STUDIO PRACTICE

Version 1.5
BA Game Development
GAM320

Author: Brian McDonald

"Nobody in this industry knows what they're doing, we just have a gut assumption."

- Cliff Bleszinski

Introduction

For this assignment you will develop a prototype game as part of a team and be assessed both in terms of your individual contribution and your team's performance. From the rubrics (below), the *collaborate* learning objective is used to assess how you work as a member of an agile game development team. Conversely, the *process* learning objective is used to assess how your team delivers its product.

This assignment is comprised of multiple parts:

Part A

Attend the scheduled weekly team meeting with your project supervisor.

Each week you should attend supervisor meeting, the details of these will be stored on the Falmouth timetable. You should attend every supervisor meeting, as attendance at these sessions are monitored as normal.

There are two types of project meeting: a project review / planning session and an individual review.

In the **individual review**, you and your teammates will review each other's approaches to work over the last sprint using a peer review form. In these meetings, the *studio practice* rubric will be used to assess your **summative** performance over the semester and informal feedback will be made available.

"Golden rule of level design - Finish your first level last."

- John Romero

In the **project review / planning session**, your team will showcase work undertaken on the most recent sprint and present the forthcoming sprint. This work should be a **working build,** however, **works in progress** can also be showcased in addition to the build. During development, the *product evaluation* rubric will be used to give a **formative** assessment of your product's performance at that point. This will help your team to direct their development efforts.

Assessment for the **first two weeks** will be **formative** and will not count towards your grade for the module.

For more information relating to the meeting processes, please read the Games Academy Agile Guidebook which can be located on the Learning Space for the Module.

"You can make an amazing game, but you can't make a success. Your players make the success."

- Irme Jele

"Lets optimize for player experience rather than what we think will make more money."

- Ron Carmel

Part B

Work with your team to develop your game during the first semester.
Between timetabled supervision meetings, your team will have allocated space in the Academy to work together and you will have access to staff through the supervised studio practice sessions and tutorials, which can be arranged by email if required, who will be able to give informal feedback concerning the status and implementation approaches of your project.

Please remember to 'TAP' your card in for the sessions you attend to ensure that your attendance is recorded or if the session is online, please sign into the SEATS attendance system via the Falmouth University Student App.

In these sessions you will be able to ask for and receive informal feedback concerning the status and implementation approaches of your project.

Part C

Green Light Process
In **Week 6**, you will present your work to date to your supervisor and another member of staff. In this session you will present a working build of your game and any works in progress. At the end of the session, you will receive one of the following ratings from the panel

- **Green** – Game can go ahead without any issues.
- **Amber –** Game can go ahead but there are issues that need to be addressed. Your supervisor will make note of these.
- **Red –** Game can't go ahead, there are significant issues with the game or the team.

If you receive a red rating, you can defend the concept to the panel and they can overturn the decision to an **Amber**.

This Green Light session will replace your normal supervisor session for this week.

Part D

Attend the Demo Day
During **week 13**, a day will be scheduled for Demo Day. Each team will need to make a working demo of their game available in the Games Academy for staff to play and assess and for other students to play and give feedback on.

Staff will be assigned to assess your game using the *product evaluation* rubric to give a normalised **summative** assessment of your product's performance at that point.

You will receive informal feedback from staff during the Demo Day and you will receive formal feedback through Learning Space within three weeks of the Demo Day.

Additional Guidance

Working as part of a creative team is a very difficult activity and it should come

as no surprise that there are likely to be some bumps in the road – as you probably discovered in your 1st and 2nd year group projects. **The Agile Guidebook** contains some advice for dealing with common issues and creating and maintaining a working environment where it's possible to get meaningful creative work done and still remain on good terms with each other.

If you are having any problems, do not hesitate to talk with your project supervisor. The process for complaints and dealing with Team issues can be found on the **Team Code of Conduct** which is on the Learning Space for the modules

Generally, successful projects tend to come from the development team respecting each other and being able to make progress (no matter how small). Remember, that a lot of the things you want to create in your games either won't work or won't be enjoyable to play. It is the core advantage of Agile development that using an iterative approach to development allows you to have multiple attempts to get things right.

Make sure you always have a working build and that everyone on the team is using version control. We have a large repository in the Academy, so there's always somewhere to store builds.

FAQ

- **Version control marking, how am I assessed?**
  We expect all students regardless of discipline to engage with version control. However, we aware of different levels of engagement in version control, we mark this criterion accordingly depending on your route or programme of study.

- **What is the deadline for this assignment?**
  Falmouth University policy states that deadlines must only be specified on the MyFalmouth system.

- **What should I do to seek help?**
  You can email your tutor for informal clarifications.

Marking Rubric: Studio Practice

Learning Outcome Name	Learning Outcome Description	Criteria	Weighting	Clear Fail	Near Pass	3rd	2:2	2:1	1st	>1st
Collaborate / Collaborate	Produce work as part of a multidisciplinary team critically appraising practices, approaches, and tools; applying them to enhance development pipelines.	Effective team worker	15%	Student has missed a large number of team meetings / SSP sessions Teammates concerned with lack of presence Student tends to be highly disruptive / chaotic	Student attends less than 50% of team sessions Student tends to be disruptive / chaotic	Student attends most sessions. Delivers acceptable work with occasional major issues Has issues dealing with some teammates	Student attends most sessions. Delivers acceptable work without major issues Has occasional issues dealing with some teammates	Student attends most sessions. Delivers generally good work with only minor issues	Student attends most sessions. Delivers good work. Inspires some teammates No noticeable issues dealing with teammates. Tends to promote team harmony	Student is driving the team to achieve great things Team is highly supportive of leadership direction and approach
		Agile Practitioner	15%	Very low attendance of agile sessions (sprint planning, stand-ups etc.) Team has little to no idea what's going on with student Not involved in planning activities	Low attendance of agile sessions (sprint planning, stand-ups etc.) Work always slips Delivers assets for integration only at end of sprint Minor involvement in planning activities	Average attendance of agile sessions (sprint planning, stand-ups etc.) Some tendency for work to slip, reluctance to share development issues with team or supervisor Struggles to contribute meaningfully to planning	Good attendance of agile sessions (sprint planning, stand-ups etc.) Work is generally delivered, with only occasional slippages. Team is often, but not always made aware of issues. Often contributes to planning	Good attendance of agile sessions (sprint planning, stand-ups etc.) Work is generally delivered, with only occasional slippages. Team is generally made aware of issues. Able to provide some support to teammates Good contributor to planning	Good attendance of agile sessions (sprint planning, stand-ups etc.) Work is delivered, with very few slippages. Team is generally made aware of issues and progress. Able to provide support to teammates Very good contributor to planning	Good attendance Work is delivered, team is generally made aware of issues and progress. Able to provide a lot of support to teammates Exceptional contributor to planning
		Version control practitioner	10%	Student ignores version control Only delivers assets outside of version control	Student uses VC with many significant problems for the team Mainly delivers assets outside of version control	Student uses mainline version control with few problems	Student uses mainline version control with few problems but runs into significant problems with branch-based development	Student is generally working in a single branch with fairly successful integration to mainline	Student is generally working across multi-branches to deliver features with few, if any, issues.	Student is successfully working across multiple branches Student is an enthusiastic adopter of other 'advanced' version control concepts
		Reflective Practitioner	10%	Student fills in few, if any peer review forms for teammates	Student comments are generally lightweight platitudes Student generally ignores feedback	Student submits feedback that leads to unproductive conflict between team members Student often ignores feedback, but does take some onboard	Student submits generally reasonable feedback that leads to occasional conflict, which is sometimes productive Student acts appropriately in response to some feedback	Student submits generally meaningful feedback Student tends to act appropriately to feedback given	Student submits meaningful and emotionally intelligent feedback Student reacts appropriately to feedback given	Student submits conscientious and generous feedback that team members are highly appreciative of. Student seeks out opportunities for self-improvement

Marking Rubric: Product Evaluation

Learning Outcome Name	Learning Outcome Description	Criteria	Weighting	Clear Fail	Near Pass	3rd	2:2	2:1	1st	>1st
Process / Deliver	Produce prototypes based on your own intellectual property that deliver distinguished experiences, justifying how and why it could engage, immerse an audience, and/or lead to innovation.	Conceptual Coherence (game mechanics, settings, theme, aesthetics, interface & platform)	15%	No game presented No game presented Game is too unstable / non-functional to be played enough to evaluate.	A small subset of the game components work well together to create a coherent experience, but they are stymied by the overall experience of discordance between components leading to a generally awkward experience for players.	A core of the game components work well together to create a coherent experience. However, there are some components that break the overall coherence leading to a conceptually awkward experience for players.	Generally, the game components work well together to create a coherent experience. However, there are some aspects of components that break the overall coherence	The game components work together to produce create a coherent experience	The game components work well together to produce create a coherent experience which players can respond positively to	There is a clear harmony of design between game components creating a highly coherent experience which players can respond extremely positively to
		Creative innovation	15%	No game presented Game is too unstable / non-functional to be played enough to evaluate.	Game is generally a rehash/homage of an existing game with little, if anything to distinguish it.	Game developed from an existing game or genre with the addition of innovative convergence / extensions. Resulting game concept is of questionable engagement	Game developed from an existing game or genre with the addition of innovative mashups / extensions. Resulting game concept is reasonably engaging	Game developed as a generally organic concept drawing components that make some sense for game. Resulting game concept is reasonably engaging	Game developed as a generally organic concept drawing components that make much sense for the game. Resulting game concept is clearly engaging	Game is genuinely novel and extremely engaging and experience
		Quality	10%	No game presented Game is too unstable / non-functional to be played enough to evaluate.	Some parts of the game are of acceptable quality, but the game gives the overall impression that much of it is not finished or working. The game runs, but may have obvious and significant stability issues	The game is of acceptable quality but feels like it would benefit from more development time to develop and refine gameplay, aesthetic and other components. The game runs, but may have obvious or significant stability issues	The game is of reasonable quality but feels like it needs more work to balance and refine gameplay and/or aesthetic components. The game has no major issues but there are clear small-scale bugs and glitches	The game is of good quality and feels like a game that could be published given more QA. The game has no major issues but there are clear small-scale bugs and issues	The game is of high quality, looks and feels like a published game with no noticeable issues There are no major issues and only slight and largely imperceptible bugs and issues	The game is of extremely high quality, looks and feels like a published game with no noticeable issues
		Player Engagement	10%	No game presented Game is too unstable / non-functional to be played enough to evaluate.	The game generates some moments of engagement and enjoyment for players, though it is generally not an engaging experience The overall game presentation looks and feels functional.	The game generates some engagement and enjoyability for players, though there is feeling of endurance rather than enjoyment. The overall game presentation looks and feels fairly functional rather than solid.	The game generates some clear engagement and enjoyability for players, though there is clear scope for improvement. The overall game presentation looks and feels fairly solid rather than slick.	The game is generally engaging and enjoyable for players, though there is some scope for improvement. The overall game presentation looks and feels fairly slick with just a few noticeable issues to detract from it.	The game is generally highly engaging and enjoyable for players. The overall game presentation generally looks and feels slick with few issues to detract from it.	The game is highly engaging and enjoyable for players. The overall game presentation both looks and feels slick. Players want to play the game beyond reasonable expectations