Group Game Development Project

Overview

In this coursework you will work in a group to produce a short, polished, videogame and a reflective production report on the process. You will use agile software production methods and frequent player testing to structure and inform your development process.

This coursework is directly linked to the previous assessment - the Games Design Document (GDD). You do not have to stick rigidly to the game that you designed for the GDD. In fact, part of the iterative/cyclical process of development, testing, analysing feedback, and reflecting on what needs to happen next, is knowing when to drop features or when something needs to be changed for the good of the project. However, it will help you and save time to use the GDD as your starting point and guide due to the limited time you have on this project. Whilst this game might well change, you must *start* with the game detailed in your mid-term assignment (the GDD).

At the end of this project, you should have a small but well-crafted playable game that you created as part of a distributed/remote development team. Having a piece like this in your portfolio, made with a group in this manner will be an excellent asset to use when applying for jobs and to speak about in future job interviews. Aside from this - have fun!

Restrictions

Reminder of restrictions for this project:

- Keyboard and/or mouse only.

- Single-player or local multi-player

- 5-10 minutes of gameplay.

- Easy to 'pick up and play', requires no lengthy reading to start playing.

- You must use Unity 2019.4 (LTS)

- Use audio-visual assets only (i.e. no code or game template assets. See Group GDD brief for details).

The game can be 2D or 3D. Both paradigms have advantages and disadvantages, depending on what you want to achieve with your development. For more details and explanations of these restrictions see the Group Game Design Document Assignment Brief for the mid-term assessment.

Deliverables

For this project you will hand in:

- A link to a playable build of your game.

- The source files and source logs for the project

- A 'Production Document' containing a reflective account of the game development process.

Link to Build

Game must load and be playable without extra installation. i.e. a player and/or the marker can just visit a URL and start playing on the webpage itself straight away, and NOT have to download a .zip file first, extract, install, then play your game.

Ensure that you test your game thoroughly before hand-in. Test from different machines and different browsers to ensure it's all in working order and that no bugs will cause problems in marking.

Source Files and Source Logs

You have been using version control for this project, and so need to **make your repository public** and provide a link to it in your submission.

This will allow your marker to visit your repository to check that you have been using good development practices and to confirm how different members of the team have contributed to the game.

Production Document

Each member of the team is to submit their own production document.

You need to include the following in this document:

- An account of how development of the game progressed:

    - What were the major iterations? What major decisions did the group take?

    - What problems did you encounter, and how did you solve them?

    - A comment on how you worked as a team. What went well? What didn't go quite so well?

- What have you learned from developing this game? Would you have done anything differently if you had known what you know now?

- A statement, out of a total of 100%, of how much work you feel each member of the group contributed to the project, with a summary of what each person did in the project. The totals for all members (including yourself) should add up to 100% to express how much you feel each person has contributed.

- Explicit reference to playtesting the group carried out during this project. You should include details of feedback the group received at any of the major playtesting milestones, as well as any other important feedback that was gathered from playtesting at other times. State how this feedback was dealt with and what, if anything, changed because of feedback from play testers. If nothing changed, why not?

A Note On The Marking Scheme

- Note well the different weightings given to different criteria and direct your efforts accordingly over the course of production.

Marking Scheme

Area	Criteria	Marks
Art	No effort made to create a appropriate, cohesive and attractive art style	0
	Art present but origins unclear (no credit given for assets; evidence of authoring not provided)	2
	Appropriate and cohesive art style, with clear referencing of assets or evidence of production.	4
	High quality art style with clear referencing of assets/evidence of production.	6
	Outstanding and unique art style, with majority of assets authored by the group specifically for this project.	8
Sound	No sounds or music present	0
	Sounds and/or music present.	2
	Sounds and/or music present with clear attribution and or evidence of generation/production by the group.	4
	Good quality sounds and/or music, clearly sourced, makes significant contribution to game experience.	6
	Outstanding and distinctive sound and/or music which greatly enhances the overall game experience.	8
Mechanics 1 (Clarity)	Completely unclear how to play the game. Objectives not provided. Controls not conveyed.	0
	Some attempt made to instruct player, but still confusing and/or ambiguous.	2
	Adequate instruction given, but with lots of text/reading required to understand how to play.	4
	Clear instructions given to player using video and/or level design. Minimal text reading required.	6
	Instructions are non-intrusive and feel part of the world. Game is 'pick up and play' i.e. minimal exposition required for immediate meaningful play.	8
Mechanics 2 (Novelty)	Mechanics are broken. No functionality and/or game does not run.	0
	Very basic and simple mechanics with little or no originality in usage.	2
	Well-established and recognisable mechanics reproduced with some small extra modifications.	4
	New mechanics used to clearly establish game as different from other potentially similar experiences.	6
	Sophisticated use of novel mechanics that are immediately engaging and yet lead to a deep game experience.	8
Game Feel	Game doesn't work.	0
	Game works, but is buggy, broken, and unsatisfying.	2
	Controls feel adequate and responsive to player input.	4
	Game feels satisfying to play, with more than average level of polish and attention to details in communication.	6
	Gameplay feels incredibly satisfying, smooth, polished and feels greater than the sum of its parts.	8

Production Process	No evidence of regular progress towards project goals provided.	0
	Version control logs provided. Work begun 'at the last minute'/very close to submission deadlines.	3
	Version control logs provided. Progress has been made throughout the production period, but is still concentrated heavily to just before the submission deadline.	6
	Good progress made from the start of the project, as evidenced in logs. Frequent and regular check-ins.	9
	Excellent control and co-ordination of group work from the beginning, evidenced in version control logs with good practice such as frequent and regular check-ins, branching, pull requests etc.	12
Feedback	No record of playtesting and feedback.	0
	Some evidence that a few people have played the game and given feedback.	5
	Playtesting milestones used to collect feedback. Feedback is considered and changes to next iteration made.	10
	All playtesting milestones used effectively, with effective analysis of several examples of feedback conducted, where feedback is used to inform next iteration and decisions.	15
	Regular feedback in addition to playtesting milestones elicited throughout the production period. High quality playtesting strategies used. Feedback clearly engaged with and used to inform development decisions and iterate on game.	20
Production document	No production document provided	0
	Vague account given of the progress of the project, with little comment on their role or what they learned.	5
	Clear account of the game's development given, with some reflection on what they learned and how they contributed.	10
	In depth account of game's development, with clear account of problems encountered (group or technical), how they were resolved, and what the student has learned.	15
	Well-written, articulate and detailed analysis of the progress, problem and solutions in the project, clear reflective analysis of what they have learned and how they would approach a similar project differently in the future.	20
Personal contribution	There is no statement, nor evidence, that the student made a meaningful contribution to the project.	0
	Statement of relative workload of the group (to total 100%) given, and student has made some non-trivial contributions (supported by evidence)	5
	Statement of relative workload present, and student has made significant contributions to the project, with evidence to support this.	10
	State of workload present, significant contributions made, evidence of personal initiative clearly shown in overcoming difficulties in project.	15
	All previous criteria, plus evidence that student was a strong team player, helping support other team members where necessary (must be backed up with evidence from other teammates).	20

Total = 112 marks, to be scaled down to 100% as a mark for this assignment (70% of module).