

CIS 4250 – Software Design V
Instructor: Prof. S. Scott
Individual Accountability Report (IAR) Template

Note. Refer to the Project Manual for detailed instructions for IAR submissions.

Individual Accountability Report (IAR) Template

The following questions **MUST** be included and answered completely for each submitted IAR.

IAR must be submitted one of the following file formats: text or PDF.

Q1. Student Name: Emily Kozatchiner

Q2. Student ID: 1149665

Q3. Associated Team Deliverable: Initial System Design and Product Backlog Creation

Q4. Team #: Group 5, Section 2

Q5. What were the main technical or methodological knowledge, skills and/or abilities (KSAs) that were required to complete this team deliverable? What prior courses or experiences (e.g. co-op, group project, etc.) from your Software Engineering degree did you draw on for these KSAs? (bulleted list is preferred):

- Knowing how to construct a base class diagram is a prerequisite skill that was learned from CIS*3750. Use case construction, used in user story creation, was also learned in CIS*3750, as well as CIS*4150.
- Reverse engineering a code base was required to complete the class diagram and analyze the existing code base. I believe this skill was learned when having to understand new code stacks for my internships, as well as in CIS*3260, where we had to reverse engineer another group's game and build a new class/sequence diagram.
- Knowing how to make issues and tasks under gitlab, and appropriate story point allocation per sprint was a skill necessary to construct well-balanced issues/stories. The following was originally learned from CIS*3760, where we assigned weights to stories during our sprints in the course.

Q6. What was your existing level of experience with these topics/skills before your team began working on this deliverable? (1-2 sentences):

I had a high level of confidence with all the skills I described above, and felt comfortable doing so because they are necessary skills in the workforce that many software developers are comfortable with.

Q7. Comment on your individual KSAs learning during this deliverable, and what additional learning may be needed to understand or be more competent with these topics / tasks in the future?

I believe I improved my skill on writing professional reports/documents, and giving more context to details that needed to be explained. I believe this is a valuable skill to have going forward in my professional career, and I plan to keep improving on it. I believe I also developed my analytical skills in relation to application improvement and code analysis.

An additional learning of mine would be estimation of story points and how much we are able to accomplish over these four sprints. I am not confident that I was able to accurately estimate stories and not have too big or too small of a feature to develop and work with. I believe that over the next few sprints, I will learn to be more competent with estimation.

Q8. What specific contributions did you make to this team deliverable? This should include technical or project management contributions.

- I had a high contribution to mapping the class diagram to reflect the system accurately, and had multiple suggestions on class communication. Multiple conversations on how we could rework the system and analysis on what is negative with the system.
- Low contribution originally to the Initial Design System, very slight contribution to the information added or carried over from the application proposal. However, during revisions I contributed a great deal to adding more detail to the Initial and Proposed Design System, as well as giving context to certain classes and our analysis.
- My contribution to the user stories was split evenly to everyone else's. I wrote up user stories for my chosen features and bugs, and put associated weightings temporarily. We would then analyze if we agreed with the weightings as a group.
- Lastly, I believe I contributed with discussion of possible new features to add for future sprints, how we can split up the stories to be more digestible, and what to be higher and lower priority.

Q9. With whom did you collaborate for any of the above contributions (be specific – saying “all team members” is not sufficient. State which parts you worked on with whom)?

I believe I had a high collaboration and contribution with Jen while analyzing the code base and figuring out how to structure our class diagram. There were a lot of clashing ideas on how to build the classes to make them reflect the codebase within discussions, but we collaborated on finding a solution.

Ben and I collaborated on defining the FilterManager class in the diagram, and splitting it from the TaskManager class. I analyzed the code and found the appropriate class attributes to attach, as well as appropriate functionalities, and had a discussion with Ben on what he thought about them. I then handed it off for him to construct the class box in the diagram, and add to it.

Jen, Sara, and I collaborated on contribution to the analysis (section 4.0 of the document). We had time to analyze the diagram and put our findings down after a lab section.

For constructing user stories and weightings, I believe we all collaborated equally. This is because we had assigned an amount of user stories for everyone to complete, and went through assigning weightings all together throughout a lab section. It would have been ineffective for everyone to not participate.

Finally, a big amount of revisions to the document after Professor Stacey's suggestions were collaborated on by Jen, Ben, Jeremy, and I. Sara had completed a lot of work, so we owed it to her to complete all revisions.

- Jeremy worked on the rewriting usage scenarios and completing analysis on the function diagram.
- I reworked section 1.0, 2.0 (Initial and Proposed Design system), and added detail to 3.0 and 4.0 (Class diagram and Analysis).
- Jen added detail to section 5.0 (Design Recommendations) and expanded on the class descriptions.
- Ben worked on section 2.0 and collaborated on section 5.0 with Jen.

Q10. Comment on how well you managed your time over the time period allocated in the Course timetable to this team deliverable (i.e. the time between the prior team deliverable to this team deliverable).

We were very constructive in our time management throughout the sprint. We had multiple deadlines for everyone throughout the two weeks allocated to complete sprint 0.

- We had completed both system overviews (section 1 and 2 of the document) right at the start of the time period.
- In the first meeting on January 21st, we had made plans to all analyze the code base, create the classes, and each take responsibility for organizing/creating a class object in the diagram.
- We all met up to complete the diagram on the 23rd, and started work on the analysis.
- Our final week was focused on user stories, with deadlines set to each complete three by the 28th, and assign final weightings on the last meeting.

Overall, each of our plans had deadlines and orderliness to make sure we were on track to finish. We did have to make a lot of adjustments after discussing with the professor on the last day, but throughout the sprint we managed our time well.