ITERATION 5 REPORT

The fifth and final iteration for this project was to be focused on prototype testing once the front-end and back-end codes had been integrated into the Django server. This crucial hurdle, however, could not be overcome due to unforeseen complications with the code needed to perform the call/get functions from the front end to properly implement the python code to access the SQL databases and algorithm function. At this point in the project it was obviously too late to attempt a different method for full-stack integration; this would ultimately result in a failure to meet the deadline with a functioning prototype.

As this is the final iteration I believe it is important to fully reflect on what all factored into these incomplete results. While formally it may be considered unprofessional to mention personal issues when working on a project such as this in the workplace, the main objective of this class is to understand the various aspects of software development projects and what to take into consideration when deciding on objectives and realistic expectations. The technical short-comings of this project have already been discussed in other documentation, so this document seems to be the best place to acknowledge the less measurable side of things.

The first personal issue this team dealt with was that of a lack of leadership. The first group leader, Lake, was unaware of the demands of the position he volunteered for and had other responsibilities that had more urgent deadlines than that of the group project. The resolution to this was decided to be that Adam would take on the role, which showed a good shift initially but ultimately he ran into a similar problem with addressing other responsibilities. Part of why the issue of leadership was deemed so pertinent was the lack of apparent involvement from other team members; it is unknown what work was being done and not shared, but at any given time for the first half of the project there were 2-3 members who were absent from group meetings and had no visible contributions made to the documentation. This caused a significant "storming" issue throughout most of the project as expectations fell on fewer shoulders, increasing the workload for those who were actively contributing.

The challenge I felt, as this group's second designated leader, was that of motivation. The graph of team motivation could likely resemble that of a roller coaster, loops and all. Certain team members were vocal with their frustrations, others needed several attempts at communication before becoming actively involved with the project. The approach for this issue consequently also impacted my own motivation; no group members were intentionally singled out or "scolded," but rather the goal was to make each member aware of how their contributions (or lack thereof) were significant in the overall success of the project. Ultimately, it is up to each individual to determine their level of interest and involvement so negative reinforcement is not likely a good motivator.

ITERATION 5 REPORT

In the end, though, group participation and motivation had shown a significant improvement and that, to me, is the biggest indicator of progress. Given a longer time with the team or another chance at attempting the program with the knowledge gained during this semester, I distinctly believe the team would produce a very impressive program, likely with several stretch goals accomplished as well as the finished product.