

Agile Development (II)

- A manifesto (from the Agile Alliance)
 - "We are uncovering better ways of developing software by doing it and helping others do it. Through this work we have come to value
 - individuals and interactions over processes and tools
 - working software over comprehensive documentation
 - customer collaboration over contract negotiation
 - responding to change over following a plan
 - That is, while there is value in the items on the right, we value the items on the left more

Agile Development (III)

- From this statement of values, agile development has identified twelve principles that distinguish agile practices from traditional software life cycles
- Lets look at five of them
 - Deliver Early and Often to Satisfy Customer
 - Welcome Changing Requirements
 - Face to Face Communication is Best
 - Measure Progress against Working Software
 - Simplicity is Essential

April 1, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	5	April 1, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	6
-	arly and Often to Satisfy Cust		-	e Changing Requirem	
analysis Strong the ear the the Strong and fre the Custome systems	an Management Review published of software development practices correlation between quality of software s ly delivery of a partially functioning syste less functional the initial delivery the higher the final delivery! correlation between final quality of softwe equent deliveries of increasing functionalis more frequent the deliveries, the higher the f ers may choose to put initial/interm into production use; or they may s unctionality and provide feedback	s in 2001 system and m he quality of are system ty nal quality! hediate	 Stateme Develochange unders Plus, a refacto 	e change, even late in the pr ent of Attitude opers in agile projects are not afra e; changes are good since it mean standing of the target domain has agile development practices (such bring) produce systems that are fle asy to change	aid of ns our increased as
April 1, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	7	April 1, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	8

 In an agile project, people talk to each other! The primary mode of communication is conversation there is no attempt to capture all project information in writing artifacts are still created but only if there is an immediate and significant need that they satisfy they may be discarded, after the need has passed 			 Agile projects measure progress by the amount of software that is currently meeting customer needs They are 30% done when 30% of required functionality is working AND deployed Progress is not measured in terms of phases or creating documents 		
April 1, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	9	April 1, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	10
Simpl	icity is Essential		Extren	ne Programming	
 This reamou Agile path The probability High simple 	icity is Essential efers to the art of maximi nt of work NOT done e projects always take the sin consistent with their current y do not try to anticipate tom olems; they only solve today' n-quality work today should p ole and flexible system that w hange tomorrow if the need a	mplest t goals orrow's s problems provide a vill be easy	 Extreme commo principle For in "Te the "We befa As Kent takes commons 	e Programming (XP) takes nsense software engineerin es and practices to extreme stance sting is good?"	e levels e test cases amming

 XP Practices The best way to describe XP is by looking at some of its practices There are fourteen standard practices, we'll look at six important ones Customer Team Member User Stories Pair Programming Test-Driven Development Collective Ownership Continuous Integration 	 Customer Team Member The "customer" is made a member of the development team A customer representative should be "in the same room" or at most 100 feet away from the developers "Release early; Release Often" delivers a working system to the customer; in between, the customer representative provides continuous feedback to the developers
April 1, 2003 © University of Colorado, 2003 13	April 1, 2003 © University of Colorado, 2003 14
User Stories (I) We need to have requirements	User Stories (II) User stories are not documented in detail

- XP requirements come in the form of "user stories" or scenarios
 - We need just enough detail to estimate how long it might take to develop software to support this story
 - avoid too much detail, since the requirement will most likely change; start at a high level, deliver working functionality and iterate based on explicit feedback

- we work out the scenario with the customer "faceto-face"; we give this scenario a name
- the name is written on an index card
 - developers then write an estimate on the card based on the detail they got during their conversation with the customer
- The index card becomes a "token" which is then used to drive the implementation of a requirement based on its priority and estimated cost

15

April 1, 2003

Pair Programming

- All production code is written by pairs of programmers working together at the same workstation
 - One member drives the keyboard and writes code and test cases; the second watches the code, looking for errors and possible improvements
 - The roles will switch between the two frequently
 - Pair membership changes once per day; so that each programmer works in two pairs each day
 - this facilitates distribution of knowledge about the state of the code throughout the entire team
- Studies indicate that pair programming does not impact efficiency of the team, yet it significantly reduces the defect rate!
 - [Laurie Williams, 2000] [Alistair Cockburn, 2001] [J. Nosek, 1998]

April 1, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	17	April 1, 2003

Test-Driven Development

- All production code is written in order to make failing test cases pass
 - First, we write a test case that fails since the required functionality has not yet been implemented
 - Then, we write the code that makes that test case pass
 - Iteration between writing tests and writing code is very short; on the order of minutes
- As a result, a very complete set of test cases is written for the system; not developed after the fact

© University of Colorado, 2003

18

Collective Ownership

- A pair has the right to check out ANY module and improve it
 - Developers are never individually responsible for a particular module or technology
- This concept is a hard one for people to adopt, you will often hear
 - "Hey, I'm a team player, but I don't want anyone mucking with my code!"

Continuous Integration

- Developers check in code and integrate it into the larger system several times a day
- Simple Rule: first one to check-in "wins"; everyone else merges
- Entire system is built every day; if the final result of a system is a CD, a CD is burned every day; if the final result is a web site, they deploy the web site on a test server, etc.
 - This avoids the problem of cutting integration testing to "save time and money"

19

April 1, 2003

Other Agile Methods

- Scrum
- Crystal
- Feature-Driven Development
- Lean Development
- Adaptive Software Development
- Dynamic Systems Development Method
- See <http://www.agilealliance.org> for more information

Scrum

- Developed by Ken Schwaber
- Definition
 - scrum, *n. Sports.* A play in Rugby in which the two sets of forwards mass together around the ball and, with their heads down, struggle to gain possession of the ball. The mass or formation of players during such a play. *Chiefly British.* A disordered or confused situation involving a number of people.

April 1, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	21	April 1, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	22
-	n, continued		Crysta		
 Involves two lists Product Backlog essentially features of the desired system Scrum Backlog features for the next "scrum" Involves three phases Pre-Scrum planning meeting Scrum Post-Scrum demo and debriefing Plan what you are going to do, do it, and then demo the current system to your clients and get ready for the next planning meeting 			 Essent You i nur will will etc 	out comes a life cycle tailore	O r" like life money
April 1, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	23	April 1, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	24

Crystal, continued

- Crystal's notion of domains is interesting, since it addresses the problem of comparing apples to oranges that sometimes occurs when discussing different software life cycles
 - A life cycle for an 8-person web content project SHOULD be different than the life cycle of a 500-person military project

Feature Driven Development

- Developed by Jeff De Luca and Peter Coad (one of the "gang of four")
- Simple life cycle
 - Develop an overall system model
 - Build a feature list
 - Plan by feature
 - Iterate
 - Design by feature
 - Build by feature

April 1, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	25	April 1, 2003	© University of Colorado, 2003	26
 Has or "The A system Singation Af 	continued ne notable success story Singapore Project" stems integration firm had failed to em to managing commercial loans apore bank fter two years, they gave up, claiming the	for a large	 Jeff and Pete They first "useless of A small te They then They then They then The bank wa system that a 	am worked on the overall object model for about worked on feature decomposition and planning implemented a small set of the features as "pro s elated; in about two months, they were b actually did something!	called the a month for a two weeks; of-of-concept" eing shown a
■ "The ■ A sys syste Singa ■ Af	Singapore Project" stems integration firm had failed to em to managing commercial loans apore bank	for a large	 They first "useless c A small te They then They then The bank wa system that a At this poi 	trashed the original object model and what they ases"! am worked on the overall object model for about worked on feature decomposition and planning implemented a small set of the features as "pro s elated; in about two months, they were b	called the a month for a two weeks; of-of-concept" eing shown a

 It had produced 3500 pages of use cases, an object model with hundreds of classes, thousands of attributes, but no methods and no code!

 Over the next few weeks, we will look at several of the core practices of Agile methods: design patterns, refactoring, and test-driven development

April 1, 2003

What's Next?