Team Contributions: POC
The Crazy Tens

Team #25, The Crazy Four

Ruida Chen
Ammar Sharbat
Alvin Qian
Jiaming Li

November 4, 2025

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

Overview

The POC demo will be performed in-person and run locally from a group member's laptop. The goal is to demonstrate the core gameplay mechanics and an end-to-end 1v1 game flow.

Setup

- Start the local server (`Node.js` terminal server) on the presenter's machine.
- Use the hard-coded two-player configuration (no authentication for the POC).
- Open the game in a browser on the presenter machine.

Demo flow (approx. 5–7 minutes)

1. Brief introduction of demo objective (30s).
2. Show initial game state: deck creation and hands dealt to both players.
3. Two team members will control each player and demonstrate gameplay:

- Playing cards from a hand.
- Demonstrating matching logic (suit, rank, and add-to-10 rule).
- Demonstrating wildcard logic (changing the suit).
- Demonstrating drawing a card when no valid plays are available.

4. Drive the game to an endgame state and show the end condition.
5. Conclude with limitations and next steps, then take questions.

Notes

- No login/authentication is required for this POC demo.
- Will mention current limitations (hard-coded users, basic UI) and planned next steps.

2 Team Meeting Attendance

Student	**Meetings**
Total	3
Ruida Chen	3
Jiaming Li	3
Alvin Qian	3
Ammar Sharbat	3

Explanation:

Realistically, we have had very few team meetings. This is largely because of the packed schedules of 3 team members and also the fact that project management and communication through Discord has taken precedence over in person or virtual meetings.

No team meetings above have a corresponding GitHub issue just yet, as we were not aware about making one before said meetings. We plan to create these issues of old for traceability. Also, moving forward we will proactively make issues with agendas for all team meetings.

3 Supervisor/Stakeholder Meeting Attendance

Supervisor's Name: Paul Rapoport; Email: rapoport@mcmaster.ca

Student	Meetings
Total	7
Ruida Chen	4
Jiaming Li	3
Alvin Qian	4
Ammar Sharbat	8

Explanation:

The last 2 supervisor meetings are on Github (Issues 43 and 82).

Many meeting with Professor Rapoport were initiated by teammate Ammar Sharbat, because he is the team liaison to the supervisor. He also has taken a keen interest in the Core Problem of Game Design and Game Mechanics, and has met with the professor several times to discuss issues pertaining to these topics.

Outside of the very very project search meeting (which was initiated by another teammate), teammate Ammar has also initiated all group meetings with the supervisor.

Other teammates have attended important meetings to update and discuss project progress and problems with the supervisor. Teammate Jiaming Li missed one meeting due to family reasons.

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	Num
Name 1	Num
Name 2	Num
Name 3	Num
Name 4	Num
Name 5	Num

[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: [fill in this information]

Student	Lectures
Total	Num
Name 1	Num
Name 2	Num
Name 3	Num
Name 4	Num
Name 5	Num

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

6 Commits

Student	Commits	Percent
Total	97	100%
Ruida Chen	25	25.8%
Jiaming Li	26	26.8%
Alvin Qian	24	24.7%
Ammar Sharbat	22	22.7%

7 Issue Tracker

Student	Authored (O+C)	Assigned (C only)
Ruida Chen	19	9
Jiaming Li	17	7
Alvin Qian	19	8
Ammar Sharbat	24	9

8 CICD

The project repository is hosted on GitHub and uses GitHub Actions for Continuous Integration and Continuous Deployment (CICD). Each push or pull request triggers an automated workflow that performs the following tasks:

- **Build and Lint:** The workflow installs all dependencies, compiles the code, and runs ESLint to enforce consistent formatting and syntax.
- **Unit Testing:** All Jest test suites are executed automatically. Code coverage reports are uploaded to Codecov.
- **Static Analysis:** CodeQL is run to detect potential vulnerabilities and logic errors.
- **Artifact Packaging:** For successful builds, the workflow produces a testable web or desktop artifact for internal review.

This setup ensures that any code merged into the `main` branch has passed validation for correctness, maintainability, and security. By automating these checks, CICD reduces integration errors and accelerates the development feedback cycle.

9 Team Charter Trigger Items

The team has identified several triggers within the team charter to monitor collaboration and performance consistency:

- **Commit Frequency:** Each member should contribute at least one meaningful commit per week. Falling below this threshold for two consecutive weeks triggers a discussion about workload balance.
- **Meeting Attendance:** Missing two consecutive team meetings without prior notice triggers a check-in with the member to identify scheduling or communication issues.
- **Branch Discipline:** All code changes must go through a pull request reviewed by at least one teammate. Direct commits to `main` are not allowed and will trigger an immediate process review.
- **Responsiveness:** Team members are expected to reply to key project communications (e.g., PR reviews or Slack updates) within 24 hours. Failure to respond repeatedly triggers a group discussion for reassigning responsibilities.

So far, no major trigger violations have occurred. The team has maintained consistent communication and review discipline. If violations are observed in the future, the plan is to (1) hold a brief retrospective discussion, (2) revise or clarify the trigger threshold if needed, and (3) document the agreed corrective action in the next meeting notes.

10 Additional Productivity Metrics

[If your team has additional metrics of productivity, please feel free to add them to this report. —SS]