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Course Structure

- Learn software development by working on a large team project
- External “customer” provides project, evaluation
- Long hours in the lab
- Student journals and independent reading
Materials and Tools

- Java
- Eclipse IDE
- JUnit testing framework
- CVS version control
Preliminary Lectures

- Introduction to Eclipse
- Overview of eXtreme Programming
- Testing first with JUnit
- Threads
- Graphics
- Networking
eXtreme Programming 1

- Testing First
- Pair Programming
- Sustainable Pace
- Simple Design
- Refactoring
- Small Releases
eXtreme Programming 2

- Continuous Integration
- Collective Code Ownership
- Coding Standards
- Customer Involvement
- The Planning Game
The XP Iteration

**Planning Game**
- Report on previous iteration
- Customer writes stories
- Team estimates stories
- Customer chooses stories

**Planning**
- Break stories into tasks
- Do simple overall design
- Assign pairs
- Allocate tasks

**Coding**
- Check out working code
  - Write test
  - Fail test
  - Refactor
  - Write code
  - Pass tests
  - Synchronize with repository

**Delivery**
- Pass all tests
  - Create .jar file
  - Deliver to customer
  - Customer plays with system
Why Use XP in a Course Like This?

- Provides rapid feedback
- Small releases mean something is up and running quickly
- Deadlines don’t slip, features do
- No “death march”
Spike: Pente

- Simple game, but involves graphics, networking, and threads
- Two weeks in three-day iterations
- Graphics and networking are very difficult to test
- Networking is tricky; use Lethbridge and Laganiere’s OCSF
Main Project: Starmada X

- Complex boardgame simulating starship combat
- Relatively few core rules, many optional rules
- Turn-based rather than real-time
- Networked game means no need for AI opponent
Outcome

- Students learned to appreciate pair programming, with some friction and balance issues
- User stories were often vague
- Time estimates were good for small stories, low for large ones
- Code eventually became muddled
- Students finally produced a playable (if very fragile) game
Lessons for Next Time

- Most of the time is spent on the GUI
- Communication is crucial
- Big Design Up Front is not a danger
- Project should be carefully simplified beforehand
Several expressed interest in continuing work on the project.

“I believe I am a much stronger programmer today than any day previous. I’ve learned to cope with responsibility among other programmers, relay information about my progress and ask others for theirs. I think more importantly, I am much more confident about what needs to be done for a project and what questions to ask to keep that confidence.”