Peer Assessment For Principles of Software Engineering

Eric Zhang*
National Centre for Computer Animation

Abstract

This paper is an assessment of myself and a few others on the participation of the PokemonTCG assignment set for The Principles of Software Engineering. I will be describing my contribution to the project, others' contribute in my perspective and the co=operation of the group as a single unit.

The project is based on a trading card game called Pokemon Trading Card Game and we, as a team of approximately 10 assigned members are responsible for simulating such game in a limited card pool.

1 My Contribution

1. Participating in Concept Design, Brain-storming and THE construction of UML

2. Researching and directing designs according to the rules of the game.

3. Producing code handling Game Mechanics such as card movement, damage calculation.

4. Testing the program as a user and report specific bugs to be fixed by the teams or ourselves.

5. Organizing priorities and stopping ourselves from "digging into a rabbit-hole" when necessary.

6. Documentation of code and creating a technical guide for the game.

7. Outlining issues of card implementations and communicate with the card team(s) regarding both their requirements and our function specifications.

2 Others' Contribution

Throughout the project, Jack, Renat and I are the three main programmers for the core since our fourth member has stopped replying to our updates and hasn't informed us of his status.

Jack built the skeleton of the project and focused on pybind11, card loading at the beginning of the project and continued to produce code, fixing bugs, reporting issues and peer-check our codes against the planned structure. He's also consolidated the structures, Ai concepts and made UI inputs more intuitive for users.

Renat has also participated in our design stage and has been working on text-based UI and inputs. He and I are also documenting most of the program at this moment of writing this report. He experienced some hardware issues at home but he still participated in coding after fixing the said issues.

For the card teams, only Team Bright Tides has been in stable contact with us during the development, especially Moira. We've feedback information between the teams through Moira alone for the most part of our development. She has made requirements from the card teams clearer, although sometimes unnecessary, ultimately provided us with several functions we need to implement.

As for Stacy, I cannot say much but she has participated in crafting pseudo-codes for cards and the implementation of Bright Tide's Ai.

The rest of the teams, are almost absent from the implementation stage. Lucien and Tom started implementing their cards and Ais at the end stages of our development cycle.

3 Conclusion

As a team of three, our group has worked alongside in a logical manner and had no real conflicts in any stages of the development.

However, as the entire group, we didn't have a consistent roots of contact between the card teams and us which has increased our design and feedback time longer. The sudden illnesses didn't help but there are approximately a-half of the group being inactive during the early-to-mid stages of the project. If the teams are more active in terms of communication, we would have an easier time listing card mechanics.

In conclusion, it was a successful project as a whole but it could have been improved through more communication between the teams.

*e-mail: s4903744@bournemouth.ac.uk