Team 74 Final Project Peer Evaluation (group consensus):

Overall our group worked pretty well together. We set several goals and worked hard to meet them. While we didn't have a great work flow, we managed to complete nearly all of our goals.

As a group we set reasonable expectations for what tasks we would complete and by when we would complete them. While the expectations were reasonable, we sometimes did not meet them because of procrastination and some features depending on the completion of others. We also had unanticipated problems with using libraries in the beginning.

We did not really communicate our skills to each other aside from deciding on who would do the front end implementation, but we picked the parts we wanted to implement based on our own strengths and preferences. We always let each other know about our time constraints and were able to work around them. It was difficult to find meeting times for all five of us, but we were able to make it work. Not all of us were there for the entirety of meetings, but we all catered to each others needs to make more time for the group. We had a few problems with some members being late and s a result we weren't as productive. However, everyone always managed to make it to the meetings.

Our group faced some social issues, but rather than communicating them to each other as often as we should have, we let it slide, which also reduced productivity. Several of these problems were due to not communicating that some parts were reliant on certain functions. Because we portioned our work largely by individually signing up to do portions of sprints, we did not notice until later that some members did not do as much as others. However, we still adapted to those behaviors and overall we were able to complete those features. Overall, we should have communicated more and made a clearer list of work because we had such a big group.

We had quite a few technical problems, such as finding the correct libraries to use and with deploying. This didn't put us in the best place for the first sprint, but we got most of the library-based functions to work by the second sprint. With deploying, we started early and were able to have our application deployed a week and a half before the presentation. It had a small problem, but when we tried to fix it last minute, the application wasn't completely functional anymore.

Overall, we should have been better at planning out our schedules and what we needed to do. With a team of this size, it was hard to know when things were done or supposed to be done. We should have paid more attention and communicated about dependencies on uncompleted parts because this made us much less productive. Nearing the end of the project especially, we should have communicated more because there were a lot of portions that we thought were already implemented, but were not fully.

Application Completion :

- Rahshel :

  Rahshel put a lot of work and time into our application. She ultimately ended up leading our group in a lot of the major parts of our application. When we were figuring out how we would use the different libraries, she helped a lot of our other members out, especially with pydub. She also deployed the application for the team, which ended up taking a lot of time because of the libraries and files we used. When she had completed her portions, she stayed to help the team with the uncompleted parts of the application. Overall, we all agreed that she put a lot of time into the application compared to the rest of the team.

- Jessica:

  Jessica spent a lot of effort and time on the application, especially with the front end. She also spent time looking for additions to the application, such as music visualization and wavesurfer. In the beginning of the project, she designed and coded all of the application except for the portions dependent on the backend. However, her style wasn't the best and was a bit difficult to navigate. This also reduced some of our productivity because we had to reorganize some of the templates. At the end of the project, she helped with implementing other unfinished work.

- Aalique:

  Aalique also put in a lot of work. When he was finished with his own work, he would often reach out to other members and help them if they needed it. This helped the group be more productive, especially in the group meetings. He was one of the few that fully implemented his portions from backend to frontend, which was one of the problems we ran into with other members.

- Jason:

  We agreed that Jason could have communicated more with the team. Until the last minute, he had not put in as much work with the project. At the end, we assumed that certain parts were working but in actuality he hadn't really tested them or created a basic template for their functionalities. While the written code did work in the end, we had to scramble to create a UI for those parts because the UI was dependent on how he implemented the functions. However, Jason did do quite a bit of work, especially with competitions. We wished that Jason could have done more because he has a lot of strength with the backend. He had to wait for several dependencies, but should have communicated more that he needed them. At the last minute he was able to get a lot of functions working quickly, but we could have been much more productive if it had been done earlier.

- Christtia:

  Christtia ultimately did not contribute much to the group. She was at all of our

project meetings, but the team did not notice until later in the project that she had not written as much as other members because of our sign-up system. At project meetings she did not end up working as much as other members. However, as a team, we should have communicated this to her instead of each just picking up more things to do. Because of our lack of communication, we were less productive, especially at the end of the project, because she spent time working on parts that we had already implemented.

*note: Rahshel's and Jessica's commits show up on github pulse but not on the graphs