

Team Contributions: POC Software Engineering

Team 8, RLCatan
Rebecca Di Filippo
Jake Read
Matthew Cheung
Sunny Yao

This document summarizes the contributions of each team member up to the POC Demo. The time period of interest is the time between the beginning of the term and the POC demo.

1 Demo Plans

[What will you be demonstrating —SS]

2 Team Meeting Attendance

[For each team member how many team meetings have they attended over the time period of interest. This number should be determined from the meeting issues in the team's repo. The first entry in the table should be the total number of team meetings held by the team. —SS]

Student	Meetings
Total	8
Jake Read	8
Sunny Yao	8
Rebecca Di Filippo	8
Matthew Cheung	8

[If needed, an explanation for the counts can be provided here. —SS]

3 Supervisor/Stakeholder Meeting Attendance

[For each team member how many supervisor/stakeholder team meetings have they attended over the time period of interest. This number should be determined from the supervisor meeting issues in the team's repo. The first entry in the table should be the total number of supervisor and team meetings held by the team. If there is no supervisor, there will usually be meetings with stakeholders (potential users) that can serve a similar purpose. —SS]

Supervisor's Name: Prof. Istvan David

Student	Meetings
Total	4
Jake Read	4
Sunny Yao	4
Rebecca Di Filippo	4
Matthew Cheung	4

[If needed, an explanation for the counts can be provided here. —SS]

4 Lecture Attendance

[For each team member how many lectures have they attended over the time period of interest. This number should be determined from the lecture issues in the team's repo. You can find the number of lectures in the time period of interest by looking at the Google calendar for the capstone course. —SS]

[NOTE: There will be approximately 13 lectures between the start of class and the POC demos —SS]

Student	Lectures
Total	13
Jake Read	13
Sunny Yao	?
Rebecca Di Filippo	8
Matthew Cheung	?

Rebecca - The reason for my lower attendance was because of busy weeks with midterms and project deadlines in other courses, so I just reviewed the lecture slides instead.

[If needed, an explanation for the lecture attendance can be provided here. —SS]

5 TA Document Discussion Attendance

[For each team member how many of the informal document discussion meetings with the TA were attended over the time period of interest. —SS]

TA's Name: Tiago de Moraes Machado

Student	Lectures
Total	3
Jake Read	3
Sunny Yao	3
Rebecca Di Filippo	3
Matthew Cheung	3

[If needed, an explanation for the attendance can be provided here. —SS]

6 Commits

[For each team member how many commits to the main branch have been made over the time period of interest. The total is the total number of commits for the entire team since the beginning of the term. The percentage is the percentage of the total commits made by each team member. —SS]

Student	Commits	Percent
Total	258	100%
Jake Read	54	21%
Sunny Yao	43	17%
Rebecca Di Filippo	115	44%
Matthew Cheung	46	18%

[If needed, an explanation for the counts can be provided here. For instance, if a team member has more commits to unmerged branches, these numbers can be provided here. If multiple people contribute to a commit, git allows for multi-author commits. —SS] Some of us commit more frequently than others, but overall work has been fairly evenly distributed.

7 Issue Tracker

[For each team member how many issues have they authored (including open and closed issues (O+C)) and how many have they been assigned (only counting closed issues (C only)) over the time period of interest. —SS]

Student	Authored (O+C)	Assigned (C only)
Jake Read	0	3
Sunny Yao	0	0
Rebecca Di Filippo	0	1
Matthew Cheung	0	0

[If needed, an explanation for the counts can be provided here. —SS] We haven't added any of our own issues, but the few closed ones are for peer reviews. Since there's only four of us, issue tracking hasn't been a priority, and for most small tasks we've been listing them out in Discord and assigning them informally. Moving forward we'll use the issue tracker more, since tasks will be larger and more complex once we get deeper into development. Sorry if this makes things hard to track, but there has been a ton to do across all our courses and we didn't get around to making a ton of tiny issues.

8 CICD

[Say how CICD will be used in your project —SS]

9 Team Charter Trigger Items

Trigger Summary: Based on our team charter, the primary triggers for intervention include:

- Missing a scheduled meeting without at least 12 hours notice
- Repeated missed deadlines with little or no advance communication (more than 1–2 times)
- Consistently arriving late without notice
- Not contributing adequately or submitting low-quality work
- Disruptive behavior or conflict without an attempt to resolve collaboratively

Observed Trigger Events: No formal trigger violations occurred during this period. A few scheduling conflicts were communicated ahead of time and aligned with acceptable reasons outlined in the charter. These included:

- A member completing work after returning from vacation during reading week
- A delayed arrival to a meeting due to transportation issues, and the meeting was shifted accordingly

- During a long (approx 12 hours) SRS polishing work session, a member needed to attend a mandatory tutorial during the meeting and another member had prior family plans in the evening and had to leave early.

All instances were communicated prior to the meeting or work session and did not impact project progress.

Plan and Reflection: No corrective action was necessary, as all situations fell under acceptable charter guidelines and were handled responsibly. The team will continue to:

- Communicate scheduling conflicts in advance
- Support academic and personal commitments when reasonable
- Maintain fairness, accountability, and consistent participation

Our current triggers appear appropriate and do not require revision at this time.