other details will be added.

B: The above will remain as the focus, ensuring a close contact with the stakeholder.

A → B: Have meetings with the stakeholder and to ensure that tasks and user stories are kept prioritised and groomed to be value adding, either in the short term or long term

1.2 Success Criteria

A: For this project, we obviously wanted to create a valuable product for our stakeholder. We achieved our MVP for the project, which was a website with the following functions:

- List of pubs available
- Queue time for the pubs

In our team reflection for week 5, we also wrote that "*... Our main goal in this course is to learn about working as a team by using available agile practices. To get there, we need to know how to use the different Scrum techniques and be able to improve our work with these methods. Another important aspect is to learn how and what to communicate to become a more efficient group...*".

We feel that our communication has gotten a lot better, both due to our frequent meetings and chatting in between them, and our pair programming sessions. We have also learned a lot more about scrum and sprints, including sprint planning, stand-ups and retrospectives.

B: However, there is always more to learn, and during our future projects we hope to become true agile masters.

A → B: The best way to learn is to do, so we will do our best in the future as well.

1.3 User Stories

A: This sprint, the estimation worked relatively well and also the task breakdowns had improved. We also think that we have written better user stories that follow the INVEST criteria. The team felt in general that over the project's course we have continuously been able to improve both setting estimates as well as breaking the user stories into more useful tasks. The task breakdown also helped us "double check" how much value the corresponding user story creates and if we need to reevaluate the user story.

B: Even though there have been major improvements in these areas, we all think we would get even better at estimating and breaking down tasks if we were to continue this project. We would already have a more clear idea of what exactly user stories and tasks are supposed to look like, which would have made the project's start more efficient and smoother.

A → B: If the project were to continue, we would continue working with estimates and task breakdowns to become more comfortable with them. It would maybe also help to do a "recap" of everything regarding user stories, like tasks, estimates and the INVEST criteria, and see where each team member's view and knowledge on this is at and compare within the team. Thus, the whole group could move forward with the same understanding.

1.4 Key Performance Indication

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

This week's velocity: 49 points

Completed points: 49 points.

We set a lower velocity this week due to Thursday being a holiday, and due to one of the members being unavailable during Friday as well.

1.4.2 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:

- Improve acceptance criteria - make them more clear and detailed
- Code reviews with GitHub's review function

Voter Name	Vote
Thomas Jinton	7
Jennifer Krogh	NA
Ludvig Lindell	6
Jesper Lundgren	6
Johan Nilsson	7
Emma Pettersson	5
Antonia Welzel	6
Average	6.17

The majority of the group felt that the identified problems had not improved that much from last week to this one. This is mostly due to the fact that not enough attention was paid to the problem. Also regarding the acceptance criteria, there seemed to be an uneven understanding on

what certain tasks exactly entailed within the team, which therefore made it sometimes difficult for the whole group to set acceptance criteria.

1.4.3 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	NA
Ludvig Lindell	8
Jesper Lundgren	8
Johan Nilsson	5
Emma Pettersson	8
Antonia Welzel	7
Average	7.3

The group was in general satisfied with this week's sprint. Even though, we did not show any significant improvement on last week's issues, it did not have any major effect on this sprint and there were also no other important issues.

1.5 Acceptance Tests

A: We tested our website by letting our stakeholder direct us as we clicked around the website. This let us see that all the features the stakeholder wanted were implemented, and that they worked as was expected.

We also tested the features that the other group members implemented, to help find errors that the implementer might have missed. Obviously, we also tested our own features, using the acceptance criteria as a base to see that everything worked properly.

B: We would have liked to write better and more concrete tests, since our were not very well planned. They were not an afterthought, but they were also not our focus.

A → B: For our next project, we will put more focus on testing our product, so that we can find more bugs and errors and fix them before the stakeholder gets a hold of the product.

2 Social Contract and Effort

2.1 Social Contract

A: As we've not experienced any major problems related to the social contract this sprint, we have not updated it. It was useful to write down, so that we were all on the same page, but after that everything has been working on smoothly.

B: As we are happy with our "working environment" and our social contract, we want to keep going the way we are.

A → B: Continuing as we're doing, and making sure that we are ready to correct our behaviour and to change the social contract if the need would arise.

2.2 Time Spent

Team Member	Time Spent
Thomas Jinton	8
Jennifer Krogh	4
Ludvig Lindell	8
Jesper Lundgren	8
Johan Nilsson	6
Emma Pettersson	7
Antonia Welzel	11
Total	

A: The whole team has made an effort to finish the assigned tasks during each sprint. Our time spent usually matches our velocity with occasional outliers.

B: There were over the course sometimes differences within the group regarding the time spent as well as the time that was meant to be used for the tasks. The reason for this can be differences in skill level of for example coding or the use of version control, as well as potential bugs in the code that had to be solved. In the future, the whole group would have liked for the time on the project to be spent more evenly.

A → B: For another time, we might use a different estimation system by using the points more as an estimation of the difficulty of a task than the amount of hours required, which would have also been more individual to each member's skills and therefore would have been easier to solve within the course time.

3 Design decisions and product structure

3.1 Design Decisions and Customer Value

A: After talking with our stakeholder, we've added some new features and behaviours on our website. We added a possibility to go from address on each pub directly to a map. Also, we made sure that queue times are shown on both the list of pubs and on our map.

B: We want to continue to implement the features that our stakeholder wants, and make sure that our design decisions reflect that.

A → B: Making sure that we listen properly to our stakeholder

3.2 Technical Documentation

A: The commenting of the project was satisfactory today. Code documentation has continuously improved during the project, and we now have no problem understanding each other's codes.

B: We want to keep the same high standard of commenting our code. In the future, we would also like to write a better design document and also put more effort into creating a prototype to facilitate some design decisions.

A → B: Make sure we keep the same high standard by adding comments and doing code review within the pairs when possible. Also, write a more useful design document and prototype to rely on that the team can work with and develop after each discussion with the stakeholder.

3.3 Usage and Updating of Documentation

A: The documentation is updated during or right after the weekly meetings on Mondays and Fridays.

B: This is working well and we want to keep it to ensure that everyone has a say in changes. Our communication and understanding improves by doing this.

A → B: Continue to follow the methods and routines implemented so far.

3.4 Code Quality and Standards

A: The code is reviewed by the two people work in a pair on each tasks whenever possible. This ensures that possible feedback, reviewing and creativity is seamlessly integrated into the value creation process. In addition, we believe that a code does not always have to be reviewed in the official GitHub way, but adding comments to people's commits is also a good way of understanding the code and increase communication.

A definition of done is also explicitly stated to aid in the process of creating high quality code. This has been a process that we have worked on and improved on, especially the exact definition

of done has been discussed a lot and we believe that we have improved our understanding and code during these weeks and many tasks have met the definition at the end of the sprints.

B: Going from here we think adding a more formal method for code review using further functionality in git could be meaningful. It would also be useful to get a wider feedback on the code to avoid code that could become hard to maintain. More documentation and descriptive comments would be significant for our git as well as our scrum board, it would make sure that everyone is aware of changes and important details. We think that confusion and misinterpretations should be avoided as much as possible.

A → B: In the future, we will use the available functions in git to do more proper code reviews.

4 Application of Scrum

4.1 Roles

A: Each week, we had a new scrum master, to let everyone in the group test how it was to be one. The last 2 weeks we had 2 scrum masters, since we were 7 group members but there were only 5 sprints.

1. Johan Nilsson
2. Thomas Jinton
3. Antonia Welzel
4. Ludvig Lindell and Jesper Lundgren
5. Emma Pettersson and Jennifer Krogh

B: We found that, for our project, having a scrum master was very redundant, since we were all developers. Also, since none of us knew what being a scrum master really entailed, we did not feel like we were very good at it. Changing scrum masters every week might not have been a very good idea, since none of us really got a good feeling of what it meant to be one. As soon as we started to feel like we knew how it worked the role was given to someone else.

A → B: If we ever do a similar agile project, we would instead give the role of "scrum master" to every member simultaneously. What we did as scrum masters were basically keep track of meeting breaks, and that is something we do not need an entire role for. Either that, or give the role to one person and let them keep it for the entire duration of the project, so that we have one experienced scrum master instead of 7 that feel as if they are doing nothing at all.

4.2 Agile Practices

A: We started off with a structured planning and with a lot of focus on prioritization. To collect all tasks and user stories a scrum board was used. These were then used during the sprint planning each week which finished with a sprint review. This aimed to collect and process the teams shared experience to help plan the next sprint and improve the overall team work. This process is also meant to help us implement the agile methodology, especially the steps of evaluating current state, tasks to be done that create value and a review of the results and methods that brought us there at the end of the week. Also at the start of the project we had a clear stakeholder and so we had a lot of ideas of how to make the application satisfy our stakeholder.

B: Of course we wanted to achieve all of the agile practices the best we could and so we had a lot of focus on reaching those goals. We believed that having planned meetings and weekly talks with each other would increase our understanding and experience with the agile practices. Our goal was to have a smaller meeting every Wednesday to give people the opportunity to show how far they have come. In addition, our goal was to take finished functions of the application and show it to our stakeholder and receive some feedback in order for us to improve our tasks and add new functionality to the website.

A → B: Perhaps it would have been better to have the daily stand-ups actually be literally daily (instead of bi-daily), which is something other groups did. This is something we plan on doing in the future. Another thing we wanted was to stay in touch with our stakeholder as much as possible and this was something that we could have improved on a lot. For example, our stakeholder was not available all the time and we had to contact her and plan time for her to join our meetings to show her our progress. For a future project or a future update of this website, we would like to plan weekly meetings with our stakeholder and make sure that every week is convenient for her. By doing that we would increase our communication with our stakeholder and also we think that our final product would be better with more feedback and suggestions from the stakeholder.

4.3 Sprint Review

A: The sprint review this week was the final one and wrapped up the sprint as well as the product for this project. We discussed what we had done both this week and also the past few sprints, where we agreed that this was a good wrap-up of the project and our product.

When we reflected on earlier sprint reviews, we thought that they had gone well and been effective since we finished with a product that has the features that create most value for the external stakeholder. We all therefore think that we had a good priority of user stories.

B: If we were to do this project again, we would have tried to implement more structure to the sprint review, so that we could make more use of the time.

A → B: To make the review meeting more efficient and also have more use of it later on, we could make more of an effort to document the activity as well as follow a meeting agenda or time schedule.

4.4 Best Practices

A: We have continued to use the same IDEs, VC and scrum board. Our usage of our scrum board (Trello) has steadily increased, as we've grown more comfortable using it. For example, we're now better at moving cards to their right place (in progress, to check etc).

B: We would probably benefit from using more of the features included in the tools that we use, for example code reviewing in GitHub, and there are probably ways to better organize and use our scrum board. By better using our tools, our sprints could become more organized and we could spend more time focusing on value-creation rather than organizational stuff.

A → B: Continuing to use our tools, reminding everyone to check and update Trello, not being afraid to try features in our IDEs and lastly make a conscious effort to use more of the features that GitHub provides.

4.5 Relation to Literature and Guest Lectures

A: We had lectures on both Scrum as well as how to work as team remotely. These lectures were held in the beginning of the course, which was good since that was when we needed the information. We also had one final lecture this week, with information on what they expect us to hand in. Of course, this information was also given earlier in the course, but the lecture was a good refresher and also had some additional information.

B: The information on the final presentation and the final report would have been good to get a bit earlier as well, since we were very unsure of how these would be handled before the lecture was given.

A → B: We could have tried to find out the information for ourselves or bring the teachers' attention to potential problems by writing them an e-mail or starting a discussion on Canvas.