Agile Project Management - Source and Review Index

Version 1.0 · 4 November 2026

Sources: Robert Clines's October 21, 26, 28 and November 2 recordings, their completed local analysis outputs, and the supplied *Introduction to Agile Project Management*, version 8.0, 187 PDF pages including slides, exercises, glossary and sample solutions.

This index explains the curated decisions used in the Complete Guide, Quick Review and Practice Questions. PDF-viewer pages count the cover as page 1. Times are recording-relative; segment IDs refer to cue-bounded analysis segments, not speaker-turn numbers.

Provenance and validation

All **78 saved request/response pairs** passed the supplied repository's current schema/source validator. Request digests, checkpoint request references, source hashes and stored response hashes where present were checked. Both manifests contain the full expected batch sequence for every session. Every analysis segment has one classification, and each emphasis candidate has a recorded disposition. No new API calls were made for this compilation.

This establishes source matching and completion of the saved pipeline; it does not independently verify every paraphrase or spoken statement. The four `topics.json` files retain **573 proposed claims and 110 claim review flags**. Original JSON, quotes, segment flags and repair history are unchanged. The curated materials consolidate duplicate proposals, qualify classroom simplifications and use the workbook to check important distinctions. Passing validation does not automatically clear editorial review flags.

Workbook prose and relevant slides were compared with the lecture teaching. The Scrum loop, architecture-slice diagram, release plan, sprint calendar, task board, burndown and example estimation/task tables were inspected visually. There is no claim that every workbook detail appears in the guide or that any independent PMI/AACE/Scrum standard has been verified. Official current certification specifications were not supplied; all graded questions are original practice based on these course sources.

Completed session inventory

Date	VTT cues	Speaker turns	Analysis segments
2026-10-21	927	319	403

Date	VTT cues	Speaker turns	Analysis segments
2026-10-26	1,146	311	438
2026-10-28	1,162	361	456
2026-11-02	534	174	213

Date	Classify + topics batches	Topics	Claims	Raw claim flags
2026-10-21	10 + 10	24	128	39
2026-10-26	12 + 12	30	187	38
2026-10-28	12 + 12	38	167	17
2026-11-02	5 + 5	26	91	16

All five expected final outputs are present for each date: classifications, topics, instruction transcript, draft study guide and review queue. The dates identify separate sessions; the November 2 recording was not written into October 21's output folder.

Workbook and lecture coverage map

Workbook part	PDF pages	Main supplied lecture coverage	Curated location
Module 1: introduction	7-13	Course framing and objectives	Guide section 1
Module 2: overview and frameworks	15-48	October 21	Guide sections 2-3
Module 3: requirements and stories	49-74	October 26	Guide section 4
Module 4: planning and integration	75-109	October 26	Guide section 5 and integration in section 7
Module 5: estimating	111-126	October 28	Guide section 6
Module 6: executing	127-153	October 28	Guide section 7
Module 7: organization	155-168	November 2	Guide section 8
Group exercises	169-174	Activities are discussed throughout	Original integrated practice in section 9

Workbook part	PDF pages	Main supplied lecture coverage	Curated location
Glossary	175-177	Cross-reference	Definitions consolidated in guide/review
Sample solutions	179-187	Workbook supplement	Checked for examples; not presented as student’s completed work

The workbook includes slides as well as explanatory prose. A slide’s printed number is not its PDF-viewer page; for example, the sprint task-board slide is on PDF p. 103. Use the PDF numbers above to navigate.

Instructor study-emphasis navigation

The automated candidate records are aids to review, not automatic exam hints. The saved dispositions remain unchanged. “Retain as study emphasis” below means the instructor emphasized study or understanding; it is not a guarantee of exam content.

Date / evidence	Candidate anchor	Saved disposition	Curated reading
2026-10-21 / 1	01:00:11	exam_content	Retain method-selection context and project drivers as study emphasis.
2026-10-21 / 2	01:11:04	exam_content	Retain the explicit take-notes instruction on the user-story role/capability/value pattern.
2026-10-26 / 1	00:16:09	exam_content	Retain that a methodology cannot fix unaddressed underlying causes.
2026-10-26 / 2	00:25:48	exam_content	Retain transition-requirement recognition; do not infer it is the only important category.
2026-10-26 / 3	01:14:49	exam_content	Retain characteristics of useful stories and shared understanding.
2026-10-28 / 1	00:29:28	non_exam	Organizational reporting interest, not a student exam designation.
2026-10-28 / 2	00:48:04	non_exam	Stakeholder interest in completion forecasting, not an explicit exam designation.
2026-11-02 / 1	00:51:44	non_exam	General approach-selection advice; do not manufacture a specific exam promise.
2026-11-02 / 2	00:57:05	non_exam	The timestamp is in tentative exam recollection. Separately retain clear study guidance earlier in the same turn at segments 199-200.

Date / evidence	Candidate anchor	Saved disposition	Curated reading
2026-11-02 / 3	00:57:51	exam_content	Retain roles and ceremony purposes/participants as explicit study guidance.

The November 2 candidate at 00:57:05 reuses a long speaker-turn text whose earlier sentences contain stronger study guidance. The segment-level inspection distinguishes the actual candidate anchor from **00:55:35-00:56:41, segments 199-200**, where Modules 3-5, ceremonies and roles are directly named. Segment 207 reiterates roles and ceremonies. The raw non-exam disposition at the later timestamp is preserved; the earlier explicit guidance is cited directly in the guide.

Source differences and qualifications

Issue	Decision for the study materials
Agile versus deadline-driven work	The course uses fixed-date predictive examples but also allows Agile hard end dates. Assess constraints and deliverability rather than using the date as a categorical rule.
Stand-up as a status meeting	The workbook uses that label and SM-led three questions. Teach brief coordination/impediments and label the facilitation format as course-specific.
Scrum activities and planning levels	Preserve the taught set including release planning and refinement. Do not represent every course activity as a universally mandated formal Scrum event.
Team size	Lecture preference is nine or fewer. Workbook p. 28 mentions nine; p. 160 also mentions twelve with nine ideal. Preserve the preference and disclose the inconsistency.
Preliminary estimate	Lecture groups it with bottom-up; workbook p. 111 allows top-down or bottom-up. Both are identified.
Estimate ranges	Retain only as illustrative workbook classes; no independent AACE or PMI alignment claim.
Fibonacci cards	Workbook endpoints 0/100 and sample value 20 indicate modified estimating cards, not the exact mathematical sequence.
Epics and estimability	A large story needs decomposition; an unclear small story may instead need investigation. Do not equate every uncertainty with large size.
Acceptance criteria and implementation	Make conditions observable/testable; “how achieved” does not require prescribing a technical design.
Requirement classifications	Four top-level categories; functional/non-functional sit under solution. Security/dark-mode examples are local wording to analyze, not universal classification shortcuts.

Issue	Decision for the study materials
WBS and 8/80	Retain decomposition versus sequencing; workbook explicitly allows guideline exceptions. Its activity-under-deliverable illustration is not generalized to all standards.
Definition of Done and deployment	Preserve a shared standard plus the corporate readiness example; ready-to-release and deployed are different. Do not universalize every listed approval/training step to every story.
Hardening and calibration sprints	Treat as course adoption/integration examples. Make required quality work visible and do not claim they are mandatory Scrum events.
Sprint cancellation	Preserve PO authority in the taught exceptional scenario; avoid making every new request a cancellation trigger.
Calibration case arithmetic	October 28 says two of five finished, then gives an inconsistent unfinished/demo-failed count. Teach learning/testing, not the conflicting counts. Original numeric practice uses explicit new data.
Relative history, names and ownership	Exclude garbled/unsupported ages, NASA/RAD/ASD/Spiral attribution and Scrum ownership assertions from graded recall. Manifesto year is optional course background, not an exam promise.
Anecdotes and statistics	Exclude the tentative 61% estimation effect and unsupplied failure-rate reports from numerical facts. Co-location outcomes and personal success records remain anecdotes.
Overall duration	Earlier increments do not prove universally faster projects; the same-scope one-year example does not prove universal equal duration either.
Organizational guidance	Camera use, co-location, resource percentages and mentoring arrangements are contextual practices with tradeoffs.

Review-flag decisions by session and topic

Each row below accounts for a group of the **110 raw flagged claims**. It records how the subject was used or excluded in the curated material. These are editorial decisions for this version, not deletion of the original flags or a certification-standard approval. Where a flagged proposal is corroborated, the guide relies on clearer instructor wording or the identified workbook passage.

2026-10-21

Topic key / source segment IDs	Flags	Curated decision
agile-and-waterfall; 23, 137, 138, 139, 188, 191	6	Use method-selection teaching with context. Exclude the unclear relative-age comparison; interpret “Waterfowl” only from the surrounding waterfall comparison. Technical-project examples do not restrict all Agile use to IT.

Topic key / source segment IDs	Flags	Curated decision
agile-methodology-selection; 140, 141, 338, 339, 341, 342	3	Retain changing-needs/feedback reasoning. Car lead-time anecdote is not a tested statistic; game release intervals do not establish a development method.
predictive-hybrid-and-agile-approaches; 36	1	Use the learning objective as coverage direction; actual hybrid explanation comes from October 26 and workbook pp. 89-90.
scrum; 36, 37, 244, 365, 366, 394, 395	4	Corroborated by workbook pp. 25-28 and clearer lecture teaching. Rugby terminology is optional background; do not infer authorship or ownership of Scrum.
modern-project-management-history; 56, 57, 58, 60, 61	4	Exclude the unclear history, individual-name and relative-date claims from graded recall. Workbook repeats some historical assertions; repetition is not independent verification.
agile-iterative-development; 133, 135, 136	3	Retain the small-piece/feedback explanation after reading the surrounding instructor passage; guessing is an illustration, not evidence that predictive work lacks feedback.
agile-feedback-loops; 134, 363, 364	2	Retain stakeholder feedback as the teaching; do not turn the classroom game into a universal comparative performance claim.
rolling-wave-planning; 144	1	Retain progressive detail/near-term planning; omit unsupported historical attribution from the recall pair.
agile-incremental-delivery; 145	1	Retain earlier usable portions as a potential benefit, without a universal total-duration guarantee.
agile-sprints; 147, 148, 149	3	Use the course’s one-to-four-week range with its two-to-three-week preference; November 2 provides clearer corroboration.
self-managing-agile-teams; 149, 150	1	Separate team capacity/execution from PO product priorities; self-management does not mean arbitrary product choice.
agile-product-backlog; 152, 153, 154, 155	2	Retain repeated ordering and reassessment; predictive projects can also approve changes, so avoid an absolute no-change contrast.
spiral-model; 192, 193	2	Keep as course background only; do not grade disputed classification, purpose wording or historical attribution.
dsdm; 375, 376	1	Use full name and fixed-cost/time, flexible-scope model corroborated by workbook p. 23.
kanban; 229	1	Retain flow/prioritization/WIP teaching; the course’s applied-to-existing-process wording is descriptive context.
extreme-programming; 235, 369, 370	2	Use XP practices corroborated by workbook p. 24; strict co-location/no-documentation descriptions are qualified course characterizations.

Topic key / source segment IDs	Flags	Curated decision
feature-driven-development; 238, 239, 367, 368	2	Use the clear earlier FDD passage and workbook p. 25 instead of the garbled “FTD” response; retain the business-need caution.

2026-10-26

Topic key / source segment IDs	Flags	Curated decision
requirements-purpose-and-quality; 3	1	Retain requirements as capabilities/conditions addressing needs; corroborated by workbook pp. 49-51.
scrum-standup-purpose-and-boundaries; 345, 346, 349, 350	3	Retain the brief daily coordination format; label the three prompts and SM facilitation as the course model rather than universal rules.
user-signoff-ceremonies; 48	1	Retain the collaboration lesson, not a claim that every approval or sign-off is useless or invalid.
user-needs-collaboration; 294	1	Retain after corroboration with the clearer instructor teaching and workbook pp. 53-55.
business-analyst-product-owner; 69	1	Distinguish collaboration/job titles from accountabilities; a PO need not be a BA and a PM is not automatically an SM.
requirements-types; 65, 66, 67, 85, 86, 87, 88, 97, 102, 112, 255	7	Keep four top-level categories and two solution subdivisions. Security/dark-mode examples are local classifications; temporary transition work differs from ordinary product behavior.
user-stories; 130, 291	2	Use the clear instructor explanation and workbook template rather than relying only on the student answer.
agile-epics; 281, 286, 288, 290, 410	3	Normalize the garbled “Pythics” only in the curated prose using repeated epic definitions and workbook p. 51. Distinguish large work from a small item needing investigation.
acceptance-criteria; 154, 155	1	Retain observable confirmation/testing conditions; clarify “how achieved” so it does not require prescribing technical design.
work-breakdown-structure; 303, 304, 306, 311, 312, 313	6	Preserve deliverable decomposition versus later sequencing; 8/80 is explicitly a guideline with exceptions in workbook p. 76. Do not universalize the activity-under-deliverable diagram.
agile-scope-and-activities; 307, 308	1	Retain progressive planning; scope may flex but obligations, feasibility and change decisions remain.

Topic key / source segment IDs	Flags	Curated decision
agile-gantt-charts; 316	1	Treat low-value Gantt examples as the instructor’s context, not a ban on schedule/dependency tools for every Agile organization.
scrum-planning-levels; 320, 326, 327, 328, 341, 342, 343, 351	4	Use workbook pp. 78-82. Label task-hour and daily status wording as the course model; show-of-fingers is an example, not a compulsory ritual.
backlog-refinement; 360	1	Use refinement/story time as preparation for upcoming stories. Do not infer absence of a need to clarify work from the garbled required/not-required sentence.
sprint-retrospective; 426	1	Corroborated by workbook p. 83: preserve good practices and identify improvements without blame.
scrum-sprint-cadence; 414	1	Replace the unclear minimum-duration response in curated notes with November 2’s clear one-to-four-week course explanation.
scrum-planning-and-progress-artifacts; 421, 424	2	Use the clearer earlier description and workbook pp. 85-86: board state and remaining hours versus days; charts do not prove causes.
agile-cross-team-coordination; 401	1	Workbook p. 89 resolves the meeting as Scrum of Scrums; coordinate dependencies instead of assuming methods remove them.

2026-10-28

Topic key / source segment IDs	Flags	Curated decision
estimation-uncertainty; 8	1	Retain the qualitative uncertainty lesson; omit the tentative unsupported 61% environmental-effect figure from graded recall.
fibonacci-relative-sizing; 34, 35	1	Retain the clarification that smaller means relatively less work, not guaranteed earlier completion.
definition-of-done; 199	1	Manually checked source 199 supports testing and informal demos. This was neighboring context in topics batch 5; retain qualification and do not claim automatic primary-scope acceptance.
planning-poker; 164, 165, 166, 167	1	Use clear process teaching and workbook pp. 114-115; the student-linked point answer is corroborated by the instructor’s surrounding explanation.
agile-task-estimation; 155, 156, 157	1	Retain repeated estimation with better knowledge; distinguish relative story sizing from task hours.
scrum-velocity; 170, 171, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179	2	Use clear instructor sources 130-134 and workbook p. 116: completed stories only; no partial credit.

Topic key / source segment IDs	Flags	Curated decision
traditional-estimation-techniques; 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 144, 145	2	Workbook p. 112 corroborates the named techniques and resolves the unclear “Kurt” as PERT/three-point in this list.
daily-stand-up; 195, 382, 383, 433	3	Use corroborated three-prompt course format. Camera/punctuality recommendations are working-agreement examples, not universal measures of effectiveness.
sprint-review-stakeholder-collaboration; 200	1	Manually checked source 200 supports early business feedback. Neighboring-context repair is preserved; clearer later lecture also repeats the lesson.
agile-team-communication; 261	1	Dashboards are the scenario’s response to stakeholder reporting concerns, not a substitute for all required reports everywhere.
virtual-team-collaboration; 301, 302, 303	2	Treat co-location outcomes as a case anecdote and recommendation; do not infer guaranteed causal gains or prohibit effective remote work.
effective-scrum-team-factors; 442, 443, 444, 448, 450	1	Corroborated by the preceding lecture and workbook pp. 136-138; keep communication, cross-functionality, realistic dedication and stability together.

2026-11-02

Topic key / source segment IDs	Flags	Curated decision
agile-discipline-and-team-responsibility; 82	1	Occasional specialists are a resourcing example; retain coordination/access boundaries, not an absolute rule excluding specialists from a team.
scrum-sprint-duration; 159, 160	1	Use clear earlier November 2 sources 58-73; shortening cycles is a context-dependent improvement direction.
scrum-team-size; 161, 163	1	Use the instructor’s nine-or-fewer preference; note the workbook’s inconsistent upper-size wording rather than calling it a universal standard.
agile-resource-allocation; 164	1	Use clearer sources 91-95 and 112; aim for realistic dedication and reduced switching, not a universal rule that every sub-40% assignment is meaningless.
agile-definition-of-done; 98, 99, 100, 101	1	Use the explicit instructor readiness explanation 97-105, with role perspectives as illustrations.
team-colocation; 164	1	Use clearer sources 113-115; improve collaboration/co-location where feasible without asserting that all work must be in person.
agile-myths; 129, 130, 131, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141	3	Use clear instructor teaching 5-26 and workbook pp. 155-156 rather than relying on fragmented student review answers.

Topic key / source segment IDs	Flags	Curated decision
waterfall-myths; 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 152	4	Use the fuller earlier discussion and workbook pp. 156-157; omit unverified failure rates and avoid claiming all methods always take identical total time.
agile-adoption-challenges; 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158	2	Use the full teaching and workbook pp. 158-160. Reprioritization of unfinished work does not require discarding its value or prohibit large initiatives spanning sprints.
scenario-based-exam-questions; 202, 203	1	Keep explicitly tentative and historical; no claim to a verified current exam blueprint. Prioritize clear role/ceremony guidance at 199-200 and 207.

Preserved repairs and raw evidence

Reviewed topic imports are retained for October 21 batches 8 and 10, October 26 batches 2 and 4, and October 28 batch 5. They validate against the supplied file-import validator. In October 28 batch 5, claims tied to segments **199 and 200** were manually retained as genuine neighboring-context support. This does not assert that the stricter automatic-repair primary-scope safeguard accepted them. Those flags remain in the original topic output; later clearer passages also support the curated testing/feedback lesson.

Each dated output folder retains `session.json`, `classifications.json`, `topics.json`, `exam-emphasis.json`, the instruction transcript, draft guide and review queue, plus requests, accepted responses, original proposals and repair history under `analysis`. These files remain local provenance and are not automatically published as course pages. The website export contains the curated guides, practice and rehearsal material instead of raw classroom discussion.

Continuing the course

For a later recording, create its own correctly dated output folder, process only if its `session.json` is absent, and resume analysis with repair support as needed. Do not rerun processing over a completed session just to rebuild the website. After reviewing new material, update these source guides, the companion quiz fingerprint and any explicitly reviewed progress compatibility, then rebuild and preview before publishing.