

## COMPENG 2SH4 Project – Statement of Contribution

Your Group Name                      \_\_kristin&&delayna\_\_\_\_\_

Your Name                              \_\_Kristin Figueredo (figuererek)\_\_\_\_\_

Your Team Member's Name        \_\_Delayna Guenther (guenthed)\_\_\_\_\_

**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.

Kristin did (me):

- Iteration 1A (Initial Player class implementation)
- Iteration 2A (Development of objPosArrayList class)
- Iteration 3, Feature 1 (Implementing Snake Body (movement and )
- Iteration 3, Feature 3 (Creating the endgame and collision features)

Delayna did (team member):

- Iteration 1B (Initial GameMechs class implementation)
- Iteration 2B (Random Food Generation + Food Class) (I helped a little bit on this)
- Iteration 3, Feature 2 (Snake Food Consumption and snake growth)

Done together (on one laptop but working together)

- Iteration 0 (creating the objPos class)
- Above and Beyond Features (Implementing 5 foods, 3 of which were regular foods, one was a bomb and the other was money) (Delayna did more of this section)

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

Delayna contributed a lot to the development of this project. She implemented the GameMech class, created the final random food generator that encompassed the additional food features, helped with snake growth and independently did the snake food consumption.

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.

We worked well as a team by setting internal deadlines, coordinating when to push and pull changes to simplify code merging, and contributing equally to the program's development. Our dedication to completing all features ensured we had a similar mindset throughout the project. Whenever either of us needed help, the other would be there providing input, asking questions or trying to fix the problem. This allowed for better communication, great initiative and a non stressful experience. At first, we underestimated the time needed for integrating our components, but we addressed this by allocating additional time for testing and establishing

clearer integration milestones. Overall, Delayna was an excellent teammate, and her collaboration made the experience both productive and enjoyable.