welcome to

GAMELET DESIGN

for education
Objectives

- Segregation homework 5 conclusion
- Discussion of educational simulation design process
- Present your educational simulation
Extension for Homework

- Only about half of you completed the Schelling assignment
- By Weds midnight, please post your analysis of your game via GORP: fun and learning
Process for educational simulations

- 1a. simulation domain and target concept(s)
- 1b. presentation and critique
- 2a. implemented simulation
- 2b. in-class playtest and critique
- 3a. play test with kids
- 3b. presentation of play test results (this presumably focuses on whether kids were interested in the domain and whether they could understand something about it, based on their interaction with the implementation, with whatever assistance is needed from the CU student... the simulation won't have a polished UI, so does not have to be a hands-off play test)
- 4a. idea for a game built on or around the simulation, with fun analysis, and very rough learning analysis [I think we do need something on learning here to avoid deadends at 6]
- 4b. presentation and critique
- 5a. implementation
- 5b. in class playtest and critique
- 5c. playtest with kids (?)
- 6a. learning analysis and proposal for scaffolding
- 6b. presentation and critique
- 6c. playtest with kids
- 6d. final presentation

At each numbered stage of individual work, but not the lettered sub stages, we allow and even encourage students to abandon their concept from the previous stage, and adopt another student's idea that seems better.
In the past we feel students made an early commitment and stayed with bad ideas... we want them to respond to critiques, abandon bad ideas, and develop better ones. For example, a student could drop the domain they proposed in 1 and implement one of the other ideas in 2, or could decide to do a playtest in 3 on another student's implementation from 2, because they feel that their idea isn't as good, and not as worth playtesting. We need to decide whether when students abandon their concept they have to choose another student's concept, or can come up with something new. My hunch is that we should allow new ideas, but under fairly strict conditions: they have to come up with a convincing analysis of their new idea that covers all previous stages. In the limit they would have to go back and do their own kid playtesting if they wanted to introduce a new idea after phase 3, but if we are convinced their new idea is really good, perhaps because it is an adaptation of an idea that was already playtested, we could waive this. We agree to be careful about input from the Trails people... we can and should welcome it, but we have to be the final arbiter for the students about whether they will act on input or not. We arrogantly believe that we can make better judgments about fun and learning than other people can, and we need to feel we can bring our judgment to bear with the students feeling caught in a conflict.
Discussion

- Anyone volunteer to present their game?
- You can present as a success or an instructive failure
Next Assignment

- Propose a simulation domain and one or more target concepts
- Answer the following questions:
  - Why would someone want to learn the target concept(s)?
  - Persuade us that working with the simulation would promote learning the target concept(s)
  - Persuade us that the simulation has promising properties as the basis for a fun game
  - Eg has good prospects for emergent events, progress toward goal, partial reinforcement, etc.
- Due: in GORP Monday March 6, 11:59pm
Sources of inspiration

◆ Arbitrary mapping between game and learning domain
  ◆ Try different ones
  ◆ Good idea /bad idea?
◆ Simulations
  ◆ Simulations of conflict and society: http://conflictandsociety.atspace.com/
  ◆ The Madness of Crowds:
    http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/12.01/start.html?pg=9
  ◆ JASSS: Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulations:
    http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/JASSS.html
  ◆ Disaster Dynamics at NCAR: http://www.dd.ucar.edu/