

Process and Decision Documentation

Project/Assignment Decisions

- For Side Quest 3, I wanted to explore game ideas without relying too heavily on AI for brainstorming. I made this choice because I wanted to challenge myself to be more creative with limited AI help. I used Claude AI only to generate some rough starting points to save time, and limited myself to exploring three ideas before choosing the one I liked most. Seeing the first iterations without additional prompting helped me test how well the model handled different difficulty levels and prompting techniques. The first game concept (medium-difficulty) was broad but not very detailed. Meanwhile, the matcha café game was more complex since I had a lot of components, while the third idea (flower catcher) was the simplest. I ended up liking the third output the most because it matched the aesthetic I originally imagined.

GenAI Documentation

Date/s Used: Monday, February 2, 2026

Tool Disclosure: tool name + model/version: Free Claude AI (Sonnet 4.5)

Purpose of Use: I used GenAI to help me write code so that I can see the visual output faster and decide which one of the three ideas I had were feasible with limited prompting. I also used it to ask for help when my code wasn't working due to the javascript files' names.

Summary of Interaction: Claude provided me with easy to use organized javascript files. This structure created a clear decision tree (similar to what was shown in class) where each file handled a specific game state, making the code easier to understand, debug, and edit. Claude also added visual design elements including grain noise texture and a green gradient (all of which I asked for). It did not add hallucinate and add anything I did not ask for.

Human Decision Point(s): I had separate chats for each idea I had to prevent Claude from hallucinating and getting confused. From experience, when you brainstorm multiple ideas together, AI tends to combine them into something that doesn't really match what you asked for. I also spent more time writing specific prompts so I wouldn't get frustrated. The reason for this is because I've noticed that the longer the conversation goes, the less helpful the AI becomes, so I made sure to list all my feedback along with the code it generated.

Integrity & Verification Note: To make sure Claude's output was accurate and actually fit what I needed, I checked each response as I went by using the [p5.js](#) web editor and looking at the visuals. Every time Claude gave me something, whether it was code or an explanation, I compared it back to my own requirements and the side quest requirements to make sure it was correct.

Scope of GenAI Use: I came up with my own game ideas without AI help. I wrote my own prompts. All of my reflections are written and proof-read by me without AI assistance. I also wrote the Read Me file by myself.

Limitations or Misfires: The first two game ideas I explored were more complicated than the last idea I had and the output of those were not quite what I expected. It needed to be fixed by further prompts from me. Another limitation I observed was that it took 2-5 minutes to produce all the code I asked for. It made me feel as if Claude was providing me with high quality code, compared to ChatGPT's fast but inconsistent/unreliable outputs.

Summary of Process (Human + Tool)

Describe what you did, focusing on process rather than outcome.

- Started by requesting a flower catcher game with specific requirements (25-second timer, keyboard controls, multiple game states).
- Claude created the initial file structure with all JavaScript files using double-underscore naming convention (main.js, game.js, etc.)
 - This was the first and only error it made.

Decision Points & Trade-offs

Describe one or two key decisions you made:

- First issue: JavaScript files weren't loading properly due to the underscore naming convention (which I didn't catch at first).
- Communicated the problem to Claude, which quickly identified the issue and recreated all files with standard naming (main.js, game.js, etc.)
- Updated index.html to reference the corrected file names

Verification & Judgement: Explain how you evaluated whether your decision or change was appropriate:

- Tested the game and identified usability issues:
 - Grain noise was distractingly animated
 - Background was too dark
 - Instructions box blocked the basket
 - Win screen title color wasn't aesthetically pleasing
- Provided specific feedback to Claude for each issue in bullet points.
- Claude iteratively updated the CSS to address each concern I had.

Limitations, Dead Ends, or Open Questions

- After testing out 3 different ideas with limited exploration with the first 2, I ran out of free messages with Claude. I only got to prompt it less than 10 times and I had to wait for more than 3 hours to keep iterating, which was quite frustrating because I wanted to add more drawings to the background.

Appendix

First idea: Cake decorating game

- [Link to my full conversation with Claude AI](#)
- [Preview of the cake game](#)

Second idea: Matcha cafe game

- [Link to my full conversation with Claude AI](#)
- [Preview of the matcha game](#)

Third/Final Idea: Flower catcher game

- [Link to my full conversation with Claude AI](#)