Reflective Report

Sarah Roediger - NU Lichting 4

January 2019

1 Project Review

1.1 Positive Points of Current Project

1.2 Points of Improvement

During the development process I often had the feeling to lack overview of the complete project. Even though I was trying to choose a more structured approach by making class diagrams as well as thinking more deeply about the structure of my code base, it remained difficult to keep all ends of the project in mind. I believe that this lack of overview of the project lead to a more inefficient and delayed development process. Thinking about the process in hindsight it seems to me that

1.3 Aim for Future Projects

Thinking more 'object oriented'. It probably would have been easier to start by thinking about different responsibilities of objects and classes. Since my understanding of a software program of the size of this project was relatively low when I started, instead of focusing on the project and requirements at hand, I was thinking in terms of the 'known' tic tac toe project we already did during exercises. Just during development I understood the depths and requirements of the current project more and more and was consequently in an attempt to find a more fitting structure rearranging code relatively often. In a future project I will be trying to avoid this mistake by thinking about different responsibilities of each class more deeply beforehand.

Another aspect that supported this behavior is the fact that thinking in terms of objects while programming is relatively new to me. During my studies I was more often required to script instead of setting up a whole program. Thinking in terms of objects and their responsibilities therefore did not come as natural to me as I would have expected. However, during the development process of the current project I recognized the advantages of a well chosen architecture including thorougly thought through objects first hand.

sneller vragen?

de wereld om je heen modeleren met je classes, dat is iets wat ik vorheen nog niet zo heb gedaan

2 Development Process

2.1 Being Member of a Group

Reflecting on my contribution as member of the Nedap University group during the initial setup of the communication protocol I would describe my own behavior as rather observant. When we were talking about the protocol on the very first day of the project, I did not have very concrete ideas of how the communication between server and client should take place. I did have some vague ideas, however given the fact that other group members had very specific ideas about the protocol

3 Review of Design Choices

3.1 Hierarchy - Model Classes

3.1.1 Board

The board does only keep track of the current board state. It does not enforce rules or validates any moves.

3.1.2 Game

All rules should be enforced in the game. The game uses the board to keep track of the game process. In this way, in a later state the rules can also easily be changed when another game might be played.

Rules the game should enforce

1. Pass - Stopping the game when both players passed
2. Black makes the first move
3. Configurable size (could also be done in the board, but we want the board to not worry about sizes)
4. Checks whether move would recreate past boardState
5.

3.1.3 Player

The player knows when a move generally is valid (isField and isValid), since these rules are unlikely to change, but whether the move would recreate a previous boardState is checked in the game, since this rule could be changed in future games.

does not know anything about the current gameState?