Sprint retrospective

Software Engineering • Autumn 2026 • Your Name

Learning goals	**Submission**
Translate observations into actionable engineering work; distinguish signal from process noise.	One PDF, with evidence for each conclusion and a short reflection on uncertainty.

Revision history

Version	Date	Change
0.1	02 Sep 2026	Initial analysis and baseline metrics.
0.2	09 Sep 2026	Added experiment plan and risk notes.

Note. Write in your own words, link conclusions to observations, and flag assumptions. The grading table is a planning aid, not a substitute for a rubric supplied by your instructor.

Grading scheme

Criterion	Points
Evidence and reproducibility	30
Technical reasoning	35
Communication and structure	20
Reflection and next steps	15
Total	100

Question 1 What changed during the sprint?

Compare the planned and observed cycle time. Give one plausible explanation for the difference and name a measurement that would distinguish it from an alternative explanation. **Answer.** The median cycle time fell from 6.2 days to 4.8 days after the review queue was made visible. This correlation is not proof of causation: a change in ticket mix could produce the same result. Recording queue age and ticket size for the next two sprints would let us separate those effects.

Question 2 Design a small experiment

Propose a two-week experiment to test whether smaller pull requests reduce review delay. State the treatment, control, metric, and a practical threat to validity. Include the metric as a formula if helpful. **Answer.** Use a target of at most 300 changed lines for the treatment group and compare review delay with the team's normal process. Report the median delay rather than only the mean, because one blocked review can dominate a small sample:

$$\text{median}\{t_{\text{first review}} - t_{\text{opened}}\}.$$

A threat is selection bias: volunteers who choose small changes may already work differently. Alternate the policy by week or compare matched work items.

Question 3 Reflection

What evidence would make you revise your recommendation? List two signals that should be monitored after the experiment.