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**Team Project: Individual Assessment**

Overall, my team experience started extremely slow, but worked out a lot better in the end. Since the two of us were never on-campus at the same time, it was a challenge to collaborate. With the third team member dropping the class and not notifying us until the first project due date, we had a few issues. William and I picked up the slack and I would say that I think we worked a roughly equal amount. However, in terms of effort, I would say I had put in considerably more. If I were to weight our performance scores, with me as a reference, I would rate William 1-2 points lower. In terms of raw performance and not effort, I would say I performed at 90% of what is expected for this course and William performed at around 80%.

In terms of my involvement, I focused mostly on the visuals and the research. I would help William with the formal explanations for each section of the project, but much of my work was created from a prototype developed by William. For instance, William would list requirements on what he would want to see in the project, and I would design it (since I have a moderate graphic design and project management background). However, our motivations for the prototype (how we would implement and design it) was based off my ideas since I had prior research from my psychology classes and my Air Force ROTC experience as a trainer, to understand how morale works between different people. I did all the diagrams and the second iteration of the prototype in their entirety. We started extremely technical and I did a lot of this area. I created the state transition diagrams and the pseudocode for the project and explained it to William so he would understand it the same way I did. He would summarize the project and identify areas for development and the functional/non-functional requirements. I would then proofread many of the explanations and rewrite it from a technical standpoint. In terms of the final presentation, William was having difficulty tying sections back to the topics in the class, so I rewrote the presentation and arrived an hour early to rehearse with William. We both tried to tie everything back to the class in a formal way.

As for what I learned in this project, I found a few things to live by:

1. *Things will go wrong at the least convenient time.*

When we were presenting our prototype, my online copy lagged behind my ddesktop copy and I couldn’t go back to change it. I learned that you should probably test something once, if not at least three times before actually submitting it for review.

1. *Scheduling tasks is a good idea.*

When we were working on the project, we sort of just worked on things as we got to them. Having things scheduled creates organization and requires less effort to go back and change thing in the project because your idea about how to make it work changed during the time you write the project.

1. *Aesthetics is almost as important as functionality*

Our first iteration of our prototype worked – well. It had all, if not more functionality than the final model, but it looked like it was drawn in MS Paint. When working with the prototype, I didn’t get the “feel” that I thought I should get with a fully functioning system – it felt lacking and like a sort of patchwork model. When we ported the prototype to our most recent iteration, I realized this lesson.

In summary, both William and I worked a considerable amount on this project. Although I did a lot more in terms of effort, time, and substance, I could not have completed the project without William. As for what I learned, there are some many things (too long for this report) that are not taught, but learned through experience and testing, which I think is where the value of the class comes from.