Meeting Minutes

Date of meeting: 10/12/18

Time of meeting: 11:30am – 1pm

Attendees: Bethany Cowle, Alice Baker

Minute taker: Bethany Cowle

Postmortem of previous week:

Last week we discussed potential iterations that could be made to our game based on playtesting feedback. We changed two main features; one of which was adding tokens to the game in order to make the scoring system less confusing as players found that writing their score at the end of each game took a lot of time and confusion and also slowed down the pace of the game. We thought that adding tokens would be a better solution as it would allow players to keep track of their score visibily without having to write numbers on paper. We also decided we might test a mechanic that will allow liars to be aware of eachother and that they can gain extra points for working as a team. We will be playtesting these features this week to see how they change the game.

Most of the tasks this week were completed, however a couple of Alice’s tasks were left unfinished. Alice notified Beth through email that the tasks wouldn’t be completed in advance of the deadline. The team also communicated well through email to discuss ideas during the week.

Feedback received:

This morning we had a presentation and received some feedback from the lecturers.

Dave mentioned that he wasn’t sure how players are supposed to lie about the imaginary situations cards such as “What cult would you start?” as it isn’t a real life situation and therefore difficult to lie about. In order to solve this, it was suggested that we include multiple choice answers on each card, so players choose the most likely answer (or the least likely one they would do if they are lying that round), however, when we playtested the game, the majority of players said that one of their favourite aspects of the game is that it allows players to learn things about each other and share personal stories that they might not otherwise have had the opportunity to hear, so removing the option to create personal stories as answers may be removing one of the core elements that makes the game enjoyable for players. He also mentioned that some of the question cards are humiliating and may embarrass players which might make people not want to play the game or may make the game unenjoyable. However, during the last sprint we conducted an analysis of competitor games (looking at the types of question cards similar games have and reading Amazon reviews to see what parts of these games players liked or didn’t like) and we found that players within our target demographic tend to enjoy questions that embarrass and humiliate players and questions that provide room for answers with shock factor, especially when the game is being played amongst groups of close friends as it causes a lot of laughter and amusement, which is the scenario we have in mind when our game is being played. We also have evidence of this within our playtesting questionnaires, as when players were asked what their favourite questions were, many players said that these types of questions were their favourites. However, a few players also said that these questions were their least favourites, which is why we decided to introduce different categories of cards so that players can choose what types of questions the group would like to answer depending on the people playing and how close they are.

Dan Mayers asked us how many questions we had and how many we had playtested so far, we currently have around 70 questions, 30 of which we have playtested to see whether they are enjoyable and provide space for amusing discussion or not. Dan also suggested that we have around 100 question cards within the finished product.

In addition to this, Rob has reminded us to keep in mind that we need to make our game unique from other games that are similar on the market as there are a few games with similar core mechanics and currently it is uncertain whether our game stands out from the rest. In the future weeks, we will be continuing to playtest and iterate the mechanics we have in order to make our game a more unique and more memorable game for the players.

Overall aim of the current week’s sprint:

This week we will be doing more playtesting of our game, which we will collect feedback from and use to iterate our game further. We will also be producing ‘hint cards’, which will hopefully be used in situations where players are finding it difficult to come up with a lie to a question. These can be used as a prompt to help the liar imagine a fake scenario for their answer, or if the player successfully manages to include the word on the card within their answer undetected, they may be able to score extra points. We also aim to create sets of cards to hand out to people to playtest over Christmas, each containing around 25 different questions so that we are able to get all of our questions playtested if all sets are used rather than testing repeats. We also need to think of more questions for the risky category, as this category is currently lacking as many questions as the rest.

Tasks for the current week:

Alice Baker:

* Playtesting (3 hours)
* Game Jam on Thursday (2 hours)
* Type up 20 hint cards (2 hours)
* Create files to print for playtesting (2 hours)
* Type up playtesting feedback (1 hour 30 minutes)
* Cut out one set of the playtesting cards (1 hour 30 minutes)

Bethany Cowle:

* Playtesting (3 hours)
* Game Jam on Thursday (2 hours)
* Type up 20 hint cards (2 hours)
* Type up playtesting MDA (1 hour 30 minutes)
* Cut out 3 sets of the playtesting cards (3 hours)
* Think of more questions for the risky category (30 minutes)

Game Jams:

We will be having a game jam on Thursday to discuss playtesting feedback and how we can iterate our game based on the feedback we receive.