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**Evaluation of Team Providing You with Library:**

We were assigned as team 28, we were given code to work with by group 27. We gave code to group 20 so they could work with.

To note, we had to use a separate library provided by the TA to finish the project.

1. Communication: 5

The group was available at all times to address any issue we had with using the code provided by them. They were also very punctual on updating us to the status of their library. Thus a score of 5 was seen as a fair score to assign them for this section.

1. API Stage: 3

There was issue here on clarification of function use. The team was there to try and help address the problems we had, but this would be unable to help us. This would lead us to having to ask the TA to provide us with a library. This would lead the team to receive a score of 3 for this section.

1. Test Cases: 4

There code would have passed the test we provided to them, but unfortunately they did not have the catch.hpp file, which lead to them not being able to pass our tests. By the time they realized the issue the project was nearly over. Due to them just not realizing the need of the catch.hpp file we still felt that a score of 4 was fair.

1. Final Database Library: 3

There were issues with regards to the library. Use of the functions was still confusing especially with regards to the record section of the code. Then there was an issue of the query function that lead it to be unusable. This is another factor that lead us to have to use the library provided by the TA. A score of 3 was seemed as fair for this section.

1. Problem Handling: 4

They heard our complaints and tried to address the problems that popped up. However this was still unable to help us remove the problems we found. Since they were easily available and tried very much to fix the problems, we seemed it was fair to give them a score of 4 for this section.

**Team Evaluation Summary:**

To divide of the responsibilities consisted of us assigning ourselves the work we would do for the team. That member of the group would then be held responsible to finish the work for the project he assigned himself. Once the work has begun, if a member of the team found they were facing a problem, then they would have to get ahold of another member to help. The amount of work changed for a person based upon his ability to get his portion of the work done. Looking back we should have first found everyone’s level of skill with coding, and then assigned the workload to reflect that.

One of the major problems we faced was trying to use the database provided to us by the other team. Getting their functions to work during checkpoint 4 lead us to having to use a different library provided to us by the TA’s. Another problem we faced was with the making of the query class that we had to provide to group 20. The problem rose from the where statement of the argument. We were able to have the where argument be parsed and do the minor operations involved. The operations of and, or, and not was where our problem came from. We were unable to get these operations to work correctly.

Overall we have decided as a team that the grade multiplier for each member would be distributed based on a number of reasons. These reasons include how available they were to help out, amount of work they contributed, and their overall attitude during the project. Below is the distribution of the multipliers for each member:

Haden Elder: 1

Joseph Rangel: 1

Junho Lee: 1