

# 1H Group Logbook

## Meeting 1

- **Date:** 5 November 2025
- **Time:** 19:00 - 20:00
- **Platform:** Discord
- **Attendees:** Ge, Yuxu; Mohan, Anand; Jackson, Luke; Dharmappa, Nithish Sagar; Channagounder, Rohan
- **Absentees:** None

### 1. Agenda

- Discuss and finalize each member's research questions (RQs).
- Decide whether to use one shared RQ or multiple RQs.
- Plan next steps and assign tasks.

### 2. Review of Previous Action Items

- N/A (First recorded meeting)

### 3. Discussion Summary

- The team unanimously agreed to collaborate on one common RQ: "Which AI architectures or behaviour models can enable NPCs to adapt to a player's play style... without breaking immersion?".
- Confirmed the research topic as "Challenge perception from players in digital games".

### 4. New Action Items

- **All Members:** Find two papers related to the final RQ (Deadline: 7 Nov 2025).
- **All Members:** Write short annotated bibliographies and upload them (Deadline: 7 Nov 2025).
- **Yuxu:** Responsible for maintaining the Logbook and shared folder.

**Reflection:** This initial session was crucial for aligning individual interests into a cohesive group topic. Establishing a shared vision for the Research Question early on helped reduce ambiguity and set a positive tone for future collaboration.

# Meeting 2

- **Date:** 9 November 2025
- **Time:** 14:00 - 15:00
- **Platform:** Discord
- **Attendees:** Ge, Yuxu; Mohan, Anand; Jackson, Luke; Dharmappa, Nithish Sagar; Channagounder, Rohan
- **Absentees:** None

## 1. Agenda

- Confirm deliverable requirements and whether a written literature review is required.
- Lock down the pre-Wednesday plan and individual tasks.
- Construct RQ framework and review framework direction.

## 2. Review of Previous Action Items

- **All Members:** "Annotated bibliographies" (Uploaded/In Progress - Luke to add remaining summaries).

## 3. Discussion Summary

- Confirmed the assessment format is a live presentation; no separate written literature review file is submitted.
- Defined presentation structure: approx. 10 min literature review + 5 min deep dive.
- Decided to reframe the focus from "which methods" to "how effective are adaptation approaches" to enable better comparison.

## 4. New Action Items

- **Luke:** Upload outstanding papers/summaries (Deadline: ASAP).
- **All Members:** Skim others' summaries, tag papers (Keep/Discuss/Drop), and add page refs (Deadline: Wed meeting).
- **All Members:** Prepare to select the paper for the Deep Dive (Deadline: Wed meeting).

**Reflection:** Clarifying the assessment format eliminated unnecessary work on a written report, allowing us to focus resources on the slides. Reframing the RQ focus was a key learning moment, ensuring our literature review would be analytical rather than merely descriptive.

# Meeting 3

- **Date:** 12 November 2025
- **Time:** 19:00 - 20:00
- **Platform:** Discord
- **Attendees:** Ge, Yuxu; Mohan, Anand; Jackson, Luke; Dharmappa, Nithish Sagar; Channagounder, Rohan
- **Absentees:** None

## 1. Agenda

- Push forward the literature review draft.
- Start PPT construction.
- Confirm presentation role allocation.
- Decide which papers to include.

## 2. Review of Previous Action Items

- **Luke:** Upload outstanding papers - **Completed** (All members have uploaded summaries and full texts).
- **All Members:** Skim and tag papers - **Completed** (Yuxu and Anand have reviewed and provided reasons).

## 3. Discussion Summary

- **Role Allocation:** Confirmed Rohan and Nithish as Presenters; Luke responsible for script and slides; Yuxu and Anand to assist.
- **PPT Strategy:** Confirmed the presentation itself is the literature review; needs about 10 slides.
- **Paper Selection:** Start with the top 5 papers, decided via voting in the shared sheet.

## 4. New Action Items

- **Luke:** Create a new spreadsheet for paper voting; create main slide deck template.
- **All Members:** Vote on papers in the shared spreadsheet.
- **Group:** Begin collaborative editing of the main slide deck.

**Reflection:** Allocating roles based on individual strengths (e.g., speaking vs. writing) maximized our efficiency. Using a voting system for paper selection ensured that every member had a voice, minimizing potential bias and increasing group buy-in.

# Meeting 4

- **Date:** 19 November 2025
- **Time:** 19:00 - 20:30
- **Platform:** Discord
- **Attendees:** Ge, Yuxu; Mohan, Anand; Jackson, Luke; Dharmappa, Nithish Sagar; Channagounder, Rohan
- **Absentees:** None

## 1. Agenda

- Discuss conflicts regarding the presentation schedule.
- Clarify priorities for PPT production (Deep dive vs. Main slides).
- Schedule the next synchronous collaboration session.

## 2. Review of Previous Action Items

- **Group:** Collaborative editing of slides - **In Progress** (Anand and Yuxu wrote drafts separately; Yuxu integrated parallel versions from different members and resolved logical inconsistencies in the slide structure).

## 3. Discussion Summary

- **Schedule Change:** Luke raised a conflict for the Tuesday slot; the team agreed to apply for a change to Wednesday.
- **Deep Dive:** Confirmed the deep dive should focus on "one specific paper".
- **Collaboration:** Decided to hold an offline/synchronous meeting tomorrow (11/20) for efficiency.
- Nithish Sagar and Rohan concurred with the meeting outcomes and confirmed they would prepare the presentation in accordance with the agreed content.

## 4. New Action Items

- **Group (Luke, Yuxu, Anand):** Meet tomorrow (Nov 20) at 11:00 am to complete slide production together.
- **Luke:** Decide on the specific Deep Dive paper and inform Anand before the next meeting.
- **Rohan & Nithish:** Prepare presentation content.

**Reflection:** This meeting highlighted the importance of flexibility in scheduling. By actively consolidating parallel drafts, we avoided version control issues and ensured the presentation narrative remained consistent despite multiple contributors.

# Meeting 5

- **Date:** 20 November 2025
- **Time:** All-day Flexible Session (Working & Chatting)
- **Platform:** Discord
- **Attendees:** Ge, Yuxu; Mohan, Anand; Jackson, Luke; Dharmappa, Nithish Sagar; Channagounder, Rohan
- **Absentees:** None

## 1. Agenda

- Confirm presentation schedule change.
- Discuss slides strategy (content density vs. readability).
- Select Deep Dive paper.

## 2. Review of Previous Action Items

- **Luke:** Decide Deep Dive paper - **Discussed** (Anand leaned towards CORGIS; Luke had concerns but accepted; discussion continued).
- **Group:** Meet to work on slides - **Completed** (Yuxu updated the logical structure of the causal chain; Anand uploaded speaker notes).

## 3. Discussion Summary

- **Time Confirmation:** Presentation successfully changed to Wednesday 1:00 - 1:30 pm.
- **PPT Design:** There was disagreement regarding text density on slides. Some members preferred detailed text, while others prioritized clean visuals. **Yuxu facilitated a compromise by proposing the Speaker Notes solution to balance aesthetic requirements with content completeness, which the group accepted.**
- **Deep Dive:** Leaning towards CORGIS paper, combined with ROCS framework (SPIDER) for analysis.
- Nithish Sagar and Rohan concurred with the meeting outcomes and confirmed they would prepare the presentation in accordance with the agreed content.

## 4. New Action Items

- **Luke:** Create Google Sheet containing the mark scheme; reply to Francesca to confirm the time change.
- **Group:** Continue polishing the slides, balancing "readability" with "content completeness".
- **Nithish & Rohan:** Prepare the presentation based on the updated slides and script.

**Reflection:** Resolving the conflict over slide design taught us that compromise is essential for progress. Moving detailed text to speaker notes satisfied both the need for academic rigour and the requirement for a presentable visual aid.

# Meeting 6

- **Date:** 21 November 2025
- **Time:** All-day Flexible Session (Working & Chatting)
- **Platform:** Discord
- **Attendees:** Jackson, Luke; Ge, Yuxu; Mohan, Anand; Dharmappa, Nithish Sagar; Channagounder, Rohan
- **Absentees:** None

## 1. Agenda

- Coordinate deadline management (Peer Review and final submission).
- Review slide feedback and finalize strategy (content density and readability).
- Plan the final collaboration sprint.

## 2. Review of Previous Action Items

- **Luke:** Create Google Sheet/Doc with mark scheme - **Completed** (Uploaded a copy of the mark scheme for verification).
- **Group:** Continue polishing slides - **In Progress** (Yuxu and Luke both uploaded edited versions; Yuxu is finalizing the Logbook).

## 3. Discussion Summary

- **Submission Strategy:** The team reached a consensus to submit the PPT, Logbook, and Peer Reviews on Sunday to avoid potential issues on Monday.
- **Slide Finalization:** Decided to use Yuxu's edited version as the base, removing duplicates. Anand reiterated the need to reduce text density and move details to Speaker Notes for better readability.
- **Methodology:** Anand tentatively added a Methodology slide; the team is reviewing its necessity.
- Nithish Sagar and Rohan concurred with the meeting outcomes and confirmed they would prepare the presentation in accordance with the agreed content.

## 4. New Action Items

- **Luke and Anand:** Continue modifying slides, specifically addressing readability and font issues.
- **Yuxu:** Complete the Logbook and submit peer reviews.
- **Group:** Conduct a final sprint on Saturday afternoon/evening to finalize all submissions.

**Reflection:** Proactive deadline management, such as aiming for a Sunday submission, reduced the team's stress levels. The final peer review discussion reinforced the value of accountability and ensured all members felt their contributions were recognized.

# Meeting 7

**Date:** 22 - 23 November 2025

**Time:** All-day Flexible Session (Working & Chatting)

**Platform:** Discord

**Attendees:** Jackson, Luke; Ge, Yuxu; Mohan, Anand; Dharmappa, Nithish Sagar; Channagouder, Rohan

**Absentees:** None

## 1. Agenda

- Finalize slide order and visual consistency. Resolve specific content gaps (Slide 4). Confirm final submission logistics (File formats and Peer Review).

## 2. Review of Previous Action Items

- **Luke:** Compare slides against mark scheme - Completed (Verified content alignment).
- **Anand:** Visual editing of slides - Completed (Refined layout and readability).

## 3. Discussion Summary

- **Slide Structure:** Anand proposed a finalized 11-slide sequence, ensuring a smooth logical progression from "Why it matters" to the "Deep Dive." The group agreed to change the slide background to white to improve readability and removed duplicate slides.
- **Content Refinement:** Focus was placed on Slide 4 (Synthesis/Evidence Gap). Anand identified that the original version lacked necessary detail and edited it; Luke reviewed the changes and confirmed the new version was much clearer and better communicated the core argument.
- **Title Adjustment:** The group agreed to refine the presentation title to: "*How Adaptive Non-Player Characters (NPCs) Shape Player Challenge and Immersion*" to better reflect the specific focus of the literature.
- **Submission Logistics:** Confirmed that Yuxu will submit the final PDF version (to prevent formatting shifts between PowerPoint/Google Slides) and the Logbook. Peer reviews are to be completed individually.

## 4. New Action Items

Yuxu: Generate final PDF of slides and submit along with the Logbook.

All Members: Complete and submit individual Peer Review forms.

**Reflection:** The final sprint demonstrated strong attention to detail. The team successfully shifted focus from content generation to quality assurance, checking against the mark scheme and ensuring visual consistency. By collaboratively refining specific slides, we ensured the presentation's logical chain was persuasive and ready for final submission.

---

## Final Reflection

Throughout the project, the group significantly improved its ability to synthesize individual research into a coherent critical narrative under tight deadlines. We moved beyond simply merging content to aligning our analytical arguments regarding the research gap in *player challenge perception*. A recurrent challenge was balancing the depth required for a critical literature review with the constraints of an oral presentation format. The team resolved this by prioritising clear argumentation in the visual aids while ensuring academic rigor and extensive evidence were preserved in the supporting speaker notes. Going forward, the group recognises the value of establishing a shared theoretical framework earlier to streamline the collaborative writing and review process.