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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** | Detailed feedback was given on each section of the application that was created. As a result, the quality of work produced increased during Sprint when compared to Sprint 1. | In terms of the communication on the feedback of the application, not much more could have been done to improve on this further. | Locky:  George: The feedback I received was really helpful compared to Sprint 1.  Rohil: The quality of work that was produced by the developers was too a much better standard. Whatever feedback was possible, was given to the developers.  Kyle:  Joseph: By the end of Sprint 1, we had a set plan of what to do for Sprint 2 in terms of feedback, theres not much more that could have been improved on |
| **Designation of duties** | Having a public holiday during the first week of the Sprint threw the planning and structure out of whack. Despite this set back, tasks were given at the start of the sprint. | When giving tasks to the team, more detail could have been given in terms of the requirements. This allows team members to get their tasks done to the expectation that the Scrum Master has. | Locky: As the scrum master, I felt the burndown chart and the lum sum task designation at the start was a good way of doing things in Sprint 2  George: No agile tool was used during Sprint 2, I still think next time a tool like Jira should be used in conjunction with what was done today.  Rohil:  Kyle: I find the task designation was really good in Sprint 2 and something that I would expect from further sprints.  Joseph: |
| **Communication outside of university** | Communication outside of university was at a high level. Both Facebook and Discord were used to communicate with group members | The issues that were brought up after Sprint 1, were all rectified and not much more could be improved in terms of communication outside of University. | Locky:  George:  Kyle: Facebook group chat was good as people were active asking questions and making contributions most nights.  Rohil: I think Discord was the best tool used in terms of communication for this sprint.  Joseph: |
| **Team meetings (both workshops and outside of them)** | Team meetings within workshops were of a very high standard as we had the product owner/tutor there as well for feedback as the application was being developed. Team meetings outside of workshops were done every Wednesday. This allowed some work to be done between the workshop and the team meeting. | 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: attended all meetings.  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 had put a considerable amount of effort in ensuring the requirements and feedback from the tutor and client were acted upon. Compared to Sprint 1, the team worked together much better in Sprint 2.

The team did well in Sprint 2, 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. During this sprint, computer science students assisted information systems student with some coding tasks to give them some experience with Django, Python and SQL languages. Likewise, information systems students assisted computer science students with scrum master and client duties to give them some experience within those areas of a scrum project as well.

There were a few problems that arose in the sprint 2. Firstly, certain client requirements were overlooked and only towards the end of the sprint that they were realised. As a result, the quality of those requirements were of a poor standard due to the lack of time. Feedback from the client was quite positive, however, the feedback towards the end of the sprint was of a negative standard due to the issue of overlooking key requirements. Secondly, as the the sprint and release plan were created at the very start of the project, during sprint 2, the team fell into a similar trap that happened in sprint 1 where some of the tasks time and effort were underestimated.

Most of the issues that were encountered in Sprint 1 were rectified in sprint 2. To ensure that no client requirements are over looked again, at the start of the sprint, the entire scope of the project should be re-iterated to the entire team. Again, the spread of work could be improved on between members, more so if the team member finds that the task difficulty has been underestimated. 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 to ensure that the product artefacts meet certain requirements. These requirements are planned and set out during the planning phase of a project.

Unlike sprint 1, at the beginning of sprint 2, quality control procedures were set in place based on the recommended strategies from the sprint 1 retrospective. The team created a general quality checklist that would be used for every artefact that would be created in sprint 2. This allowed the team members to use this checklist as they were developing any sections. It acted as a guideline to what would be of a suitable quality to submit to the Github for use in the main application.

Furthermore, regular meetings were held with the client to ensure that anything being produced was of the client expectations in terms of functionality and quality. The feedback provided from the client was the most useful when it came to refining any parts of the application.

Feedback provided by team members on artefacts produced had a set guideline that needed to be finished. The feedback required consisted of: “what was done well?” “what could be improved on?” and “any other suggestions or feedback?”. When this feedback was given to the team member, it helped them finalise their artefact to a very high standard that met client requirements as well as well as the rest of the teams standards.

Measures used within this sprint to ensure effective quality control measures were used worked effectively. As a result, no changes are required for further sprints in regards to this. However, there are always ways to improve quality but not related to the control measures implemented before a sprint.

# 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.

Within sprint 2, some of the quality control measures suggested from sprint 1 retrospective were incorporated. One of the main recommendations was to have more detailed feedback from the client and tutor. Not only this, it was also recommended to have more regular meetings with the client. These measures were implemented within sprint 2 and a significant difference was realised at the end of the sprint at the quality of work produced. This is something that should be used in future sprints to ensure the level of quality of the project is of a high standard and meets client expectations and standards.

Due to the public holiday at the start of sprint 2, it caused the initial client and tutor meetings to be postponed to a later week. As a result, there was not much feedback given on the tasks that were completed at the start. If we were to allocate time to feedback for the earlier tasks, it would have been too hard to complete the relevant tasks before the end of the sprint.

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. Furthermore, if a public holiday is scheduled on a meeting day with the clients and tutor, a replacement meeting day needs to be factored into the sprint plan to ensure that the relevant feedback is given. This ensures that the entire project has consistency.

# Issues Raised:

There were a number of minor issues that hindered the progress of the team during sprint 2, all of which were a consequence of poor communication within the team. The issues we encountered were task difficulty, time management and software compatability.

Firstly, during the sprint planning, many of tasks were underestimated in terms of difficulty and time. As stated earlier, this resulted in more time being taken to complete tasks and therefore the team struggled to keep up with the burn down chart and sprint plan. Some tasks were more difficult than others and were assigned to people depending on their skillset.

Due to the public holiday at the start of the sprint, team members were not able to meet to discuss the sprint plan and therefore were behind schedule from the very start. This added pressure to many of the team members, especially anyone that had tasks with an underestimated time and difficulty.

Lastly, many of the developers were new to the Django framework. As a result, a lot of their programming experience was not very helpful to assist them in this project. As a result, most of the coding conducted from this assignment resulted in poor code quality and work arounds that are not efficient. In the future, developers should have the choice of what programs to use to create the application that is requested by the clients.

All of these minor issues were a consequence of poor communication within the team and can easily be solved with some more 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. As a whole, there was a very big improvement from sprint 1 to sprint 2. It can be said that any further sprints as a team will result in some further improvement as a team and improved quality as a whole.