ENG1 - Assessment 2

Change Report

Change2.pdf

Group 4

Mikaella Loppnow	ml2708
Tom Daly	td1026
Ethan Buss	eb2225
Dillon Pandya	dp1195
Ereife Odusi	ed781
Harriet Kirby	hk1114

Processes, Tools and Conventions

To plan, make, keep track of and review changes to the Assessment 1 deliverables, we first had to choose a team and take over their project. For this, we scheduled a mid-week meeting and reviewed all the possible options. We went through each team's deliverables by first playing their game, looking at their code and seeing what game closely aligned with ours and which ones we would enjoy playing, as that was important to us as a group otherwise we would lose interest in the game. We created a tier list and chose a top 3. After doing further individual research, we came back together during our scheduled practical and decided to take over ‘Group 6’ and their project.

First, we downloaded all of their documentation from their website and created a new shared folder on Google Drive to store all the Assessment 2 work. We then cloned their GitHub and created a new shared repository on GitHub that everyone can access, and also found their website code and downloaded that too.

After acquiring all the necessary files and setting up our shared resources, our next step was to establish a clear workflow for managing the project. We implemented the use of the shared resources, ensuring all team members could work simultaneously without overwriting each other’s contributions. This allowed us to efficiently track all changes made to the code and documentation and who the changes were done by.

For project management, we utilised two tools. We used the projects tab in GitHub for any code-related issues and used the timeline feature when we needed to get the issue sorted. We also used Monday.com, which we use to create our GANTT charts. This is due to us not liking the way PlantUML GANTT charts looked, and by using Monday it enabled us to visually organise tasks into lists and assign them to specific team members. This tool was used to have a good overview of our project’s status and ensure that no task was overlooked.

On top of all this, we also scheduled weekly meetings every Tuesday on top of the compulsory session we had each week. This was so we could review the progress we made with the deliverables throughout the week, and if we had any issues that could be solved before our next meeting, which meant also updating things like the Monday and the GitHub frequently. This helped keep the team aligned with what we needed to do and made everyone aware of the deadlines for the various tasks everyone had to complete for either the documentation or the implementation.

In terms of the actual documentation, we decided to improve the existing documents we inherited by adding more detailed explanations and updating any outdated information. Having all the documentation stored on a shared drive, by using Google Docs enabled the team to make use of real-time collaboration as well as showing who edited the documents, ensuring accountability within the team.

In summary, our approach to managing the inherited project of ‘Group 6’ involved the use of planning, collaborative tools, and regular meetings. This enabled the team to progress throughout the project smoothly but also ensured high-quality outcomes in line with the goals of the project brief.

Changes to Deliverables

i. Requirements

1. Added ‘UR_LEADERBOARDS’ to the user requirements and functional requirements tables.
2. Added ‘UR_STREAKS’ to the user requirements and functional requirements tables.

Both of these additions were required due to the updated brief and the new features requested by the client.
Original Document: Req1.pdf
Changed Document: Req2.pdf

ii. Architecture

1. Added camera follow system - in order to include more activities and locations around the map, we needed to expand the size of the map. However with the current camera implementation, fitting the complete map on screen at all times would require the view to be very zoomed out, making the game difficult to play. In order to overcome this, we decided that a zoomed in camera that follows the player’s character as it moves would be the best solution. This change can be seen in the ‘Systems Package’ diagram, through the addition of the ‘CameraFollowSystem’ class.
2. Changed collision handling method - collisions were previously added through a *.json* file, meaning that collisions had to be implemented separately for each object. In order to overcome this, we imported the collisions directly from the Tiled map file in the new ‘CollisionRenderingSystem’ class. The addition of this class can also be seen in the ‘Systems Package’ diagram.

Original Document: Arch1.pdf
Changed Document: Arch2.pdf

iii. Method Selection and Planning

1. Replaced the previous teams’ ‘Team Organisation’ section with our team organisation - we updated the team organisation section, to represent our own team rather than the previous. This is because our approach to team organisation contained some differences and we wanted this to be reflected as our approach is a part of our team identity.
2. Replaced ‘Weekly Snapshots’ with Gantt charts - we felt this change was necessary as it gives a more general overview of the plan followed; the previous plan contained lots of specific details and decisions that were covered in other documents and so we felt that they detracted from conveying what tasks were completed each week.
3. We did not make any changes to the outline of software engineering methods used as this very closely described the methods that we have been following as a team throughout the project.

Original Document: Plan1.pdf
Changed Document: Plan2.pdf

iv. Risk Assessment and Mitigation

1. No changes were made to the ‘Risk Management Process’ section as the process followed by the previous team was very thorough and so we did not feel that anything should be changed.
2. We did not make any changes to the ‘Risk Register’ section, as we did not identify any additional risks to the previous group and agreed with their likelihood and severity ratings. The methods of mitigation were also all well documented and so we did not feel that they needed to be changed.

Original Document: Risk1.pdf
Changed Document: Risk2.pdf