The hardest part about working in a group was trying to figure out what to do. We spent about 20 minutes discussing our topic, before we decided on implementing a universal ATM locator. This was the first idea, but most of the discussion time was spent on how useful it was. Did we need it in NYC, our frame of reference? Banking apps did the same thing, so it might be redundant here. But people pointed out that in rural parts of the country, more people would be further away from an ATM and would need help locating one. So, this app we came up with would be designed for them.

Before we settled on an ATM, we thought of other devices that we could use instead. Since ATMs were so abundant, most people in the group figured that this app was obsolete and decided to give different suggestions. One of the ideas was an e-waste disposal idea. This was only considered for a few minutes, before the group went back to discussing ATMs. The most wildly discussed second option was a public bathroom locator. This was discussed mostly because most people had trouble finding a bathroom, whereas everyone could easily find an ATM. But the team settled on the ATM locator.

People contributed through texting or talking. Some people didn’t discuss their ideas or talk, which was fine, since we were mainly talking about what to do. Even with about seven people actively participating, the idea phase took a while. After the idea discussion we split into group to create the app. Instead of keeping it as one large group, we decided it would be best to split into four groups to implement the idea. This way, there would be enough people to work on an app, but not enough for everyone to get in each other’s way.

The four groups that people were split up into were client side, back end, front end, and dynamic UI. This allowed for each group to work on one specific part of the app and since we shared knowledge in Java, we would use that as our base. The client side would be used to filter index by distance, fees, and bank type. The back end would be cloud-based. The dynamic UI would allow users to search for their ATM a multiple of ways. This group structure allowed everyone to work dynamically and with little overlap. When working together, we would be able to perfect our code before putting it into one large program.

During the planning stages, I noticed that we didn’t write pseudocode to help us understand what program needed to do. Next time, it would be better to write pseudocode because it allows for better organization. We would be able to plan a few steps ahead and see what needed to be done beforehand and discuss the best way to approach the issue. Instead, we used vague guidelines of what we needed, and we worked off those guidelines. For most projects, writing pseudocode and being organized in what the group needs as a whole and individually would be what helps a group be more productive.

The group project was straightforward for the most part but could have been more streamlined. We didn’t have a leader and we mostly just differed to the people who talked the most. The planning part was mainly discussing what we were going to do, but not the steps on how to get there and the implementation. We didn’t even have a person who was going to put everyone’s work together into a working app. There could have been more preparations that went on so that this could have gone smoother. Like, for example, more pseudocode and an idea of what we actually wanted out app to look like. Even though we had some basic ideas, we didn’t have a full picture on what it would look like and how it would work. That was for each group to do come up with individually.