Project Retrospective

AMOS WS2024/2025 – Project 4: Personalized Play

What Worked Well

This project was a great learning experience for all of us: Many team members got to work with new technologies like voice inputs and Genkit, which made it exciting to dive into a completely unfamiliar tech stack. It was also really valuable to see more experienced members supporting those who were newer to the field. Having clear project vision from the start made a huge difference - it helped us stay focused and build the application with a solid understanding of what we were aiming for. Working closely with our industry partner was a big plus; they were super helpful and always quick to respond. Our weekly meetings with them kept everyone on the same page and allowed us to get fast feedback whenever something was unclear, so we didn't lose time figuring things out on our own. For communication, Discord worked really well, especially with dedicated channels for different topics. This made it easy to have multiple discussions going at the same time without things getting messy. Another thing that worked well was assigning tasks right after team meetings, so developers could get started right away. Overall, the team size felt just right for the project - it was big enough to handle the workload but still small enough to stay organized and efficient.

What Didn't Work Well

Unfortunately, for most of the project, our team meetings didn't give us enough time to go through the different phases in enough detail. The timing wasn't ideal either - having them right after the morning lecture left everyone pretty drained, and the overlap with the lunch break didn't really help. At the beginning, having a faculty observer in our meetings who was also part of the industry partner felt a bit uncomfortable for some team members, especially during retrospectives, as they weren't sure they could be fully open. Big thanks to the chair for quickly adjusting this! In hindsight, we probably should have done some upfront research before jumping into development to avoid some hiccups along the way. Luckily, everything worked out in the end. We also realized along the way that our initial PR review process was a bit messy since tasks weren't assigned to specific reviewers, which led to some confusion. To make things more predictable, we started assigning reviewers when assigning tickets; still, it wasn't really transparent to us how the reviews are tracked or how they are factored into our grades. Another challenge was the workload for the Product Owners - they were putting in a ton of hours, but the effort didn't really feel fairly reflected in the 5 ECTS they received.