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Our group initially started as two groups, and then merged into one after we received our initial proposals. For the initial report, it was just Melody Cao and I and we distributed the work equally between the two of us. When we started working with Anastasia and Bonnie we continued that pattern. It was initially difficult because the four of us couldn’t find a time to meet that fit all of our schedules, but starting from the second meeting we had figured it out. I would say that we all contributed equally to the project, we consistently split up the work at each stage, worked on our parts individually on a Google doc that was shared between the four of us, and then we would meet up to discuss any developments or difficulties that we had encountered.

🡪 Distribution of work:

* Leen Hayek: 25%
* Yumeng Melody Cao: 25%
* Anastasia Konefal: 25%
* Bonnie Hawkins: 25%

I would say that there is a 3% uncertainty in the percentages shown above and I think that this was due to scheduling conflicts; some of us put in more work at the initial stages than the final stages and vice versa but I definitely think that the amount of work we put into evened out in general.

In our first meeting as the new group we just looked at topics we had in mind and the data sets we had found, I think that at this point Melody was more focused on the work pertaining to finding the data, while the rest of us worked more on writing the revised proposal. After Melody had looked experimented with the data and made sure that it all works out, we started the data cleaning process. In terms of data cleaning, each of us had to match up the hospital data with the patient survey data for one state, thus making up the four states we investigated in our project. Then while working on our technical report draft, we all pitched ideas and contributed equally to the topics we thought should be discussed as well as the r-code we should use. Once we had our variables set, our data cleaned, and the r-code for our model ready we divided the writing among the four of us; Bonnie worked on the introduction and discussion of variables, Anastasia worked on checking conditions, Melody worked on the model results, while I worked on the conclusion and limitations. This was the general division of the work for the presentation and the technical report. However, I think that I should note that while we did divide the work between ourselves we did continuously meet to go over each other’s parts in order to discuss and edit them as a group.

All in all I would say that we had a great group dynamic, I think that everyone was really hardworking and eager to put in the effort. For example, we set internal deadlines for our group and we all consistently met those deadlines. Similarly, everyone in our group really wanted to take on more and fully contribute to the project. Our team was very cooperative and everyone was open to discussing their parts and accepting pointers or suggestions from the other team members. I am honestly incredibly pleased with our project and the way we worked together as a group!