Process & Decision Documentation

This document is used to make your design and development process visible. At this stage of your academic career, you are expected not only to produce finished work, but to articulate how decisions were made, how ideas changed, and how collaboration (for the assignments that include group work) unfolds

In professional and co-op contexts, employers do not only evaluate your final projects in your portfolio. They often ask candidates to explain their process, justify trade-offs, reflect on iteration, and describe their roles within a team.

You will need to submit a modification of this document for every group assignment (A1 – A3) and a shorter version for your individual assignments (Side Quests and A4).

For A1 – A3, this is a group document submitted once per group. Each group member must clearly document their own role and responsibilities. Different roles will naturally produce different design processes.

Process Overview Visualization (Group Work Only)

Include one simple visual representation of your group's design process. This may take the form of a timeline, flow diagram, loop, branching sketch, or other format that reflects how your project actually unfolded.

This visualization does not need to be polished or visually refined. Hand-drawn sketches or screenshots are acceptable. For assignments that are extensions of previous assignments (A2 and A3), you may resubmit or reuse previous submissions with additional add-ones and context.

Your visualization must clearly show the following elements:

- Roles and responsibilities: Indicate which roles involved at different stages of the project.
- Who did what, and when: Show how work was distributed over time. This can be approximate (e.g., "early," "mid-project," "final week") and does not need exact dates.
- Key stages or phases of work: For example, for A1, can start with research.
- Decision points or pivots: Indicate moments where the group changed direction, simplified scope, or made a significant design decision.
- Iteration or feedback loops: Show where ideas were tested, revised, or reworked (e.g., after playtesting or feedback from instructors).

The purpose of this visualization is not to present an ideal or "correct" design process, but make your actual process visible including parallel work, false starts, and revisions.

Reference examples (for inspiration only)

You may find it helpful to look at well-known design process visualizations you've likely seen before, such as:

- Nielsen Norman Group – Design Thinking Overview: https://media.nngroup.com/media/articles/attachments/Design-thinking-101-NNG.pdf
- Design Council – Double Diamond: https://www.designcouncil.org.uk/our-resources/the-double-diamond/

These examples are provided as references, not templates to follow. Your visualization does not need to match these models and will not be assessed based on adherence to any specific framework.

Project/Assignment Decisions

Use this section to document key decisions that shape the direction, scope, or outcome of the assignment. The purpose is to make your judgement and reasoning visible, not to record every action taken.

What you include here should reflect decisions that mattered: moments where you chose one path over another, changed direction, or adapted to constraints.

The expected length and detail depend on the assignment.

Side Quests and A4 (Individual Work)

Keep this section brief, typically 2 to 4 sentences.

Focus on:

- One significant decision or change you made
- Why you made it
- What effect it had on the work

Examples:

- Simplifying a mechanic so it functioned correctly

- Changing an approach after something failed
- Deciding not to pursue an idea due to time or technical limitations

You are not expected to document every alternative or iteration

A1 – A3 (Group Work)

Provide more details, as decisions are shared, cumulative, and affect multiple roles.

Document decisions such as:

- Scope changes or feature cuts
- Design or analytical pivots
- Outcomes of playtesting or peer/instructor feedback
- Technical or coordination-related trade-offs
- Ethical, representational, or global contexts for design decisions

For each major decision, briefly include:

- What changed
- Why the decision was made
- Who was involved or responsible

This may be written in short paragraphs or bullet points.

This section is not a complete project history. It is a record of decisions that shape the work. Clarity, judgement, and relevance matter more than length.

Role-Based Process Evidence

This section documents how your work developed over time and provides concrete evidence of your process. It is used to make your thinking, iteration, and decision-making visible, whether or not GenAI was used. You may reuse relevant process evidence across documents where appropriate, as long as it accurately reflects the work for that assignment.

For group assignments (A1 – A3), this section is completed collectively, with clearly attributed role-based entries. For the group, your entries should correspond to elements shown in your process overview visualization such as stages, iterations, or decision points.

For individual assignments (Side Quests and A4), this section is completed individually, using a simplified version of the same structure. For Side Quests, you may omit sections below where no meaningful decision-making occurred. For example, for the first side quest which you need to just upload a blank p5.js to GitHub, you must have to remove a significant amount of the process based evidence as not a lot of design decisions were made.

Examples of acceptable process evidence include (but are not limited to):

- Screenshots of video editing timelines
- Drafts of scripts or research notes
- Annotated sources
- Sketches or diagrams
- Early document outlines
- Prototype screenshots
- Code snippets or commits
- Before-and-after revisions

Project management artifacts (e.g., task boards, timelines, coordination) may be included here when they are relevant to understand how assignment-level decisions were made.

If GenAI was used to support planning, coordination, or role management, this should be noted briefly here as part of the process evidence. Deeper reflection on how GenAI affected teamwork, fairness, and coordination over time belongs in the GenAI Reflections (A4).

Entry Header

Name: Vrajani Popawala

Role(s): Editor

Primary responsibility for this work: Set up Github and work on Visual Studio Code

Goal of Work Session

Briefly describe what you were trying to accomplish during this phase of the assignment.

Examples:

- Drafting an initial script section
- Refining pacing in the video edit
- Revising a mechanic after playtesting

- Narrowing or reframing research examples
- Debugging or simplifying a feature

Tools, Resources, or Inputs Used

- GenAI tools (if used)
- Lecture Notes
- Teammates
- Prior drafts or code
- Playtesting feedback
- External references (in-text citations with square brackets, ex. [1])

GenAI Documentation

Everyone must complete this section. If not GenAI was used, write, "No GenAI used for this task." When GenAI is not used, process evidence should still demonstrate iteration, revision, or development over time.

Because GenAI can closely mimic human-created work, instructors or TAs may occasionally request additional process evidence to confirm non-use. This may include original working files (e.g., an illustrator file), intermediate drafts, or a brief check-in with a TA to walk through your process.

These requests are not an assumption of misconduct. They are part of ensuring academic integrity in an environment where distinguishing between human-created and AI-generated work is increasingly difficult.

If GenAI was used (keep each response as brief as possible):

Date Used:

Tool Disclosure: tool name + model/version (example, ChatGPT 5.2)

Purpose of Use: Why you used GenAI (e.g., brainstorming, debugging, summarization, wording support).

Summary of Interaction: Briefly describe what the tool contributed. Do not paste full transcript here, that will be included in the appendix of this document.

Human Decision Point(s): Describe where you overruled, modified, rejected, or redirected the GenAI output, and why.

Integrity & Verification Note: Explain how you checked GenAI output for accuracy, bias, appropriateness, or fit with course concepts.

Scope of GenAI Use: Clarify which parts of the work GenAI did not contribute to. GenAI cannot write the whole assignment without changes.

Limitations or Misfires: Note what the tool did poorly, misunderstood, or could not account for.

Summary of Process (Human + Tool)

Describe what you did, focusing on process rather than outcome. This may include:

- Iteration between drafts or versions
- Discussion with teammates
- Testing and revision
- Moments of uncertainty, failure, or rework

Decision Points & Trade-offs

Describe one or two key decisions you made:

- What options you considered
- What changed
- Why that choice was made

These decisions should align with decision points shown in your visualization (for A1 – A3).

Verification & Judgement

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

Examples:

- Playtesting
- Group discussion
- Peer or instructor feedback
- Comparison with course concepts
- Re-reading assignment criteria
- Ethical, representational, accessible, or global considerations

Limitations, Dead Ends, or Open Questions

Note anything that:

- Did not work as expected
- Was left unresolved
- Required compromise or simplification

Appendix

Please include a full transcript of your conversation with the GenAI. GenAI transcripts are used for transparency and verification only and are not assessed for writing quality or completeness.

Note: If GenAI is used in another language, you must include both the original language and a translated transcript in the appendix