COMPENG 2SH4 Project – Statement of Contribution

Your Group Name	hector
Your Name	Joud Al Mowesati
Your Team Member's Name	Vivian Le

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.
   - Iteration 0.
   - Iteration 1A and 1B.
   - Iteration 2A.
   - Iteration 3 (just feature **1**)
   - Implemented multiple food generation on the board for bonus (which can be found in DrawScreen()).
   - Created increasePlayerLength() method for special effect for bonus.
   - General commenting and debugging.

2. Repeat Part 1 above but this time tell us about your project partner's contribution to the development of your COMPENG 2SH4 project.
   - Iteration 2B
   - Iteration 3 (feature **2)**
   - Iteration 3 (feature **3**)
   - Completed and implemented bonus into the project.
   - General commenting and debugging.

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.

During the project, whenever I faced a bug or my partner did, it was helpful to push the code and get the other person to look over it. Having a second eye made catching and debugging any issues that occurred easier and faster, which made it an overall smoother process. I also liked having a split workload and allocated tasks but would often feel confusion after my partner worked on the code as I would have to update and verse myself about what had changed in the program, how, why, and where the new code has been implemented. We decided to split the workload iteration by iteration, which was good in an organizational and incremental workload. This however, made it so the other person at times had to wait for the other to finish to implement their code (when the former code is required for the next code).