**Scrum Postmortem Review**

**Funky Town Fancy Pandas**

**Capstone Project 2014 Sprint Two**

Released October 2, 2014

Kurt Pedrosa

Funky Town Fancy Pandas Scrum Master

1. Summary

In this Scrum sprint the team was tasked with completing the preliminary budget document for the Autonomous Panda System (APS). The time frame for was defined to be two weeks. In these two weeks the group was committed to completing a preliminary conceptual design of the APS, and a budget estimate.

As per the Scrum process, the team divided the budget document into sections. These sections were defined by comparing the rubric, provided to us by the class instructors, and a budget document example from the team Birdnators from the 2013-2014 Senior Design Project.

Continuing with the same planning process used for sprint one, each section became a backlog item and the team utilized the website called Planning Poker (www.planningpoker.com) to characterize each item by their perceived difficulty. The higher the number, the harder the task.

The planning meeting estimations for the backlog items were as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Backlog Item** | **Estimation (points)** |
| Introduction | 4 |
| Functional Decomposition System | 30 |
| Requirements Traceability | 28 |
| Budget Decision Matrices and Justifications | 40 |
| Risk Analysis | 15 |
| Glossary/Acronyms/Abbreviations/References | 10 |

For this sprint, the team felt more comfortable with the estimation of the backlog items, in turn, each item had a good approximation of time. Learning from the last meeting, the backlog items were divided to individual team members. Items with higher difficulty level were broken down even further and divided among the team member. This created a more effective team as well as eliminating dependency between team members.

1. Log

Below is a highlighted list of the stand-up meetings performed during spring two.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date of meeting (2014) | Comments |
| September 25 | Assigned trade studies. Kurt: Microprocessor and Cameras. Mary: Batteries and Wheels. Kok Peng: Motors and Sensors. Luis: Sensors. Merissa: Frame and arm/clam.  No problems were stated by any of the team members |
| September 28 | All team members finished researching their assigned parts. Currently working on, Kurt: Introduction, System Decomposition and Microprocessor Matrix. Merissa: Requirement Tracability, Claw/arm Matrix. Luis: Requirement Traceability, Camera Matrix. Mary: Wheels Matrix. Kok Peng: Batteries and Motors Matrix.  No problems were stated by the team. |
| September 29 | All members have been working on backlog items. Problems stated were: Luis: Adding .docx files to repository. This problems was assigned to Kurt. Merissa: Debated claw/arm being bought or 3D printed. This was resolved during the stand-up meeting. Kok Peng: Unsure about the RPM requirements. The team agreed that he should work with Mary on this. Mary: Problem with which part vendor to choose. This problem was resolved during the stand-up meeting. |
| September 30 | All team members have been working on backlog items and not problems were stated. |

1. Retrospective

Continuing the postmortem method used for spring one, the scrum master requested the team members to answer seven questions that described quality of the sprint. These questions were:

1. What went right?
2. What went wrong?
3. What would you do different if you ran the same project again?
4. What have you learned from the project?
5. What hindered your progress during the project?

These answers were confidential, between the member and the scrum masters, and helped discussion during the postmortem meeting.

At first glance, the team had a major shift in morale, and work output. Every area of concerned that arose during sprint one have been corrected. Team dynamic has improved drastically. Staying loyal to our commitments from the previews sprint, tasks were assigned to individual group members and the work load was divided to individual member instead of groups of members. The communications between the team members as also improved which has made it easier to gauge the current progress of the project.

The methods that help the team improved included the use of repository for version control, and communication, as well as the assignment of backlog items.