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# Effective Communication:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Communication aspect** | **Was it done well?** | **What could be done better next time** | **Specific user comments (both what was done well and what could be improved)** |
| **Feedback on the website creation** | Little feedback was given on the websites finished design, however the website was created to a very satisfactory standard, and the website that was made only had a few sections. | Feedback could be given for every file of the website, no matter how minor. Such as a critique of each element and how it can be expanded upon. | Locky: We didn’t have that much to talk upon and everything we did do was to a good standard.  George:  Rohil:  Kyle: At this point I don’t think we could have given much feedback as it is all pretty good, maybe we can have critique sheets in the next sprint.  Joseph: I think that feedback will improve with the next sprint as its more content based rather than framework. |
| **Designation of duties** | The designation of duties was both done well and not. The duties towards the website were not well done as the first week nothing was done. The designation of tasks outside the website focused more on the design of it were given out each week and distributed. | The designation of programming duties can be assigned package as to let everyone know what needs to be done. The utilisation of JIRA could play more of a role in keeping track of tasks. | Locky:  George:  Rohil: we used JIRA in the first two or so weeks of the project but we pretty much abandoned it soon after. (extended in Josephs’ comments)  Kyle:  Joseph: we had to log on at QUT to see everything which was a massive pain. |
| **Communication outside of university** | Communication outside of hours was done well and used either Facebook or Discord. Everybody responded in a timely manner, with only a rare exception. Communication of needs such as not being able to make it to meetings and queries were brought up and solved quickly. | Issues that are encountered by teammates could be brought up earlier. If a group member misses a meeting they inquire about what they missed and the objectives they need to complete. | Locky: I think the Discord chats were a good idea as they allowed a good amount of work to be done without getting too distracted.  George: They did help in a pinch and everybody could use it.  Kyle:  Rohil:  Joseph: |
| **Team meetings (both workshops and outside of them)** | Team meetings were conducted regularly and progress was made in all of them. The structure of the meeting was good and current problems were either resolved or spread out to make progress including inquiries of group matters and difficult problems. Attendance of meetings were good with only a few absences. | Team meetings were done well and could only improve in minor ways such as general conduct and conciseness of work for each meeting. | Locky: attended all meetings.  George: missed one or two meetings, made clear communications as to the absence.  Rohil: missed one or two meetings, made clear communications as to the absence.  Kyle: missed one or two meetings made clear communications as to the absence.  Joseph: attended all meetings. |

# Effective Team Participation:

Effective team participation is key in determining the completeness and quality of a sprint. During the sprint, each member of the team has put a considerable amount of effort in ensuring the requirements and feedback from the tutor and client were acted upon. There were several hurdles from complete team efficiency, but these are both easily identifiable and resolved. Regardless, the team participation had been largely positive.

The team did well in sprint 1, as each recorded story was completed. Each member gladly took upon their roles, and made diligent efforts on each of their assigned tasks. The scrum master and team had portioned work as fair as they thought possible during meetings, and assigned these tasks to people of appropriate skill and experience. Computer science students were assigned the bulk of the coding tasks, and the information system students worked on the other necessary artefacts such as diagrams. Recommendations made by the tutor and client were integrated into the sprint with minimal conflict. Despite some occasional issues, team participation was effective and transparent.

There were a few problems that arose in the sprint. Despite receiving feedback and confirmation on the sprint plan, the tutor showed some reservations about the sprint. Feedback from the tutor suggested that the sprint was not as comprehensive as it possibly could have been. There were some minor conflicts between the team and the tutor during consultations due to initial misunderstandings, although their feedback would be ultimately implemented. There were also some differences in the time invested between each member, as the difficulty of some assigned tasks were underestimated in regards to member ability. There were times of oversight when assigning work and one member would not receive artefacts to complete, since the team has five members over the default four and the tasks in this sprint was designed around four members.

These issues have identifiable resolutions, however. The spread of work could be improved between members, especially if task difficulty is analysed more accurately. Additionally, the team should also consult with the tutor on how to divide work more evenly. Team members should also could also be more receptive and less confrontational when receiving feedback to avoid misunderstanding, easing and hastening the feedback implementation process. Finally, more client and tutor feedback should be sought in the creation of the following sprint plan to prevent dissatisfaction from these parties. Overall, each team member effectively participated with enthusiasm, and the issues that have been identified are presented with solutions. The release should be smooth, assuming that the issues are fixed and project momentum builds.

# Effective Quality Control:

Within an agile environment, quality control refers to a set of procedures that are put in place in order to ensure that the product artefacts meet certain requirements. These requirements are planned and set out during the planning phase of a project.

There were not many procedures set during the planning phase in terms of quality control. However, as each artefact was produced, the group had a meeting and reviewed each artefact. Impromptu feedback was then given to the producer of the artefact in terms of what needed to be improved. Furthermore, the ensure that a consistent design was used throughout the web application, a set template mockup was developed. This ensured that all visual views of the application had a similar visual appearance. Having a template improved the performance of the team by ensuring that there was no time wasted in developing an artefact that would have to be re-made.

The impromptu feedback that was given to the producer was not based on any set rules or procedures. This made it difficult for producers to produce a standard of work with nothing to guide them. As a result, producers spent time designing a framework to assist them rather than just dedicating all the time to the production of the artefacts. Secondly, there was not enough communication between the entire team and the product owner. With a lack of communication, it makes it hard to know whether the artefacts being produced is of the product owner’s standard.

There are multiple techniques that can be implemented next time to improve the team performance. Firstly, during the planning phase, the team must create a general quality checklist. Each artefact that is created will go through the list to ensure it meets the standards. This will improve team performance as the producers can use the checklist whilst creating the artefact as a guide to what they produce. Secondly, an industry standard product that has been fully developed should be used as a comparison tool to what is going to be produced. This allows the team to compare what is different in terms of quality and determine whether or not any changes need to be made to be of good standard. Lastly, regular meetings should be held with the product owner to ensure the artefacts are of good standard and for them to provide feedback to assist with the rest of the development.

# Ability to Keep Client and Tutor Informed:

The team generally performed a successful job of keeping both the client and the tutor up to date with what the team was working on as is expected with any agile development. Whilst the team would host two meetings each week to keep each other up to date on what was going on, the team would also meet with both the client and tutor once a week to fill them in on the progress. A burn down chart would be presented each week to reveal exactly how on track the team was with completing the user stories for the sprint, documenting dates of completing as artefacts / user stories were ticked off. Artefacts completed during the project were generally uploaded to the Github repository as soon as they were completed allowing both the tutor and client to see updates in live time as they both have access to the Github repository. Overall the team’s ability to keep the client and tutor informed was a success.

The one downside to the team’s ability to keep the tutor and client informed is the detail and frequency of information that they could provide. Agile development methodology is about involving everyone in the project as much as possible and as frequently as possible however, this was hard to achieve with the limited time of availability to the tutor. Whilst the team had been hard at work throughout the work they struggled to reveal all this work to the tutor in detail during meetings and mainly resorted to just providing updates using the burn down chart. Whilst this is partly due to only having limited time with the tutor the group could have experimented with various remedies to provide more detail.

In order for the team to improve on their ability to keep the client and tutor informed they need to be able to provide more detailed information about what they had been working on during the week in a very short period of time at the weekly meetings with the client and tutor. This could be achieved by coming to the meetings with a prepared summary of exactly what the team had done in greater detail than just the burndown chart which only focused on user stories and not artefacts. This would allow the team to make better use of the limited that available for their weekly meeting and ensure that both the tutor and client are aware that the team has indeed been working hard throughout the week.

# Issues Raised:

There were a number of minor issues that hindered the progress of the team during this sprint, all of which were a consequence of poor communication within the team. The issues we encountered were participation, quality control and time management.

Firstly a number of members of the team were unable to attend the agreed upon meetings outside of the Workshops. This caused a number problems within the team such as irregular distribution of the workload and resentment of the non-attending members. In future all members of the team must be positive they can physically attend meetings at the agreed upon time or, at the very least, attend via a VoIP call.

The lack of quality control we practiced was also an issue as it caused time to be wasted. Members of the team were mainly left to their own devices, and the quality and direction of their work was not checked by the team until the next meeting. This lead to several aspects of the project having to be redesigned and implemented due to non-compliance with the vision of the rest of the team and the client. In future, all members of the team should be made aware of all aspects of the project requiring implementation during the Sprint, and the role they will play in development, before the beginning of the Sprint. This will allow team members to be confident that the artefacts they produce are up to the standard of the team and the client as well as reducing the amount of unutilized work produced by the team.

Poor time management was another issue that affected the team as a whole. On a number of occasions aspects of the project were delayed because constituent parts were not completed on time. This was most apparent with the implementation of the user interface as mock-ups were not prepared before the team was ready to code the required pages, which lead to inconsistencies in the interfaces originally produced. In future, members of the team should have a clearer picture of when the tasks assigned to them are needed by other members of the team

All of these minor issues were a consequence of poor communication within the team and can easily be solved with dedication from the team. This coupled with all members having stronger awareness of all aspects of the development process will eliminate the issues raised and allow the team to better come together as a congruent whole.