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Kyle was a good partner. He was very agreeable and easy to work with. It was easy to discuss what aspects of the project needed improvement and Kyle gave constructive comments.

In general, Kyle played more of a reviewer role in the project, but this was fine. Because we chose to build off of my version of the software package proposal, there was not a lot of footwork to be done, so it was good that Kyle played a reviewer role to help me decide what the best way to improve the project would be. I could then make additions/revisions to the project as we saw fit, and then as a partnership we could review the current version of the proposal.

The review-improve-review process served us well (as far as team interaction dynamics go), and hopefully, it worked to help us produce a quality software package proposal.

The following is a log, summarizing our activities as a partnership:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity Log .** | | | |
| **Date** | **Time** | **Duration** | **What was discussed/done** |
| 11/20/2013 | 12:00p | 20 minutes | A general discussion of what would be kept/discarded from each partners first draft of the project. |
| 11/21/2013 | 12:30p | 20 minutes | Further discussion of the final outcome of the project. More specific discussion of what form the final features of the project design proposal will take. |
| 11/25/2013 | 12:30p | 20 minutes | Evaluation of Terence’s draft to decide which sections needed improvement or what content would be added to sections that required improvement. |
| 12/3/2013 | 2:00p | 2 hours  30 minutes | Major work done. Public interface function listing table added. Error Handling section improved. Verbal discussion between both partners. |
| 12/4/2013 | 12:00 | 20 minutes | Continued discussion of final improvements over lunch. |
|  | 8:00 | 30 minutes | Final edits and communication via electronic media.  Both partners reviewed the document during the process. |

Kyle’s accomplishments were few, but notable. As mentioned previously, Kyle’s role was largely that of a reviewer, but there were specific parts of the proposal that were originally Kyle’s idea that I felt contributed meaningfully to the overall project.

Kyle contributed significantly in terms of the editing process. I don’t believe he believes that his review of the draft of the document was helpful, but I consider his edits very helpful. Very little of his mark-up was what I would consider extraneous. His edits to my draft of the package proposal definitely improved its quality.

The most notable of Kyle’s contributions as far as content was the inclusion of a public interface function list. Including such information in a table helped to make it very clear what a user should expect SparTrix to be able to do.

Kyle also suggested that SparTrix be able to report to the user easily computed, but significant matrix traits to the user, i.e. the user should have access to command SparTrix to compute the determinant of a matrix and SparTrix should be able to report the sparsity of a matrix. In the current version of the SparTrix proposal, we interpreted the sparsity coefficient of a matrix to be the ratio of significant elements of a matrix to the non-significant ones. These additions would allow a user to know a little more about their matrix, and perhaps be able to estimate how well SparTrix will perform when handling their matrices.

Kyle’s shortcomings were simple and relatively insignificant. Not that I was disappointed with Kyle’s performance, but I do feel that the project could have progressed better if he had brought more to the table, so to speak.

When deciding how to combine our projects to produce a quality final version, in comparing our individual drafts, it was clear that my draft was the better of the two, so we decided to work with it. Unfortunately, there was a lot of duplication of concepts/material between our drafts, so there wasn’t a lot to take from Kyle’s draft to bring to mine that was original or beneficial (other than what was mentioned previously). Had Kyle’s draft had more differing content, I think it would have made the process of improving the joint version even easier. However, if Kyle did produce a significantly different version, it could have made team interactions more difficult, so maybe it was all for the best.

Kyle perhaps could have been more proactive in the review process, but again, this may not have been a bad thing. I think he was not as ambitious to “fix what ain’t broke” as I was, which would have prevented from decreasing the quality of the project in an attempt to make it better. However, I do wonder if we could have produced a better proposal if Kyle had been more assertive in looking for weak points in the document.

Looking forward to hypothetical future versions of this project I have few recommendations.

First, I would recommend to Kyle that he be more assertive/proactive to have his own voice and content show through in the project more. While Kyle was a major contributor, I feel that most, if not all, of the content had to pass through my filter before finding its place in the proposal.

Second, if length limits are imposed on the proposal, I would recommend further review to condense the content of the proposal and keep only essential information. The information that is to be kept should be re-articulated, if necessary, to improve clarity.

I would also recommend that the instructor provide his evaluation of any drafts of the project in time for students to be able to take any suggestions the professor may have into consideration.

Otherwise, I would recommend just a simple, straightforward review of the entire document to ensure that SparTrix’ functionality is fully represented and no aspect of a software package design is neglected. Recommendations and future developments that pertain directly to the software package design are discussed in the proposal document.