

The work I did is already listed in the peer-evaluate statement for our team. I would like to mention that I wrote all the templates, JavaScripts, and views functions for the pair-hangout feature from scratch. The group-hangout feature implemented by my teammates were all based on my code with some minor changes.

In our team project, although we have an owner for each sprint, I acted as a leader to coordinate most team meetings and task assignments, and helped my teammates when they have troubles while working on the project. Therefore, I participated in almost everything in the project. I also taught my teammates how to use Git in a proper manner since they are not experienced, and using Git in a team project is very different from the homework assignments because there might be many conflicts.

Some Explanations about the project on the feedbacks we got from the final demo:

I think the feedback we got from the final demo was not good and frustrated me, mentioning that our project was "simple" and "buggy". I would to explain about our project a bit because I think I did a lot of work for the project.

For "simple", I do agree that the logic of our website is simple, but the work was not little. The number of templates we used was more than twice as many as the individual homework, and most of them correspond to a JavaScript file, which takes much more time than simple templates rendered by Django. And we spend a lot of time designing the UI, and tried different styles. I know it would be much easier to just use one set of templates from the internet, but we tried different ones and designed our own, which took a lot of time.

One other thing was that our group-event and pair-event functions were pretty similar, and therefore the code was redundant. I would choose only one of them if I'd do this project again, but we did both. I know the duplicated work was not worth it but each page in an event need to be implemented twice, and we could not just copy and paste because there were some subtle differences that we need to take time to think about and design. This also took us time.

We spend too much time on the redundant work and was not able to thoughtfully design the navigation and responds when people like back others and go to recommendation page. And I think that is the biggest reason the professor and the TAs were not satisfied in the final demo. I do agree the navigations was poor for those pages, but the functionalities were implemented. It frustrated me when the professor said our project was pretty simple because I spend about 80-90 hours on it. A lot of work was replaced and could not be seen.

As for "buggy", I don't think we have big bugs except for the chat-box. I think the main reason the professor thought it was buggy was because the navigation to the recommendation page was not clear and there as not popup info to guide you, but those are not bugs, but design problems (we did not have time to implement). Another potential "bug" the professor mentioned where passing the parameters in the URL, but what we did was to just write the

parameters in the URL to a form, and we are doing form validations, so manually changing the URL with malformed info won't crash our site. As for what Wellington mentioned, about the inconsistent try - except's we used. We deliberately thought about where we should or should not use them. And the reason we did that was for malformed JavaScript requests, which was not necessary if users use our site normally. But we still did that and performed tests to make sure our site never crashes (give 500 internal error). If you test, I believe you'll find the same.

That's what I need to say. I just want to explain that our project was not that simple and buggy. And I'm really sorry for the poor navigation UX designs, which made you feel the site was buggy.