COMPENG 2SH4 Project – Statement of Contribution

Your Group Name drmemory

Your Name Maryam Ahmed

Your Team Member's Name Jessica Yang

You must complete this statement of contribution without discussing it with your project partner, i.e., individually. Your statement should be concise (at most one-and-a-half page). It has three parts:

1. Tell us about your own contribution to the development of your COMPENG 2SH4 project. For example, you can tell us about which project iterations (as mentioned in the project manual) and C++ project classes that you worked on and completed. You can provide a concise answer either in paragraph form or through bullet points.

- For the COMPENG 2SH4 project, my contributions included the following:
- Implemented the Rule of Four for objPos class: I helped complete the objPos class, ensuring it followed the Rule of Four, which included implementing the destructor, copy constructor, and assignment operator to manage memory properly.

- Iteration 1B: I assisted in refactoring game mechanics from PPA2 and PPA3 into C++ OOD, with a focus on the GameMechs class to handle game functions like input collection, game state, and exit conditions.

- Iteration 2B: I contributed to the random food generation system, ensuring food was placed in valid spots and interacted properly with the FoodBin class.

- Bonus Feature: I contributed the bonus feature by writing the rough draft code and code for the special effects on the snake's growth and score, and worked on calling this functionality in the player function to enhance the gameplay.

2. Repeat Part 1 above but this time tell us about your project partner's contribution to the development of your COMPENG 2SH4 project.

- My project partner contributed to the development of the COMPENG 2SH4 project in the following ways:
- Completed the other half of the Rule of Four for objPos class: My partner worked on implementing the remaining parts of the objPos class, ensuring it adhered to the Rule of Four by handling the necessary memory management functions.

- Iteration 1A: My partner focused on implementing the Player class, porting the functionality from PPA3 to C++ OOD, which included setting up the snake's movement and FSM for direction control.

- Iteration 2A: My partner worked on implementing the objPosArrayList class and ensuring it functioned correctly for managing the snake's body and the list of food items.

- Bonus Feature: My partner contributed to the the bonus feature by implementing the second part of the code for multiple food items with special effects, working together with me to integrate this functionality into the game.

3. Tell us about your experience in your first collaborated software development through this project – what was working and what wasn't. If you are a one-person team, tell us what you think may work better if you had a second collaborator working with you.

- Collaborating on this project was an interesting and eye-opening experience. At first, I thought it would be easier, but I quickly realized that coding with someone else is more challenging than expected. The main difficulty came from needing to understand their code and approach to solving problems, especially since they might not always code an iteration the way I would. This required us to adjust our thinking and work around each other's differences in coding style, which added some complexity to the process. However, these challenges also helped me grow as a developer, as I had to adapt to new ways of thinking and problem-solving.

- Despite the initial hurdles, it was ultimately a very positive experience. My partner and I communicated constantly throughout the project, making sure we were aligned and tackling tasks efficiently. We were able to overcome any difficulties that came up, and by the end of the project, it felt like a successful collaboration. The experience taught me a lot about working with others, managing different coding styles, and the importance of clear communication. Working with a partner definitely made the project more engaging and allowed us to tackle more complex features than if we had worked alone.