

Retrospective

Main Criteria

- Has the retrospective identified genuine problems with the team's policies and practices?
- What strategies has the team decided on to address any identified problems?
- Are those strategies likely to work?

Date	14/10/24
Attendees	Andrique, Gwyneth, Melissa, Jaemin, Shaun, Bernice
Retrospective Meeting minutes	Andrique Huang

What went well?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Due to the significant progress made in sprint 2, sprint 3 was much less rushed and overall members were less overwhelmed and had more time to work on different features. This gave us the opportunity to also work on the aesthetic look of the product.2. Using the feedback received from the first sprint as well as experience from the last 2 sprints, members had a clearer idea of how to document the process.3. Task documentation was a lot more clear. There was less overlap between different tasks, which was an issue that caused members to accidentally work on the same things in the last sprint. Because the task breakdown was much better written, members could efficiently contribute to the project.4. Git repository management was much more organised than the last sprints due to frequent pushing and well planned branch creation. This overall reduced the number of conflicts and made combining everyone's work much smoother.
-----------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>What could have been done better?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Due to balancing many other assessments, members struggled to attend meetings or complete their work at the same time as everyone else. Often members uploaded their work at late hours, resulting in less active collaboration. 2. Meeting times could also be more consistent or announced earlier before the proposed times. This often led to members being unable to attend due to other priorities. 3. More frequent communications during development of different features. Due to members being busy, there was less active communication in the primary channel, and members mainly communicated before or after features were implemented.
<p>What will we try next?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Members should organise casual collaborative development sessions during the day so that the work can be completed earlier, allowing for members to work on their other assessments at night. 2. Meeting times should be proposed and finalised at least 3 days before the date, allowing time for members to indicate if they are available or not. 3. Members should aim to provide more frequent communication for any small progress increments, not just for when pushes are made or large features are implemented.
<p>What questions do we have?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What further features could be implemented in order to elevate user experience? 2. How could we integrate disability support into our website?