Throughout the development of the SNHU Travel Project, there have been many different roles from the Scrum-Agile team that were crucial to the project. The product owner communicated with the development team and the testers to make sure that communication was held between both so everyone was aware of what needed to be done, and the testers were able to share their input on what should be changed to make the project more user friendly or include certain things that were not previously included. The development team would take the testers input and make the necessary changes and resubmit the changes to the product owner to share with the testers. The testers would then share their input on if anything still needed to be changed.

The user-stories helped to maintain focus on what each user wanted individually while also focusing on things that multiple users wanted. For instance, many users wanted a list view, but some users wanted the ability to add in filters. This allowed for the user-stories to be placed into category of importance so the development team knows what is most important to add (things that multiple user want) and things that are not as important (one user mentions it or a visual aspect that will not affect the over function of the product). By focusing on the necessary changes and submitting them in a timely manner, the testers were able to retest the changes and add in their input, yes this is a long process, but it avoids additional problems upon completion of the entire project.

At one point the stakeholders changed their entire focus for the project, while this was a major interruption, the development team was able to make the necessary changes. With the big interruptions the team was able to create more user stories, focus on size and importance of the new changes, then go from there to add in and change the needed portions so that it meets the new criteria provided by the stakeholders/ users.

For the group project, I emailed my team to first discuss who would take on which role, from there we started working independently to complete our portions then reconvened to discuss what everyone thought and what we agreed upon and what we disagreed upon. This was effective for our team because we were able to add in input and bounce ideas off of each other without criticizing each other. This is an important part to Scrum-Agile communication as it encourages the team to communicate and the team does not criticize each other only ideas.

Using Affinity Grouping helped to break the project up into portions based on size and importance, this was the team was able to focus on the larger more important portions first then focus on the smaller less important portions of the project after. This allows for the important parts to be focused on more closely and allows for the team to keep track of their progress and see what is left to work on. Holding a daily scrum allowed for the team to share their progress and communicate if they need help on something is also a very important portion of Scrum-Agile. The daily scrum allows for the team to communicate with each other on what still needs to be done, what has been completed, what is more important, and any updates on the project that will be causing a change.

The pros of the Scrum-Agile approach were the effective communication and the organization of each individual portion of the project. The team is able to focus and work when there is a communicative environment and has the organizational skills necessary to track progress and see where things need more work.

The cons of the Scrum-Agile approach were that it is a very long and tedious process and there can be rather large interruptions when portions are almost complete. Though spending more time on the project would encourage better work, it can also be confusing when big changes happen and now all the work that was done has to be redone to accommodate the new requirements.

The Scrum-Agile approach was a good approach for the SNHU Travel Project, however, I do not think that it is the best approach. While some aspects of the approach made completing the project easier and run smoothly, some aspects took much more time and made completing parts harder than it should have been. Overall, the approach isn’t bad but it is not the best, I would use parts of Scrum-Agile and then use other approaches to do parts in a quicker and more efficient way.