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We used the class exercise of gathering requirements as our main source of reference when planning our game and how it should work. All group members took notes during the class, making sure to write down what would be expected in the game, and what could potentially be added later to enhance the gameplay experience. Later, we set up the project on Github and everyone translated the requirements into user stories and added them to the Github project.

For team communication, we decided as a group to set up an online chatroom. We felt this approach would be best because it is flexible and can easily meet the needs of all group members. The chatroom allows people to post thoughts and questions when they have them, and others to respond and answer when they get a chance to check the chatroom. This removes the need to search for times when everyone would be able to meet up in person to discuss the project, and makes it easy and convenient to interact with other group members. Because of this, our stand-up meetings did not look anything like the typical workplace stand-up. Instead, we found it better to provide updates as we go. We still maintained the same model – group members provided updates of what they were working on/planned to work on, however they did it at their own pace and at times that were convenient for them. If someone had a problem or roadblock, they posted in the group chat, and help was offered as soon as someone had a chance. This usually did not take long at all, and again, made the whole process much more convenient than in person meetings.

One place where we did run into disagreement was in the distribution of story points. When we all originally made the story cards, we forgot to assign story point values to them. One group member noticed this and added points for all of the cards, however some group members felt that the points awarded to some stories were inaccurate. This discrepancy was solved easily and amicably. The stories that were points of contention were brought up in the chatroom and discussed. Once they were talked through sufficiently, we updated the story cards on the Github project and the disagreement was resolved.

In deciding who did what, we didn’t have any particular way of doling out responsibilities. Rather, tasks were taken and completed on more of a first-come-first-served basis. The workflow went something like this: a group member posted in the chat that they planned on doing a certain task and asked if everyone was okay with that. During this sprint, no one had any qualms with others working on what they suggested for themselves so we did not run into any problems here. Another way that tasks were assigned was by group members asking what could be done to help out. This worked well and resulted in the group’s work being distributed evenly.

As alluded to earlier, our lax “stand-up” were found to be quite effective, and we don’t foresee this changing in the near future, however if we do run into communication problems we are open to revisiting this and making necessary changes. Maybe it is just the type of work that was being done this sprint, but it feels as though we didn’t really have anything that stuck out as ineffective or needed to be changed. For the most part, everyone worked on different parts of the code, and although we did have some group members working on the same pieces of code they didn’t run into problems getting in each others way. Of course, with anything, there are sure to be inefficiencies and kinks that need to be worked out, but we foresee these cropping up as we get further into the development process and have more work on our plates.