**MEETING MINUTES**

04/02/2019 @ 11am – 1pm

Attendees – Alice Baker & Bethany Cowle

Manager and minute taker - Alice

**Postmortem for the previous week –**

All of the tasks were finished on time and we communicated efficiently throughout the week. We looked into other betting games and how we might be able to use these in our game. We had two successful playtesting sessions, with two slightly different betting mechanics. The first involved betting on who players thought the liar was, then depending on the amount of counters they bet with, they would receive that many points for getting the correct answer and would move forward on their own board (like the points grid in Azul). If players bet incorrectly, they would deduct points and move back on the board. This iteration worked well and players gave us positive feedback – they really liked that the votes were open now, where they were hidden in previous versions of the game. We then tested our next iteration, which removed the points grid on the board so that the betting counters were used as points instead. Players also liked this iteration and we noticed that it was quicker to work out points. The tension was increased significantly once we added the different betting mechanics, as there was more at stake when voting who the liar was.

**Feedback received –**

We met with Rob on Monday morning to explain and play through a round of our game as we play tested it last week. The most recent iteration we had was to test a betting mechanic similar to how the game Wits & Wagers work. Players would start off with 2 counters that they could use to make bets, then receive double the tokens if they guessed the liar correctly. In this betting mechanic, the bets were open so that all players could see what everyone else had voted for. As this can influence other players, Rob suggested that we could try closed betting, so that the betting information would be hidden, and therefore players wouldn’t be influenced by other player’s votes. We tried hidden voting in the previous version of the game which worked well, so we’ll be testing this in the future. We also discussed how we might be able to incorporate the use of odds in the betting mechanic, like how Wits & Wagers works to receive more tokens. Rob also mentioned the possibility of having players create a narrative with their answers, which could be auctioned off at the end of a round. After meeting with Rob, we were able to think of lots of ways we could use these mechanics during our game jam, which we can look into further during the upcoming weeks. These ideas will be outlined in the design document to be updated this week.

**Overall aim of the current sprint –**

During our game jam, we decided on a few iterations for working in odds for our betting mechanic. This first one we’ll be trying this week is - if a player places their bet on a space where there are no other votes, the stakes are at their highest. For example – If 3 players placed their bets on player 1, and 1 player places their bets on player 2, the player who voted for player 2 will be betting at 3:1, while the 3 players who placed their bets on player 1 will be betting at 2:1. We’ll be working on the details this week before playtesting, which will be updated in the ruleset. If we get a chance, we’ll be playtesting a similar version to this, where the odds will be the highest if you’re the player who places their bet down first.

**Tasks –**

**Alice**

* [2h] Game Jam (Monday)
* [1h] Update the design document
* [2h] Playtesting
* [1h] Type up playtesting feedback

**Beth**

* [2h] Game Jam (Monday)
* [1h 30m] Update the ruleset for the two new iterations
* [2h] Playtesting
* [30m] Write up playtesting MDA analysis

***Any other business***

Game jam dates and times -

Monday 04/02/19 @ 11am – 1pm