

# Third Sprint Final Activities Report

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

## Introduction

Once again, we remind the readers that most of what we explained in the previous two reports still holds true. The contents of the report do not change in structure: in the first part, we'll outline our main takeaways from the Sprint Review, and in the second part we'll highlight our criticisms of our workflow as they emerged in the Sprint Retrospective.

## Sprint Review

### Duration and Approach

This Review was especially short: we were all very up to date on what had been achieved and were eager to be done with the ritual and back to our regular lives, as the project is nearing its end. As the Scrum Master, since the team was finally comfortable with the "Product State" process, I introduced a new short segment, as a means to create a new outlet for thoughts and opinions. This was only accepted by part of the team, as a couple member were, if not critical of the idea, somewhat uncooperative. In total, it lasted about 45 minutes, on Monday the 14<sup>th</sup> of December.

### Product State

As I mentioned, our use of Essence Cards was quick and efficient. We identified a growth in 4 Alphas: Stakeholders, as expectations and requirements seem to now be finalized, and we've received useful feedback from a meeting with the PO; Opportunity, due to the solution being finalized and the discussion about the constraints we had with the PO; Way of Working, because of the advances we made in task division, parallel progress and integration; and finally Requirements, although, as we noted in the attached document, the quality of our work isn't yet up to our standards.

## Video

The video showcases our main advancements, on multiple fronts: the Word Cloud, the image handling on the Map, and the email notification at threshold. We've decided to avoid showing the scheduling widget, because it was only implemented on our last day, and has yet to complete the steps and testing required by our DoD (which means it is working on a feature branch, specifically `feat/periodic`). We also quickly completed what was left from the Second Sprint (part of the tweet visualization on the map) and the tweet collection import.

## Team Feedback

Lastly, I'd like to highlight some of the feedback that was given in the last part of our meeting, in a few simple anonymous quotes.

"Interface definitely needs to be reworked. clearly, we focused on getting features done, but I worry the responsive part will take longer than we think." Due to this feedback, we created a new product backlog item, which has yet to be discussed with the PO, for picking and completing a compelling interface.

"I really wish we could have had a few more days to complete our User Story. Even just one day would have meant not carrying it over to the next sprint..." As the Scrum Master, I'd like to receive some feedback on this from the instructors: would it have been okay to delay the end of the Sprint? All of the development team new this was not due to negligence, and the solution of moving it to the next sprint

is handled horribly by Taiga.

“The DoD helped us catch a sneaky bug on slower connections that I’d have ignored otherwise.” This genuinely made me proud of our advances, so I decided to include it.

## Sprint Retrospective

### Practice Patience

The Retrospective was held right after the Review, but the team was cooperative in keeping comments related to our workflow for the second part of the meeting. We completed Practice Patience again. We can gladly announce we have no scrum cards in the red state anymore! Some important notes include: the clarity of the Product Backlog, underestimating the effort and time required for the periodic branch, and the enhancement in task division. The first one is partly due to some time we took to focus solely on this: I found that assuming the Team will clean up the backlog is wishful thinking, so I sat down with a cooperative member and combed through our backlog to increase its readability, completeness and usefulness. The second one is related to the same issue that was mentioned by a team member in the quotes, which annoyed us all. The third one was probably the most important one: due to a better understanding of both the strategy behind Scrum and the tools at our disposal, we were able to distribute the work among ourselves fairly evenly, and work much more efficiently than in the first two sprints.

### Team Feedback

As I did in the Sprint Review, I asked the dev team to express some thoughts about our workflow. Here are some of my picks:

“Due to our initial division, I mostly worked by myself in the first part of the Sprint, focusing on my feature [word cloud] and only requiring feedback as part of the DoD and when merging in master. This worked well, as I did not have to coordinate too much with other members’ tight schedules.” This was important feedback for me: in the last sprint, some members mentioned they had been slowed down by the cooperation overhead, and I would be lying if I said I never felt the same way.

“Feature division in branches cleaned up our workflow.” As I mentioned before, I agree with this statement. I think it is especially relevant because changes to the DoD can have a large impact, so I’m happy it worked well.

“Because I had to interact with parts of the repo I wasn’t familiar with, I asked for help to the other members, and they quickly delivered useful feedback.” I felt it was important to include this, as I don’t want the first quote to mislead the reader into thinking our cooperation has only been lowered: we have removed unnecessary overhead and sped up necessary interactions.

## Conclusion

I believe this was our most successful sprint yet: I hope the Taiga mishandling of moving US to following sprints won’t lower the perceived success by the PO. Time tracking was strictly followed by the whole development team, and the relevant files will be uploaded on the repo as exported from WakaTime. All the other documents are attached to this one, in the same wiki bookmark.