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**Introduction to Programming**

**Individual Report**

**Date set:** Friday 2/11/2018 **Date to be handed in**: Friday 14/12/2018 **Time:** Before 5pm

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Group Number: | **3** |

Make sure % contribution add up to 100%

|  |
| --- |
| Your name: Josh Mattingley Your % contribution: 35%  Your role: Programmer & Admin.  Your contribution:  My contribution to the team was to be a programmer, this job included writing question 2 and the majority  Of question 1, following on from Henry. However, as an admin I also has to arrange the team and suggest  roles within the team and keep the operation going smoothly by ensuring everyone is happy with their  jobs. Another admin role I fulfilled was to set up the GitHub and maintain the code within one place, I  also ensured everyone was happy on how to submit their files to the GitHub which ended up working very  well.  As part of the group I also made some little additions to question 4 and some other smaller contributions  To other members’ jobs whenever they needed help.  Overall, I think we all performed well and to the best of our mixed abilities. In particular I think that Chris  And Henry surprised the group with their code they had produced and contributed to the coursework  Considering they find this subject challenging. |
| Name 2: Chris Barrell % contribution: 20%  Role: Programmer, Tester  Contribution:  Chris’ contribution in the coursework was to be a programmer and a checker. The main contribution as a programmer was to write question 3, in my opinion the question was a challenge as it had to use lots of arrays and loop structures. The most impressive thing about Chris in this case was the fact that he got on and completed the question with no questions asked making his integration with the coursework very smooth from my point of view as the admin. He had no issues, bar a few to which we discussed and got over them, but he did all of the work himself after some of my leading comments.  As I did not write the code, I spoke with Chris to see what he found challenging, what he is proud of and how he had overcome those issues. His main points were that his code was free of any clutter, he liked the idea that his code is all kept neat and held within arrays and loops which I agree with.  His first draft of the question 3 was pretty cluttered so I checked through his code and picked up on some areas to which he could improve upon, such as creating another loop to add values to an array, this was a challenging task as the spaces in the array that needed filling were not sequential, meaning he needed to implement a work around for this to work which he successfully implemented after my suggestion.  Overall, I believe that Chris’ work within this coursework was of a high standard and helped the group proceed with the coursework given his overall contribution to each question that were facing. |
| Name 3: Freddie Thomson % contribution: 25%  Role: Programmer, Time Manager  Contribution:  Freddie’s contribution to the group was to be a programmer and to also be a time manager to make sure that every-one was doing their work on time according to our plan. Fred’s main role as a programmer included him writing question 2 and question 4. Question 2 was written first by Fred to which was then started from scratch by me as the code was very messy. The question functioned correctly so there was no actual problem with the code, it just lacked any mastery in some pretty obvious places where a mastery could be demonstrated, for example there were no loops in use to fill any arrays which made the code unnecessarily long and the code was not segmented in a way that makes the code easier to read.  His question 4 also functions correctly, however this time the code showed more mastery in terms of his knowledge of C++. The code…  His job as a time manager however, was very short lived. Fred didn’t have much awareness of what was going on throughout the coursework and therefore he couldn’t really fulfil his job as time manager. I sort of took on this role naturally as the admin of the group which wasn’t much big deal as it worked out fine in the end. |
| Name 4: Henry Stratton % contribution: 20%  Role: Programmer  Contribution:  Henry’s contribution to the group has been to write question 1. Henry wanted to start the coursework off, so we let him start the first question. His first question was functional but had shown little mastery of the code. After Henry had written the code, I took the code from him and shortened the code just to make it neater and more compact.  Henry admits to his lesser understanding of programming to which all the members of the group helped to push henry in the correct direction considering his skill set. Henry tried his best which as the admin, I appreciated as he insisted, he makes a contribution of a considerable size, which he did.  Overall, Henry’s contribution to the group was welcome, however a bit short lived as the contribution past the first question was lacking, despite this he still did the best he could in all aspects of this project. |
| Name 5: N/A % contribution: 0%  Role:  Contribution: |
| Name 6: N/A % contribution: 0%  Role:  Contribution: |
| Any further comments: |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Signature: | ID Number: | Date: |