

Second Sprint Final Activities Report

Group 3: Guazzaloca, Guidi, Liso, Lorenzoni, Marzolo

Introduction

This report contains a brief overview of the activities we conducted as part of the end of the second sprint: the Sprint Review and the Sprint Retrospective. Most of the considerations we offered in the first Report still hold true, and since we've now developed a workflow for conducting these meetings we will just quickly point out the main thoughts that arose.

Sprint Review

Duration and General Approach

Once again, we held the Sprint Review on the Sunday following the end of the Sprint. Once again, only four members were present, due to incompatible schedules, but the effort we collectively put in was distributed fairly. Like last time, we made a short video documenting the user experience and evaluated the product state using essence "Alpha State" cards.

Product State

While evaluating our process with State cards, we decided we had progressed in the "Stakeholders" alpha but regressed in the "Requirements" alpha. Opportunity, Software System, and Team are the alpha which changed the least, and are the unlikeliest to change in our opinion. While the Requirements regression may seem like a problem, it only signals the growth of our understanding of them. In particular, the Twitter API only allows for selecting tweets who satisfy ANY of the constraints selected: this means that we need to discuss with the PO whether centering the product around strictly geolocated tweets is an acceptable solution; the only alternative would be manually combing through the sizable tweet amount to check whether the coordinates are inside the specified rectangle, requiring a useless amount of effort both in coding and processing power. To discuss this, we will request a meeting with the PO soon.

Video

The video highlights the main features (and consequently, user stories) we implemented during this sprint. Although the interface is still rough around the edges, we believe it presents three of the main components we will implement: the constraint selection form, the map, the tweet list and the word cloud (still absent). All of these have yet to be completed, but the basic feature set is already clearly shown. On the technical side, the video does not show that we have switched from NextJS to NodeJS + Express.

Sprint Retrospective

Practice Patience

For this retrospective, we used a similar approach to last time's and used essence scrum card to evaluate the state of our workflow. The result of this is in the attached table. We decided to start from the position we had reached in the First Sprint Retrospective, as this would allow us to reconsider our progress and internalize what had been improved upon. There are three suggestions we find especially important: increasing PO involvement (a concern that was raised for both Product Backlog and Product Owner items), having better task management (some members of the team find it uselessly time-

consuming to record what they're working on and what else needs to be done) and maintaining the balance we've reached in the Sprint Backlog.

For what concerns PO involvement, we will soon have a detailed meeting. Task management is an issue we need to talk about further: during this sprint some members have done additional work which, because it wasn't agreed upon beforehand, ended up having to be discarded. Lastly, the Sprint Backlog was clearly at full capacity, if not underestimated: two user stories will be completed in the next sprint, because PO input was required in the last few days of the sprint.

Personal Evaluation

There are three main other areas of concern we'd like to bring forward: the necessity and accuracy of productivity metrics, the irregularity of our progress and the difficulty of turning scrum values and suggestions into actionable feedback.

For what concerns productivity metrics: we have realized Wakatime only allows to download statistics about the last 14 days; this creates yet another necessary manual intervention upon an automatic tool. We're unsure whether we should switch to a different system or create a simple script to update a shared repository: both options require a substantial amount of research that we weren't willing to put in, while in the final week of the sprint. This means that we will need to discuss this issue with the professor and find a solution that can satisfy both our needs.

The irregularity of our progress was one of the points that Wakatime allowed us to raise. We don't believe it is an issue in itself, as it just highlights how this project can only claim a portion of our time. At the same time, I believe it is deeply connected with our difficulty with coming to terms with the ratio of time spent in meetings compared to coding. This is what I meant with our third area of concern: I, as Scrum Master, don't believe the way we're applying scrum makes sense, due to the low amount of time the team members are physically able to pour into the project. That said, we will continue to follow the PO and professor's guidelines.

Lastly, I'd like to provide a short list of the documents that will be submitted for this sprint: the UML diagrams (Use Case and Classes), along with an explanation; the video highlighting our progress; the diagrams resulting from Practice Patience and Essence Alpha State Evaluation; a short outline of how we used SonarQube; this report.