INDIVIDUAL PEER REVIEW

Overall, Group One worked together well and produced a well-thought out and solid strategic plan for Jackson County Library Services. Each member of the team contributed their own ideas on how to help JCLS move forward and prevent another shutdown as had taken place in 2007. The whole team was passionate about the importance of Public Libraries and the need to foster lifelong learning for all members of a community and the need to have access to knowledge outside of private institutions.

Each of us was assigned different parts of each assignment to complete and add to a centralized working document on Google docs. Each of us read over the whole document and made comments that were then addressed by other members of the group. This worked out well and many people upon reading the finished product were able to see where the holes were and make suggestions or see where something didn’t work well and could be moved to a different area to bolster an argument. Also, each team member made suggestions to one another regarding the part of the project they were assigned to. If you had an idea that might work for that person’s area then you could make your comment and it would be added to that part of the document. This enabled all of the team to work together in executing a final assignment that all team members could agree upon.

That being said, the main problem was a breakdown in communication. The group utilized Blackboard Collaborate to chat in a private room. Initially, the first few weeks, this worked out well, but as time progressed, this form of communication proved to be difficult. Some group members didn’t turn up for group chat and didn’t send a
message saying they wouldn’t be able to attend. Another group member, who was not the group leader, tried to take over the role as such and dictate to the others what they should and shouldn’t be doing. Since we were using a group chat format, people were typing all at once and information was lost in the flow of the conversation. It was hard to read the whole chat as ideas and thoughts moved very fast. This method of communicating proved to be a disadvantage for Part 1. It was somewhat chaotic and unclear, once the individual work was done, how to edit and make final the document. There was no agreement as to what should be transplanted from an individual’s workspace into the general group document. This resulted in a difference in opinion as to what constitutes a rough draft. These glitches were fixed and the second part of the assignment ran a lot smoother.

**Individual Assessment**

SM – Kept the group on target with deadlines and provided structure. Posted weekly progress reports to our Group 1 canvas discussion board clearly stating what each person’s job was for the week. Very positive, gave good feedback, easy to communicate with, easy to reach via email.

RD – Our ‘go to’ person for JCLS who had lots of great ideas on the chats, lots of enthusiasm and a ‘can do’ attitude. Very generous, if you needed information, would make sure they found out the answer by asking their manager.

KG – Completed the Literature Review for Part 1 alone and did a fantastic job, came in ahead of schedule. He got the work done.
BF – One of our editors, along with EA, who proofread all of our material as well as adding an introduction for Part 1. When something was not as clear as it could be, would leave a detailed comment. Contributed to making the document read like it was written by one person and not a committee.

EA – This group member was meticulous with the editing process making sure ideas were well thought out and grammar was good. My interactions with them made me realize that it’s important to be clear as to what your intentions are and to make sure the other person understands those intentions so that there’s no ambiguity. Having worked with this person has made me a better team player.