Final Grade Reflection

Hannah Pawig

As of now, I have an understanding of almost all learning targets; I've only submitted late work during week 4, but every other assignment I've submitted on time. In Preview Activity 7, I demonstrated my ability to read in data of several formats (WD-1). In Lab 3's final task to find Justin Bieber in the hiphop data set, I showed my ability to select the most essential columns from the data set (WD-2), filter a data frame for different data types (WD-3), as well as my ability to write robust programs which are resistant to changes in inputs (R-3). For example, instead of filtering the data set by a *bieber* score equal to the specific max value in the data set (5 in this case), I instead used slice max to find the person that had the highest *bieber* score and also satisfied the other Bieber requirements; my code will always find the person who had the max *bieber* score (of the 17 to 23 year old white males who come from a town of 10,000 to 60,000) no matter the max score for that variable. Lab 3 questions 4 and 5 are examples of WD-4. In Challenge 4, I showed that I understand WD-5, DVS-1, and that I am able to find summaries of variables across multiple groups such as California metro regions (DVS-5). Lab 4 question 5 exemplifies WD-6, DVS-2, DVS-3, and DVS-4. Generally, Lab 4 also is professional looking document (R-1) with tidy and mostly concise code (R-2 & PE-1), where pipelines are as efficient as possible without separate pipelines for mutating joins or other things. Lab 4 is also where I showed evidence of understanding PE-3, where I only created new data sets that I know I would need in the future for graphs or joins with other data sets.

I've displayed a commitment to continued learning by always trying to find ways to revise my original thinking whenever given the chance, and finding alternative solutions that we may not have seen in class but doing my own research to give other methods a try on assignments. In my first attempt to revise a few questions from Lab 4 (found in lab 4 pre-revision.html), I did end up changing my methods to find the correct answers for questions 4 and 5; for 6, I found the differences in avocado prices by type using the match() function, which is beyond the scope of this course, so I earned a G on that problem. I believe this to be one instance where I extended my learning because I found an alternative way to calculate differences between rows. In my second revision of Lab 4, which I am submitting for this portfolio, I was able to find a way to use pivot_wider() for question to find differences in price between avocado types within each of the 4 California regions. In each of my revisions, my attached reflections were not a simple comment about me changing my code; I explained and intentionally reflected on my old and new thought processes.

In my group, I feel as though we collaborate in class often and are constantly looking out for each other's progress. Outside of class, each of us communicate in our group text chat in which we have many conversations about any and all of the course assignments. I came to class with all preview activities completed every Tuesday lecture (except when I was out sick for a couple weeks and couldn't attend in person meetings). I continuously have put the effort into helping my group mates and collaborating with them on assignments, in and out of the classroom. I have responded to peer feedback through my code projects after the given constructive criticism, like how I made sure to name all arguments so that it would be helpful when others read my code like Harshini had suggested (see peer_feedback.qmd). Every peer review I have given, I have put in all my effort to praise their code and nicely critique in a meaningful way; an example of my peer reviewing can be found in the giving_peer_feedback Quarto doc.