**PROJECT POSTMORTEM**

Once you have made your final presentation WE NEED YOU TO SUBMIT THE FOLLOWING COMPONENTS AS EITHER PRINTED HARD COPY, OR ON A CD OR ON A USB.

1. A SINGLE PAGE OF A4 (MAXIMUM) WHICH LISTS THE OVERVIEW OF THE ASSETS YOU HAVE PRODUCED FOR THE TWO PROJECTS, WHETHER THEY HAVE MADE IT INTO THE FINAL GAME OR NOT.
2. A COMPLETED REVIEW OF THE PROJECT **USING THE TEMPLATE PROVIDED BELOW**. PLEASE REMEMBER THAT THE MORE DETAIL YOU ADD TO THIS COMPONENT THE EASIER IT IS FOR US TO JUDGE YOUR WORK. SO AVOID SINGLE LINES OF TEXT. **EXPLAIN WHAT YOU MEAN**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STUDENT NAME** | Thomas Wenman |
| **PROJECT NAME** | Timeline game |
| What do you think went well on the project? | Communication between members of the team was maintained well, we met up every week to discuss further details about the project and any issues that were occurring throughout. We kept in contact with the museum frequently by emailing them updates on the project and to plan for future meetings. We also used social media to communicate while working. This helped as during the design phase there were some issues raised in terms of how the artwork should look, scope of the game and where the artwork / text will be displayed on screen.  During the project there were some important issues that were addressed by the museum; these included the usage of Raspberry Pi & photographs of the objects that needed to be provided for the designers. We negotiated to use Unity with the museum as the programmers weren’t comfortable using Python. This also came as an advantage as the museum already had two large interactable screens that could support Unity. The designers agreed to search for imagery on the internet to use as reference / get information for as the photographs were sent later in the project. |
| What do you think needed improvement on the project? | Our pitches towards the museum members could have improved, due to all of us pitching in front of game designers, we went in with the same method but came out poorly as the museum members didn’t understand some of the technical details involving programming that we were talking about. I believe we should have gone in with a simpler approach by providing blueprints of the desired project finish rather than explaining it in vast amounts of detail.  The project group split into two teams, while being efficient in terms of providing two games for the museum, it also resulted into lack of communication between the two groups. Communication was fine between team members. However; each team didn’t know how the other team was getting on / could provide help as during our weekly meetings it resulted into both teams only communicating with their members.  Images provided by the museum which were needed for the project were delayed as camera issues kept on occurring. Due to them being sent close to the end of the project I feel as if we could have provided more polish / playtesting to the game if we received them earlier.  We saw Heather as the manager of everything and put a lot of pressure on her, we could have done a week by week manager plan so that everyone could take role as manager.  Due to our project being done on Github, we could have created a project backlog and set tasks to allow us to understand what each member was doing. Instead, we trusted each other by word but realized that some work wasn’t being submitted until the very end of the project. |
| What do you think of your own contribution to the project? | I believe my communication during group meetings was efficient as during the process of our project I would question our motives and try to understand the scope of our game. This proved to be necessary during creatives talks as we did over scope before realizing the timeframe for the project and what resources we have. The approach I did during group meetings was to question each motive for our game and to see if there was any deadwood (we iterated the idea a lot). And it helped resolve a lot of issues involving art and how information will be provided to the public.  Despite having poor 2D art skills, I was happy with the drawings I provided for the timeline game. However, the rest of the team I was in were also in the same boat so it helped keep my morale up knowing that all of us weren’t comfortable doing 2D art. Courtney provided an art style guide for each member to use and it was helpful. |
| **OVERVIEW** |  |
| **Thinking about the project you have worked on this year, what are the important lessons that you will take away from the experience for your next group project?** | Communication is key and that you should always update the other team(s) about your situation. This can then benefit by allowing members to work on the other project if the other team are struggling.  Playtest as much as possible to understand if the game provided matches our target audience and if any bugs are present.  Set tasks through agile rather than word of mouth. Helps understand what the team is doing and where the project is going. |
| **ESCALATION** | N/A |

Asset / Contribution List;

5 JPEG’s / Photoshop files for the artwork I created for IP3.

(gardener.jpg /psd)

(mallet.jpg/psd)

(racehorse.jpg/psd)

(uniform.jpg/psd)

(sewing.jpg/psd)

Timeline design (psd)

Textbox artwork

(textbox\_template.jpg)

Presentation contribution

Group meeting contribution / brainstorming