

Test lab: playtest pack

One pack per group. Part A is on your own; Parts B–D are in your group of 4. Player IDs only: never write a tester's full name.

PART A · SIMULATE BY HAND · ROLL FOR REWARD ROUND 3 (WEEK 3 RULES)

Odd-numbered seats **never bank**; even-numbered seats **bank when the pot reaches 12**. Play three solo games of 6 turns. Main-die 1 busts the pot and tiers you up to the d8; 3 or 5 rolls the modifier (4–6 add, 1–3 subtract); 6 is a duck (4 each, 5 each with 3+); banking uses a turn. End score = bank + pot + ducks.

Player ID / strategy	Game 1	Game 2	Game 3	Room average · simulation (10,000 games)

PART B · DESIGN ROUND 5 · ONE RULE CHANGE · 10 MINUTES

The rule	One sentence another group can follow without asking you.
Our question	What do you want to learn? About feeling, choice or understanding, and something you can observe.
Prediction	What will testers do and feel?
Wrong if...	What result would surprise you?

INVESTIGATOR SCRIPT · READ IT AS WRITTEN

"Thanks for testing. We're testing the game, not you. We'll take notes and ask you a short survey, with no names. You can stop at any time without giving a reason. We can't answer rule questions while you play: if you're stuck, tell us what you're trying to do."

Then read your Round 5 rule once. If asked a rule question: "What do you think it means?" If the game stalls: "What are you trying to do right now?" Nothing else.

Part C · playtest another group's Round 5 · 15 minutes

Investigator: script, then silence. **Note-taker:** one row per observation, what they did or said word for word. Interpret later.
Severity: High · Medium · Low · As designed · Fact of life.

#	Player ID	Where (turn)	Verbatim: what they did or said	Underlying issue (later)	Severity	Proposed fix
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						

TESTER SURVEY · CIRCLE 1 (STRONGLY DISAGREE) TO 5 (STRONGLY AGREE)

Statement	Tester ID ____	Tester ID ____	Tester ID ____
The new rule was easy to understand.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
I felt in control of my choices.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
The new rule was worth using.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
I wanted to play another round.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
The round felt fair.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
What would you change? (one line each)			

Part D · triage, then report in one minute

Back in your own group with the notes and surveys from your rule's playtest. Count first: which observations came up most often?

Symptom (what testers did or said)	Cause (why, in the design)	Severity	Priority (P1–P4)	Fix, or "keep: as designed"

Was the prediction right? what surprised you? did testers diverge (half loved it, half didn't)?

What would you simulate next? a number, rate or spread a Monte Carlo run could check before the next playtest

ONE-MINUTE REPORT

"We asked We saw The cause was Next we'll"

EXIT TICKET · ON YOUR OWN

"In my project I'd simulate ..., but only a player could tell me ..."

Reading: GDnD wiki pages Playtesting, Probability for Designers (Monte Carlo in a spreadsheet) and QA and Bug Triage.