



Sprint 2-Retrospective



Summary

What went well:

- The team all agreed that everyone was encouraging and eager to help each other when a problem is voiced.
- Everyone gave everyone else ample time when they will not be as available (due to other commitments).
- The code was written in a way that was very easy to integrate with other components (once understood).

What did not go well:

- Sometimes problems were not voiced early, and we would waste a day or two on it.
- We might have overestimated team members' velocities: this might be due to inexperience and the not asking questions early problem.
- There was no consistent naming scheme, which can make some branches/commits/PRs hard to understand.
- There was very little meaningful comment in the code, making the code hard to understand.

What we will do:

- Continue to support each other when a problem happens, but this time, communicate any problems early!
- Our Scrum Master [Nan DU](#) will be more on top of everyone's progress.
- [Anwen Xu](#) will update our documentation to include naming instructions so that it is consistent.
- We will take into consideration that our velocity might be lower than expected.