

Final Project Reflection

Team AndChill

What Went Well

- **Task assignment for the final push.** We put a lot of thought into making sure features got developed smoothly, and we didn't step on each other's toes nearly as much as we did while we were building the MVP.
- **Design execution.** The final application is fairly similar to our original ideas in form and in function. We think it's easy-to-use, and we're happy with the job we did of putting it together.

What Could Have Been Improved

- **Communication.** We improved between the MVP and final, but we still had some key miscommunications. In addition, the progress of some group members was occasionally unclear, which led to undue stress.
- **Code review.** Early on in the project, some bad code slipped through the cracks, and this led to frightening moments of late night debugging. It seemed that occasionally, completely broken code got committed. This is easy to avoid by considering more carefully what is being committed and asking for code review.
- **Timing.** A lot of the work on the final was done towards the end of the period we had to do it (due to conflicting projects from other classes). As before, we finished everything on-time, but this created a lot of last-minute stress.

What We'd Change in the Future

- **Running tests.** Our test problems were discovered at the last minute, and we didn't have time on the last day to fix them fully. It would be nice to get the test suite working across all platforms.
- **Integrate banning features.** We have user ratings, so this would make our user network even more self-regulating.
- **Local movie data storage.** Right now, we have to hit an external API for movie data. Although we cache this in memory, several movie databases allow you to download all their data for free. Doing this would allow us to do more interesting queries more easily and speed up our application in the process.
- **Use a front-end framework for Chat.** Our current solution is fairly elegant, but trying to build our chat application with Angular or React might be interesting.

Peer Reviews

Arman

- Hugo
 - Hugo was, is, a great teammate, in 6.170 and in life. He was very helpful whenever I had questions and kept the team on track with due dates and assignments. He and John did a great job finishing up the movie suggestion system.
- John
 - Jooohny boi. John is a fine fellow and a talented programmer. He tackled many of our harder problems with ease and finesse. He was very good at keeping us on track to finish the project. He did a great job with the matching algorithm and chat interface.
- Rosemond
 - Rosemond, Rose, Rosé, Rosey. Whatever he goes by he was a great teammate. He was very willing to take on tasks and help out wherever he could. He really took control over the user rating and for that I'd give him 5 stars ;)

Hugo

- Arman
 - He did a great job with his assigned tasks. Exerting most of his influence on AndChill's UI, Arman really distinguished himself in this area as this is one of the most impressive features of our app, in my opinion. He was always easy to work with and offered help whenever he could. I would have liked for Arman to be more active during mentor meetings he mostly just sat there, looking mischievous.
- John
 - John remained the most active member on the team and extensively offered his expertise in all areas of the app. I often turned to him when I encountered tough bugs or had miscellaneous questions. He was a great team member however it would have been better for the development of the team's skills if he less often stole the wind from under our sails and volunteered for fewer tasks.
- Rosemond
 - Rosemond showed his true colors with the user rating feature, taking on this feature mostly on his own. He did a great job with it, and we all appreciated his initiative. I would have liked for him to be as ambitious in other areas of the app, but I'm still very happy to have been on the same team as him.

John

- Arman
 - Arman did a great job changing around our design and fixing up user profiles. He remained very reliable for code fixes and was happy to take tasks off other group members' hands. I was somewhat frustrated by his lack of responsiveness with regard to uploading meeting minutes.
- Hugo
 - For whatever reason, it seemed like Hugo didn't receive as much tasking this time around as he did last time (I think this was bad planning on the group's part and not a decrease in dedication). However, he performed well with all his assignments throughout the project and did a good job updating the Chop user interface. I particularly enjoyed showing him around the movie suggestion implementation because it showed me flaws in my documentation and explanations while allowing us to debug together. I expect greatness out of Hugo.
- Rosemond
 - Rosemond really owned the rating system – as far as I'm aware, nobody else touched the code for it. He did a great job, and it seems like our system works well. I really appreciated the initiative he took with it and his willingness to modify it after we discovered some problems with the initial version. He has been very willing to learn and work throughout this part of the project, and I think this has benefitted all of us.

Rosemond

- Arman
 - Arman was pivotal in the improved design of our overall website. He wasn't always around when we needed him at the moment, but he always made up for it by tackling many problems at once.
- Hugo
 - Hugo took on the movie suggestions with John. He was willing to learn the API involved, and was never afraid to ask for help. I was always able to count on him when I needed someone to review my code or check my logic. A plus teammate.
- John
 - Parsons was the bread and butter of the team. There seemed to be no problem that John couldn't handle. He took on movie suggestions with Hugo, and together they really nailed it. As a teammate, he was always willing to help and provide guidance when needed.