**PROJECT POSTMORTEM SUBMISSION FRIDAY 4TH MAY 2018**
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1. A SINGLE PAGE OF A4 (MAXIMUM) WHICH LISTS THE OVERVIEW OF THE ASSETS YOU HAVE PRODUCED FOR THE PROJECT, WHETHER THEY HAVE MADE IT INTO THE FINAL GAME OR NOT.
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| **STUDENT NAME** | Sam McMillan |
| **PROJECT NAME** | Group 5: Super Sushi Showdown |
| What do you think went well on the project? | By the end of the project our group had a game that I am happy enough with, which is a success in its own right. I think Henry performed as a project manager well, dealing with a couple of problems that cropped up over the course of the project, such as Dawid’s hospital visit and Ashley’s disappearance, by effectively managing the tasks of group members that were available.  I was proud of our team when we managed to evoke amusement from the audience in our third pitch courtesy of the chef mascot’s in our game. I think that reaction was a sign that we managed to effectively evoke at least some of the emotions we wanted to make players feel from Super Sushi Showdown.  I think from a design perspective, the UI assets and main game screen look pleasing, and are clear in a simple way. Except for the instructions, the game relies almost entirely on affordances to give information to the player, down to the diegetic way the game displays score using the amount of customers sat at each either bar. As a result, the game has a good sense of clarity, the screen is never cluttered, and is visually appealing as a result.  Although target audience could be disputed, our game fit most aspects of the brief. We used a symmetric with symmetric gameplay, in a 2D game, on a single device, using a single tap. Our rules are very basic, explained in 3 short lines, which also fits the criteria of the brief. |
| What do you think needed improvement on the project? | I think overall the communication between our group was rather weak. This mainly affected the design aspect of the game. What I mean by that is that, because the three designers on the team were not communicating with each other, the game at times was a mess of different art styles that didn’t fit together. This was mostly fixed by the end of the game, although I’m still not entirely sure why we have stereotypically Italian chef mascots in a game about two oriental sushi bars.  Another thing that affected the design to the same effect was our inability to use game jam time effectively. While we sat side by side in these sessions, our team would rarely share our work with one another to confirm a singular aesthetic.  I think we struggled to over the course of this project to balance our game for the target audience specified in the brief. I think we put ourselves at a disadvantage with this from the start by choosing to base our game on a twitch mechanic. While we did include our variable speed negative feedback loop, in which the winning players conveyer belt speeds up where the losing players slows down, I don’t think that change was enough to make the game suitable for the target audience in the brief.  We also struggled to find a way to have the two players interact with each other. Even in the final build, player interaction isn’t there at all. This is a shame, and again I feel is the product of an admittedly poorly chosen core mechanic.  I also think our team neglected playtesting for too long. Admittedly, Henry did set the tasks for playtesting, but for whatever reasons the three designers, myself of course included in that, didn’t complete those tasks. As a result, I think some problems we hadn’t originally considered cropped up too late in development to address.  I do think some of the tasks I was set were somewhat mundane. For example, Henry at one point set me the task of researching schadenfreude. He didn’t ask me to look for examples of schadenfreude in contemporary games or in the mobile market, just to research schadenfreude. Aside from a basic definition of the word, I couldn’t find anything on the internet or in Schell about schadenfreude, so I had to improvise my task. Although if I am being honest with myself, this was something I should have communicated to Henry over email. |
| What do you think of your own contribution to the project? | If I am being brutally honest with myself, my punctuality during this project wasn’t acceptable, and is something I need to improve as a manager next year. I was late to a few meetings, missed a couple others, including a project management tutorial. That’s not a habit I will be developing in the future.  I also wasn’t entirely reliable with some of the tasks set for me. A few art tasks I didn’t manage to complete in the given time, a few others I didn’t start, as mentioned earlier in the brief concerning playtesting.  Prior to the start of the project, I had hoped to take on programming tasks alongside design tasks, using Unreal Engine. Unfortunately, our project was developed using Unity, an engine I am not confident with, so I couldn’t contribute to the programming. It is, however, entirely fair that the sole programmer of the group chooses what engine we use, so I absolutely can’t fault Henry for his choice in engine.  That all said, the work I have done, namely the UI assets and the counter art that made into the game, is completed to a good standard, applying design along the way, such as colour theory, affordances, and the design of the buttons to make them stand out. In general, I think my art was well made, given I am admittedly not an experienced artist. Linework was fine, the colour scheme of earthly greens and browns complimented the relaxed gameplay of a casual game. Although arguably it doesn’t fit the twitch mechanic gameplay present in Super Sushi Showdown, I think it suit the kind of game asked for in the brief.  I think I was the most vocal in meetings when it came to design decisions. I would often communicate my ideas concerning design clearly and effectively, and a decent chunk of my influence made it into the game, such as the layout of the main game screen (with guidance over several iterations from the other group members), the use of customers to display score, and the whole concept for the title screen and UI elements.  I also think for the most part I hit my stride in presentations. I was often complimented by peers for my confidence in presenting, and is something I’ve been rather proud of for myself over the course of this project. |
| **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?** | Playtesting needs to be done earlier. Arguably after our first prototype, and every iteration onwards. This is important, as our team can’t possibly discover every flaw in our game without playtesting, so the process will objectively lead to a better game.  I will also value the time that should be spent considering a core mechanic before development. Ultimately, I think we fulfilled most of what the brief asked for, but our game was built around hard fun, which did not fulfill the criteria of a casual game set in the brief.  Attendance is also incredibly important. I was not reliable with my attendance in this project, and I didn’t always have good reason to be late or absent. This is something that needs to change. I like to think towards the latter end of the project I fixed my attendance issues, however it is something I will be stressing the importance of to my group members next year.  I will also prepare more for the design tutorials next year, to use that time more efficiently, to develop a better understanding of where the lecturers think our project is it, which in turn would help my team establish where the project needs improvement.  This isn’t something I would’ve expected of Henry given he is a programmer, but as a design student managing a group I will make a point of giving my team a clearer idea of what I expect from them from design tasks. If I ever asked Henry for any specific ideas regarding the design tasks I was given the usual answer was “whatever you want to do”. I appreciate the freedom, but it also led to the inconsistencies with the art style that our project faced over different iterations. Perhaps a design document would be an interesting idea, as I don’t think any group produced one. |