Group 113,

QUT Gardens Point

Sprint 3

Dear group 113,

We are writing as a client team to give you feedback on sprint 3.

· Didn’t complete the second story. Was split due to the person being more business oriented and the task being a business story.

· One guy said he’d do CSS 2 days before it was due – didn’t complete it smfh.

· Updated databases.

· Tracking number.

· Functionality of main webpages.

· QR code integrated.

· Half the team participated in presentation.

· Completed most tasks.

· Video that displays the functionality of the website.

· Printed Sprint plan for us to keep.

· Login page complete, pages don’t link properly yet to each other (aka index and admin page). The total hours are mentioned, however story points are not equivalent to hours.

· Sprint 3 and 4 not quite set in stone.

· Initial Sprint 3 and Sprint 4 required Inclusive tasks to complete such as Task 1 in Story 3 requiring tasks from Sprint 4 to be completed.

· Databases are complete and ready, tables are set out accordingly. No errors in tulips or attributes as seen during the demonstration

Group 113,

QUT Gardens Point

Sprint 3

We are writing as a client team to give you feedback on sprint 3. We appreciate your effort last Wednesday. A number of aspects will be discussed in regards to the demonstration including the preparedness, expectations, and professionalism of the presentation.

We observed that your team was moderately prepared for your product demonstration. Again you did not have a pre-written speech and your presentation seemed a little more flustered and ad-hoc than in the previous peer review as scrambled to explain why your product had not met all its goals for Sprint 3. After an explanation of what goals were and weren’t met in Sprint 3 and why, product demonstration jumped around between team members as the separate parts of the project were only accessible from separate locations (the entire sum of the project’s parts had not yet been compiled). The moving around also made it more difficult to envisage how the completed product will navigate. Overall presentation would have been much smoother if the product were demonstrated as a whole, though it is understandable that at this point in the development cycle its parts are still being worked on separately. .

During your discussion of print-friendly labels for customers, we were impressed by the functional QR codes you had developed. There is no denying the fact that they gave their best but our team had to move between people and computers to see what was going on. mostly by one member. The presentation was directed towards one or two of the client team members rather than the entire team (who were physically present and waiting to be presented to) which may be something to improve upon in the future. One person described sign in process and other person showed other functionality of the website. Moreover, they developed admin access to the customers which allows searching customers by using their last or first name. It had some issues before but it has been significantly improved.

They used a video which showed the working of the website. Video conveyed all the aspects of their website.

Together we ticked off completed functionality and discussed functionality that hadn’t met standard

**Preparedness**

Was the team prepared for the demonstration?

Team 113 was read and prepared when asked to demonstrate their product.

Were they able to demonstrate their product?

Team 113 was able to demonstrate the product and its workings. This including its database and it front end.

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?

Team 113 was able to follow and do what was needed to complete its user story predicted scenario’s.

Do all acceptance criteria for all stories pass?

--nnot sure

How confident did the team appear that the criteria would pass?

Team 113 was quite confident….

If some acceptance criteria didn’t pass did the team claim that the story was done or not?

---- did work?

Were there at least some stories that passed all of their acceptance criteria?

Definitely, as a there were at least a dozen stories some of these should of at least passed some of the acceptance criteria.

If there were deviations from the sprint plan, did the team provide clear explanation of their reasons for deviation?

There were not many deviations from the plan as most was followed through and done. But any clear explanation would of been clearly explained if needed to be.

Did the team communicate the potential for these deviations prior to the end of the sprint?

If any yes they would've and should of if there were any potential deviation that could help the plan

With respect to the product being developed, does the product developed so far deliver business value?

The business value was definitely delivered. As the plan has progressed quite far and has seen quite the change and accomplishment.

**Technical**

Was the presentation made at the right level for the stakeholders?

Is the system architecture suitable for the product being delivered?

The system architecture was certainly suitable for the product to be delivered, the reasoning behind this is that the architecture certainly did work with the intended needs. This was to work side by side the front end and back end.

Was the developer team able to clearly articulate the system architecture and their rationale for choosing it?

Yes? (i dunno how to explain this lol)

Were there any technical difficulties in the product demonstration? If so, were they able to continue to demonstrate other capabilities of the product?

During the demonstration there were no major hiccups, although the demonstration of one part of the system was under video which was weird.

Were any defects in the product detected during the presentation on which feedback could be provided?

No hiccups could be detected at current, no feedback could be given as not much was seen.

**Professionalism of the Presentation**

Was the product presentation clear and coherent?

Presentation was certain very clear about its intentions, all explanation were logical and well explained.

Were explanations of the product clear?

All explanations of the product were very clear, everything was explain and not much was left out.

Did the product presentation appear to have been prepared in advance or did it appear to be an ad hoc presentation?

Some thing were prepared prior to the presentation as previously said, although most were shown sight on scene

Was the demonstration confidently performed?

The presentation was definitely confidently performed, most of the things were shown with confidence in knowing it would work

If problems were encountered during the demonstration how smoothly did the team recover?

There were no major issues that had popped up during the presentation, even if it did the team would most of likely covered their tracks or returned to normal smoothly.

Were questions confidently answered?

All questions were answered with ease and with confidence knowing that it would've worked if the question was technical related.

Did it appear as if all members of the team were involved in the project?

The team had come of showing that all members took part in the project. None seemed to be left out but it also did seemed one of the team members didn't do much as he didn't say much.

Recommendations:

**Continuous Integration:**

CI is a development practice that requires integrating one’s new or changed code into the master code repository at least once a day. We used the X10hosting service to support this process as all developers had remote access in order to upload code to the shared domain.

**System Integration Testing:**

This black-box testing technique tests the system as an integrated whole, evaluating the system’s compliance against specified requirements (outlined as user stories in the specifications). It tests the required interactions and verifies that all related systems can operate in coordination with other systems in the same environment. This was especially important to test once the php front-end of the application and its sql back-end were brought together.