**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** | Heather Bishop |
| **PROJECT NAME** | S177801 |
| What do you think went well on the project? | Initial high energy and output of design and implementation. We brainstormed several ideas, even beyond the ones presented. Created design documents containing a backlog of tasks needed to be completed in order to make the game we had designed. It was a beautiful culmination of all the techniques and theory we had learned over the last two years, that was within reasonable scope initially.  Interesting mechanics and narrative that could have been used to make an amazing game, the combination of resource management and puzzle elements could have led to challenging player decisions.  High quality asset in the form of 3d models and 2D art. The game looked good, polished if a little sparse in some rooms. The lighting and effects made a real impact when people saw the game.    Our meetings were productive and we worked hard at the start of the project, with each meeting lasting over an hour and designing and agreeing on features from the very first meeting.    The group communicated regularly via discord, messenger and in person. |
| What do you think needed improvement on the project? | Poor project management in the sense that the project as a whole was relatively freeform and unstructured. This meant that nobody had a perspective of what each sprint added to cumulatively, what our short term goals were for each sprint, leading to situations where each week we would discuss the games core gameplay loop and mechanics, then end up iterating on those mechanics rather than implementing them. Another reason for this was that it wasn't encouraged to read the meeting minutes and create meeting agendas and stick to them. At the time i didn't realise how vital this was to keeping a long term project on track, as in the 12 week projects as long as the team is communicating regularly the difficulties can be managed ahead of time much swifter. However as the project went on the lack of structure provided by the key tools listed above meant we spent the whole time chasing our tails in an prototype iteration loop.  We should have finalised the design and locked in, changing nothing once the prototype was created.  Everyone burnt themselves out on asset output before finalising mechanics, and by January nobody wanted to work on the project leading to a vast drop in enthusiasm, motivation and quality of work.  Mistaken issues with level design were perceived as needing more mechanics and iteration.  The backlog and design documents were never read, so each week the group would iterate and change the design and flow of the game instead of digging down and get what they had implemented polished.  Ultimately, we were trying to fix the failures of our design by iterating the mechanics.it was doomed to fail from the start. Playtesting also was very underwhelming on the project, because so much time was spent making various prototypes.      The team had meetings at least once a week, however the quality of the meetings was sometimes low in places. For example a lot of time was wasted at meetings going over the current game mechanics, implying that nobody had a good view of the project as a whole. I think perhaps meeting agendas would have helped with this, having an outline of what we needed to talk about and why. As Well as encouraging people to regularly check the design document as well as the backlog. Another issue was nobody was officially named manage each week, meaning that some weeks there were no meeting minutes and sprints were set up late. I should have just taken on the role and delegated appropriately rather than trying to do everything that was left over but still needed to be done each week. I should have delegated out the extra tasks so each person ended up with an additional one or two hours.  Not understanding how all of the interlocking parts of the game worked presented serious challenges because, as with all ambiguity in life, team members constructed their own version of the game mentally and when the team would meet this would lead to going through the design document and changing fundamental ways the game work.  One reason for this is due to the fact The group didn't really brainstorm any features. In hindsight, the team was taking the first suggestion and not thinking further. The team also didn't debate how features and mechanics would work in great detail, so then the design and implementation were at odds. For example, the way that the character controller and the level design was challenging because the character controller wasn't initially implemented to use stairs. If the team had discussed the level design together rather than tasks being assigned and carried out individually, or if as a group we had gone through the design together, a lot of confusion could have been avoided. As the person putting all of the elements of the game together I was the only one seeing the bigger picture, and then I failed to communicate that picture well enough to the team.  We should have communicated more consistently, and used a daily message or stand up to update each other on progress. There were sprints where blocker tasks weren't completed until the end of the Sprint, that caused relatively consistent pipeline issues. I should have been more forthright about chasing people up for work and reminding people that they had a blocker task to be sure they could complete it in time. |
| What do you think of your own contribution to the project? | At times I am proud of my contribution to this project. My work on the narrative was of a good quality, it blended with the mechanics well. The set of mechanics we were using at that time, anyway. The difficulties started when it became apparent I was the only project manager. Because I had no desire to to fill this role permanently I shied away and tried to encourage the others to manage equally. However when it became clear this was not going to be the case I should have reduced my work output for the rest of the project and focused on management and organisation of the project fully. Instead I chose to try and do both, manage, design, narrative, programming. This meant that by December I was struggling to juggle everything and burnt out, and had sacrificed my final project so much that I then had no motivation or time to work on group project.  I also need to work on my assertiveness. During the project there were decisions made that I knew were foolish and would cause us problems later on in development (e.g. not teaming up with a programmer, having enemies in the game, the weekly changes to mechanics). However I didn't fight hard enough for my convictions for fear of upsetting the teams feelings. Likewise when work began to fade in quality and frequency I should have fought to rally the troops, or let the project sink completely instead of trying to fix everything myself.    Logging hours was also a big issue on this project, I for one spent countless hours tweaking lighting, props, variables in scripts etc that I didn't log. This was incredibly foolish because my asset list is quite small, meaning I had no real way to track how much work I was doing each week and making myself look very lazy. |
| **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?** | Delegation is vital to any project, one man cannot be an island in game development. Not for a project of the scope we were trying to accomplish anyway.  To choose to work with people who compliment my own skills better, while the team I was working with are all very skilled individuals none of us are particularly assertive so it meant we didn't disagree about the way features and mechanics worked, leading to design flaws later on.  Project management. I need to improve my understanding of how to scope, plan and carry out a project with multiple people.  I have also learned better methods of communication through the failure of communication on this project, and I'm working on being more assertive and not just accepting work because I can't be bothered to disagree and demand better.  I have also learned that I need to trust my own design knowledge more. At several points in the project I should have fought harder to drop or keep features that playtesting had shown worked well to accomplish psychological flow. |

**Asset List**

* 3 character models and textures.
* Design document.
* Player scripts. 2 versions - first person and third person.
* Level designs.
* Gate 3d model.
* Laser output node 3d model.
* Mirror 3d model.
* Mood boards and concept art (player, enemies, bosses).
* Moving platform script.
* Feather 3d model.
* Animator controllers.