

Process Evaluation

At our first meeting in the group we made the group contract. We discussed how we would like to distribute our work and what we should do to cooperate in the most successful way. Early in our process we also met with the company Prozone, which is the company providing us our data. Here we got information about their data, current tools, what they could be interested in and what they could offer us. It seemed very promising but unfortunately the process of getting the data was a long one. It took around a month to get access to the API, which of course was a challenge, because we did not know exactly what data we could get access to. We got some data from the beginning, but this was very limited. Because of that most of our visualisations are based on this test data, and scaled when we finally got access to more.

Because of the lack in data, we had focus on the theory the first weeks. We explored the theoretical materials by our own, and later on discussed them in the group. This has generally been the process of our work. Also when getting access to the API we could start to share knowledge about the data we could get. We have programmed our visualisations individually and helped each other to understand the programming languages. If one had problems we tried to solve these together. During the design process we also gave each other feedback on the specific visualisations.

At the midway seminar we had some ideas about what we would like to visualise, and had some base visualisations to show. There was some general structural feedback on our presentations, like missing slide numbers, slide titles and conclusion slide. We needed a greater theoretical knowledge too, so we would be able to answer any questions, and be able to explain every topic we mentioned. Lastly our supervisor emphasised the importance of using original graphics, which not all members did.

At one of our meetings we talked about which theoretical topics we would like to include in our report. Afterwards we delegate the different sections between us. In the end we read each others sections to check for spelling mistakes, typos but more importantly to agree on the theoretical content. Each member have written their own results section, and contributed to the discussion and conclusion section from this. We agreed on when to be finished with the theory sections, but this deadline was not respected by most of the group members. This meant that the last week has been somewhat stressful for some group members.

Generally the group have met a couple of times a week, to discuss progress and theory. We evaluated how long we had come, and what the next step was. We met once a week with our supervisor to get feedback on our work. The group meetings have typically been placed before and after each meeting with our supervisor, to respectively discuss what our agenda to the supervisor meeting should be, and what we should do next based on the feedback from our supervisor. At almost every group meeting every member was present, and most of the time arriving on time. We have generally given members who was late a few minutes before we starting the meeting.

We have had no major conflicts, only small disagreements with our supervisor about what we thought the project should be about, and which topics we should include. Our supervisor wanted us to include some machine learning, which we thought was a bit off topic. In the end we decided not to include it. The group have worked together in mutual respect for each other, no conflicts have risen.

We had given a time line over the project but have had big problems following this, because of the late data arrival. A lot of time has also been wasted on email correspondence with Prozone concerning the data. This also means that the process has been somewhat

even more compressed and pushed to the end.

Concerning the mandatory L^AT_EX and library courses we have the following comments. The library course was informative, and gave us some knowledge of where to find materials and what to use. We had already plenty of materials, so we have not used the knowledge much. The L^AT_EX courses was not so informative, because we already where used to writing in L^AT_EX, only few informations where valuable for us. The course about poster creation in L^AT_EX was not useful at all. A few examples was explained, and the we could begin to make our posters, and the instructor could help us. The structure would be great if the course had been later in the process, we did not begin creation of the poster because we was not ready for it.

When having to evaluate the process it is our opinion that we should have been working even more together in the same room discussing our temporary results and discoveries. In the last couple of weeks we worked more intensively together, which gave great results, and which showed new opportunities which we could have followed if we had hat the time. We think it worked to study the theory individually and then talk about it, if we had any doubts, but once again it could have been a great idea, maybe to study different parts of theory and then explain it to the others. In this way we could have covered a larger field without having to individually read it all by our self. This would also be a great way to practise explaining the theory for others. In relation to the deadlines not being respected, we should have been more honest with each other, and talked about the why this was the case. We should earlier in the project have made deadlines for bringing concrete visualisations, so we was more on the same level in the process and could have improved our visualisations even further. If we had done these things we might even had enough time to expand the project into machine learning.