FEED Pulse

Hila, Renis R.

Checkpoint 9 Meeting with Robbert 30-10-2025

Hila, Renis R. 3 days ago

Today, I spoke with Mr. Robbert regarding my search for an internship for the next semester. I showed him my CV and the applications I have already sent, explaining that I have unfortunately not been successful in finding an internship so far. I asked for his advice and guidance, as well as possible referrals to companies or university research teams where I could apply. I also mentioned that I am quite worried, since I cannot swap semesters again (having already done so once before) and, as an international student, I pay a significantly higher tuition fee.

Mr. Robbert gave several helpful suggestions. First, he recommended that I attend the Career Day on November 6th, as many companies and research teams will be present there. He advised me to research in advance which teams or organizations will attend and understand what kind of profiles they are looking for.

Secondly, he encouraged me to personally contact the companies I am applying to — by calling or sending messages — to ask questions and express genuine interest. He explained that even if some companies do not respond positively or end the call, I should not get discouraged. Instead, I should keep trying and reach out to other companies, as this approach demonstrates initiative, persistence, and motivation, helping me stand out from other applicants rather than being just an anonymous name in their inbox.

Lastly, he advised me to take time to understand myself better — to recognize my strengths and weaknesses — so I can find a balance and better align my internship search with positions that fit my profile.

Write a summary of what you discussed with your teacher...

Post feedback

Checkpoint 9 Meeting with Robbert 30-10-2025

Checkpoint 8 Week8: Xuemei 29-10-2025 🔒   ☹

Hila, Renis R. 4 days ago

Today, I received feedback from Ms. Xuemei regarding my individual project progress.

First, she asked to review my architecture document, where I showed the C1, C2, and C3 diagrams. I mentioned that I have not done the C4 diagram. Ms. Xuemei explained that to address the "replay of user stories" mentioned by Ms. Maja, I should create a sequence diagram or flowchart for one of the services and it can be used as a C4. I also mention that the C2 diagram needs to be updated to include Kafka messaging, to make the communication flow clearer.

Next, I presented the technology justification section, in which I explain the technologies I selected and the reasoning behind each choice. Ms. Xuemei suggested that I could further strengthen this section by linking it to the Data Distribution learning outcome—specifically by explaining which data is stored in each database and why.

I also demonstrated my implemented user stories(demo), showing the login functionality for different roles (doctor, admin, and patient). I mentioned that there are still some bugs in the implementation, which I plan to fix later—not for the upcoming November 2nd delivery, but afterward. For this delivery, I will mainly focus on testing, including unit tests, end-to-end tests, load tests and ci/cd.

Initially, I planned to use SonarCloud for code quality checks when pushing to the cloud, but Ms. Xuemei suggested I can use SonarQube locally and present that instead.

We also discussed that while I have made progress, I am still behind on certain learning outcomes, particularly Security and Data Distribution. I asked what can i do more to in these show in these learning outcome. She advised me like with Architecture document to include the Data Distribution, to create documentation explaining GDPR compliance and a CIA (Confidentiality, Integrity, Availability) analysis of the system.

These were very helpful and practical suggestions. For the upcoming delivery, I will focus on:

1)Writing the Security & GDPR documentation

2)Updating the C2 diagram to include Kafka messaging

3)Creating a sequence diagram for the user story replay

4)Implementing and demonstrating testing and CI/CD pipeline improvements

Pu, Xuemei X. (Teacher) 4 days ago

Dear Renis,
Good summary. try to catch up. Keep up.

Checkpoint 7 W7 - Maja 22-10-2025 🔒

Pesic, Maja M. (Teacher) 11 days ago

Dear Renis,

you seem to have implemented many user stories, but you cannot demo them due to some strange error. Please make sure that you can demo what you have implemented during the next meeting. And continue with working forward.

Regards,
Maja

Checkpoint 6 X6: 1st portfolio review 08-10-2025 🔒

Hila, Renis R. 25 days ago

Today, I reviewed my first portfolio delivery with Ms. Xuemei. I began by showing the documents included under each deliverable category in the Deliverables Portfolio (e.g., Analyse, Design, Advise, etc.). The current portfolio structure follows the format previously suggested by Mr. Robbert.

Ms. Xuemei advised me to reorganize the documents according to the HBO-I domain description guidelines.

Next, I presented the Project Overview Portfolio, which contains individual sections for each learning outcome. For each learning outcome, I included the documents that best demonstrate my achievement and provided a self-assessment grade. I also showed my CI/CD setup, which currently fails but will be fixed in the next iteration. Additionally, I presented the Docker setup, where I tested if the containers could run properly on my device. My plan is to have each service running in its own Docker container, and they are all inside a larger "master" container that manages them under the same network.

I rated myself as Orienting for Cloud Native, Security by Design, and Distributed Data, and Beginning for the remaining learning outcomes—based on the grading scale presented by Mr. Robbert.

Ms. Xuemei provided feedback on these self-assessments and explained the meaning of each grade. She also mentioned an additional grade, Undefined, which applies when there is insufficient supporting evidence. Since I currently lack concrete proof for Cloud Native, Security by Design, and Distributed Data, these will be marked as Undefined, while the remaining learning outcomes will stay at the Orienting level.

Pu, Xuemei X. (Teacher) 24 days ago

Dear Renis,

Try to create a catch-up plan — you'll need to increase your pace to stay on track.

Checkpoint 5 M5 - Maja 29-09-2025 🔒

Hila, Renis R. a month ago

Today I presented my progress to Ms. Maja: the user stories, the architecture document (C4 diagrams), and the initial frontend prototype (UI only, not yet connected to the backend).

I explained that I created 12 user stories and plan to implement 5 that best demonstrate the learning outcomes. Ms. Maja approved these choices.

On non-functional requirements, we discussed data deletion for patients. She suggested three options: permanently delete all patient data, anonymize the patient while retaining records, or mark the patient as inactive while keeping data accessible. She advised me to research more for each approach.

Regarding availability and deployment, Ms. Maja noted that the app must consider global use (not just NL) so availability windows should not be limited to local business hours. For maintenance and uptime she recommended using Kubernetes (scalable pods) and gradual deployments (e.g., canary or phased rollouts of v1 → v2) rather than announcing downtime.

For the architecture she recommended renaming the "messaging service" to notification service (to avoid confusion with messaging brokers like Kafka) and using multiple databases so each service owns its data store—this reduces the risk of a single database becoming a bottleneck. She asked me to review and revise the C4 diagrams and reconsider the design based on these points.

When I showed the frontend mockups, Ms. Maja advised a step-by-step approach: start with a minimal demo (a "hello world"), then incrementally add features and integrations. She also recommended setting up proper Git repositories and a CI/CD pipeline. I explained my preference for separate repositories per service to simplify testing and deployments.

Overall, the feedback was constructive: focus on clarifying NFRs with specific, research-backed decisions, revise the architecture and C4 diagrams accordingly, and proceed incrementally with implementation and deployment automation.

Checkpoint 4 W4: update (xuemei) 25-09-2025 🔒 ☺

Hila, Renis R. a month ago

Today, I presented the progress of my individual assignment to Ms. Xuemei, requested her feedback, and asked several questions regarding the user stories and the architecture doucment.

User Stories:
I created a total of 12 user stories, of which I plan to implement 5 that best demonstrate the learning outcomes. Ms. Xuemei agreed with this approach but advised me to also consult with Ms. Maja for her approval.

Non-Functional Requirements (NFRs):
I asked whether NFRs should be included in the user stories. My initial thought was that they should only be placed in the architecture document (e.g., number of users should be handled , security, etc.). However, she clarified that NFRs should be included both in the user stories , and that the architecture document should also clearly explain why I chose certain technologies and designs.

C Diagrams:
I asked which C-diagrams are required. She confirmed that C1 and C2 are mandatory, and for C3, I should create one for one of the services. I admitted that my diagrams are not yet ready but will be finished today or tomorrow at the latest. I asked if I should send them to her, but she said it is not necessary; instead, I should present them next week to Ms. Maja for feedback.

General Feedback:
Ms. Xuemei emphasized that I am currently behind schedule and need to speed up my progress to stay on track.

Pu, Xuemei X. (Teacher) a month ago
Keep going

Checkpoint 3 M4 - Maja 22-09-2025 🔒

Pesic, Maja M. (Teacher) a month ago

You are behind with progress. It is now week 4 and you still did not make requirements (functional and non-functional) and architecture design. Please speed up!

Checkpoint 2 1st meeting with Robbert 22-09-2025 🔒   ☺

Hila, Renis R. a month ago

Today, I had my first meeting with Mr. Robbert, where we discussed my experiences at Fontys, the previous semesters, my internship, and my goals for the future.

I began by explaining the reasons why I had to repeat the first and second semesters. In the first semester, I became very ill and was unable to study for the final exam, which caused me to fail. In the second semester, I regularly received positive feedback from my teacher, but during the final presentation, I was told I was missing important elements. I disagreed with this, contacted the exam board, but unfortunately received a response too late—only a few days before the new semester started. As a result, I repeated the semester and continued after discussing it with my parents. In that repetition, I mainly did the same project again, only changing small details such as the colors of the website. After these two semesters, however, I managed to pass all the following semesters without repeating.

Mr. Robbert asked me what I had learned from these experiences. I explained that I no longer stress too much about failing or passing and that I now focus less on small details. I also learned the importance of writing detailed and descriptive feedback to properly document my work—an advice I received both in the second semester and again today from him.

We then continued with other semesters. During my specialization in Cyber Security, I enjoyed learning new things and practicing "out of the box" thinking—trying different ways to break programs and, if I couldn't, recognizing that the program was well built. The only downside was the large amount of documentation. For my minor at Pulse, I had a very different experience compared to programming. For example, my group designed a fork adapted for a paralyzed person, which she later sent us a photo of her using. It was rewarding to do something meaningful. During the minor, I also learned how to deal better with stress and how to reflect on what pushes me forward or holds me back, with valuable input from both coaches and fellow students.

For my internship, I was unable to find a company outside Fontys, but I was fortunate to do my internship here. I had a very supportive company coach who was always available, and I also got the chance to visit the partner company every two weeks, which gave me insight into how Dutch companies operate. This experience taught me a lot about communication, especially with managers, how to give better presentations, and how to create better documentation. Again, Mr. Robbert emphasized the importance of documentation, as it is proof of the agreements and work done during the

internship.

Finally, we discussed my upcoming graduation internship and future plans. I explained that I am already searching via LinkedIn and through companies where my friends work, and I also asked if doing the internship in Albania would be possible, to which he said yes. He asked about my future plans— whether I want to stay in the Netherlands or move back home. I told him I am still undecided, as I want to gain more experience abroad and also earn better financially before making that decision. He advised me not to show this indecision during interviews, as companies often see graduation internships as a way to evaluate candidates for future employment. If I appear uncertain, they may choose someone else. He also advised me to look for a company that will help me grow, stay updated, and learn, rather than one that only offers quick money or sees me as a workhorse.

Checkpoint 1 W2: IP pitching (Xuemei) 10-09-2025 🔒   ☺

Hila, Renis R. 2 months ago

I presented my individual project idea HealthConnect to the teacher. I explained the purpose of the web application, its main functionalities for patients and doctors/admins, the challenges that make it suitable for Complex Software Systems, and my initial architecture choices. The teacher gave positive feedback but suggested a few improvements: to explore a messaging-based architecture instead of only relying on REST APIs, to include the pharmacy as an additional stakeholder with its own use case, and to separate the doctor and admin functionalities more clearly. Overall, the idea was considered good, with room for refinement and expansion.