

Team 4 Project 2 Report

Initially, the team met up, and set the product backlog. We divided the work evenly between the 3 group members. Each member would do about one-third of the allotted hours within the project. In addition, the team agreed to pick Andrew Lam as the SCRUM master, so he is responsible for updating the various backlogs and burndown charts.

After completing the project, the actual responsibility of the project was divided up slightly different from the original plan. After the first SCRUM meeting, the team discussed their strengths and weaknesses and changed the project responsibilities to the following: Andrew Lam and Tony Huynh would split the work for creating the Kalah game logic and Kalah AIs while Nathaniel Leake would create the GUI and client/server. While each member did their part for the project, the organization of responsibilities could have been better. A majority of the hours that was spent on the project was implementing and perfecting the GUI. Even though Nathaniel Leake did an excellent job in creating the GUI, splitting the GUI up between the three group members would have been more efficient.

One of the problems that the group encountered was code efficiency. For the AI, each group member had a different idea for implementing the AI, so we each made our own version of it. In the end, the final AI is working and incorporated ideas from each group member, but this part of the project could have been handled better since time was wasted since everyone worked on a different AI. Another problem the team had was communication. Since each group member had such a different schedule from each other, it was hard to meet up in person and work together as a team outside of lab. As a result, the team was not as efficient when working on the project. Although this was a difficulty, the group tried to stay in communication through instant messaging whenever we would add to the project or if there was some confusion over a group member's code.

The team has agreed on a 1.0 multiplier for each member of the group. We believe this multiplier is fair to each team member because everyone completed their part of the assignment. Each member truly cared about what was best for the project and displayed it by taking the time to meet up collectively, or try to fix an error individually regardless of whether it was supposed to be their responsibility or not. These multipliers represent an accurate view of our relative contributions on the project that we all agree with.