**Meeting Notes**

**Concept Presentation Meeting**

**13 November**

*Attending: Carlos, Danika, Nils, Rene, Rody, Raphaël, Chucheng, Ruoqing, Panagiotis, Rick*

We discussed the two proposals the project group came up with. It was agreed immediately that the proposed aim of the project and of the game were in line with what the commissioners had in mind. After getting on the same page concerning terminology, we concluded that both concepts were very similar in respect to how they allow the player to interact and experiment with turbine designs.

Carlos raised the issue that the tower defense concept was quite detached from reality. This would mean that the learning goals and the game objective wouldn’t align, and it would also take away some options to learn about the real world applications of wind turbines.

In response to the first point, the project group argued that the learning goals and game objective don’t need to be the same, as long as the game encourages the player to keep playing and at the same time invest time in the turbine editor.

In response to the second point, Rene opted to replace the enemies and turrets with concepts that fit the topic better, like having water flowing in that threatens a city, which the turbines have to extract from the lane. Similarly, a city needs electricity and draws electrons from a coal power plant. By placing wind turbines, the player can replace the non-renewable energy that flows through the grid with renewable energy. Everyone agreed that this approach would fit the theme better and at the same time make the game more appealing to pacifists who aren’t fond of shooting enemies.

Carlos also mentioned that a key problem that needed solving was the fact that players can experiment with turbines until they find the best one, without understanding why a particular design works well, which kills the purpose of the game. This problem was acknowledged by all and will be investigated further by the students.

We agreed to go with the tower defense concept, with the proposed alterations. The main reason for this is that it is a creative approach that is quite different from what the commissioners initially had in mind. Since they already have a contract with another party to create a game more in line with our simulation proposal, they would be able to compare the effectiveness of both approaches.

Carlos did mention that, although he wasn’t opposed to the concept, he also wasn’t quite convinced why it would be better than a simulation approach. The pressure is on the students to show that a turret defense game is an entertaining way of presenting the course material without giving up any freedom to the player to experiment and learn.

Finally, we concluded that it would be a great achievement if 10% of the players would be interested to actually dive deeply into the subject matter. The game should introduce all the concepts and a gateway to the in depth theory should the player require it.

This means that everything in the game doesn’t have to be exactly physically correct, as long as it conveys the concepts. A bit of exaggeration can actually help in this respect.

Follow up:

* Danika promised to send us some statistics on the browser usage of TU Delft MOOC students. These have arrived already at the time of writing. These will be used to determine which tools are available without causing compatibility issues for the target audience.
* The students will start developing a first playable version. Nils will be contact person for questions related to the course material