**Team Name: Oli-zza**

Members:

Keith Hollenkamp (khollen2)

Kaiyang Hu (kaiyang3)

Chunzi Pan (chunzip2)

Yi Sun (yisun5)

Our main goal with this visualization was to present the information as simply and cleanly as possible. With that in mind, we worked to create plots and graphs that met the project criteria, allowed us to be creative, and tested our coding skills. We also wanted group members to be able to gain the experiences that they desired and to participate in ways that enhanced their learning. For colors, we didn’t want things to be boring and drab, so we picked a color palette that was made everybody happy.

For Part 1, we mostly focused on getting all of the coding right and used the project criteria to influence positioning and overall look. We made sure that everything was clearly labeled and that the colors weren’t boring. A big thank you to Professor Turk for helping us figure out how to speed up the loading times on the line graph.

For Part 3, we again wanted to present everything cleanly and simply. We also wanted to utilize the tool tips as effectively as possible. We initially thought we would put the normalized data (we used State Population) as extra rows in the tool tip, but then we decided to add them as separate drop down options so they could be plotted as well.. In terms of data for Part 3, our approach was to create multiple tables from the original data source by using the pivot function.

**Strengths**

Our graphs respond quickly and we’re a big fan of the colors. We were very pleased that we figured out how to move the labels on all of the graphs so that they weren’t interfering with the visualizations. By using the pivot function in Part 3, loading and using the data was faster, which aided in creating the visualizations.

In Part 1, we like our layout and the overall look of the visualization and are very please at how quickly the data runs.

The infographic is charming.

**Weakness**

Without initial knowledge of what is going on in the plots, it is difficult to understand what is happening. The plot of the USA in Part 1 also is a bit cluttered, but with that many stations it is understandable.

In Part 3, a big weakness is that the states you click stay highlighted until you click it again. So if you click California and then Illinois, both will be highlighted. The correct information shows up in the line plot though.

Graphic design isn’t our strong suit, and it shows in the infographic.

**What We Wish We Could’ve Done**

We wish we could’ve done Part 2 and added the audio clip to Part 1. The group was very interested in these two aspects, but we ended up not having the time to complete these.

We really wanted to add some animations to the visualizations, but we knew that we would not be able to figure that out in time.

**Who Contributed What**

While we all contributed to problem solving and discussion of logic, Kaiyang took on the brunt of the actual coding work. At one point we were all sitting around a TV that Kaiyang plugged his laptop into eating pizza, playing with Keith’s dog Oliver, problem solving, researching solutions, and offering suggestions as Kaiyang typed away.

For Part 1, Keith produced the map, Chunzi produced the Spectrogram, and then the tagteam of Yi and Kaiyang figured out the plot arrangement and the line plot.

For Part 3, it was all hands on deck for most of it. Again Kaiyang ended up doing most of the actual coding, but every member of the team contributed a good amount. Kaiyang took the lead on cleaning and creating the data tables and Chunzi worked on extracting the years from the dates. We all then worked on putting all the pieces together and getting those darn FIPS to work correctly.

Most of the report and the infographic was created by Keith, and it shows.