Team Contributions: POC
The Crazy Tens

Team #25, The Crazy Four

Ruida Chen
Ammar Sharbat
Alvin Qian
Jiaming Li

February 1, 2026

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.
- All team meetings have a corresponding GitHub issue with attendance, agendas and usually notes. To see our team meetings before POC, view links: SRS meeting, Design Documentation: MG, MIS, POC Demo Prep.

3 Supervisor/Stakeholder Meeting Attendance

Supervisor and Key Stakeholder: Paul Rapoport; Email: rapoport@mcmaster.ca

Student	Meetings
Total	8
Ruida Chen	3
Jiaming Li	2
Alvin Qian	3
Ammar Sharbat	8

Explanation:

- All supervisor meetings are on Github, see here.

- While we created an issue for the POC Demo itself, it was not counted in tally above, as it is mandatory to attend.

- Teamate Ammar has the most inflated count for meetings, but this is because he was the lead on Project management and Game Design (which was a focus of several 1-on-1 meetings with Supervisor Paul Rapoport).

- Teammate Ammar was also the only one to attend lectures after Week 1, and several meetings with supervisors took place after capstone lectures.

- Other teammates (Ruida, Jim and Alvin) have attended important meetings with Dr. Rapoport to update and discuss project progress and problems. They have done their part.

- Teammate Jiaming Li missed one meeting due to family reasons.

4 Lecture + Tutorial Attendance or Lectures + Tutorials Read

Student	Lectures
Total	13
Ruida Chen	13
Jiaming Li	13
Alvin Qian	7
Ammar Sharbat	11

Student	Tutorials
Total	3
Ruida Chen	3
Jiaming Li	2
Alvin Qian	1
Ammar Sharbat	2

Explanation:

- Note: Both tallies are not entirely accurate. Teammate Alvin Qian has not checkmarked attendance/reading of classes, so the number listed may be higher.

- These are only the classes that were attended before our POC Demo (on November 26, 2026). Classes that happened after are not in this report.

- See all Lecture and Tutorial Issues for our project here to verify attendance/reading.

5   TA Document Discussion Attendance

TA's Name: [fill in this information]

Student	Lectures
Total	4
Ruida Chen	4
Jiaming Li	4
Alvin Qian	4
Ammar Sharbat	3

Explanation:

- **Note:** Our team had a TA switch after the first document discussion (PS+Goals & DevPlan), from TA Rashad to TA Chris.

- TA Chris has been very helpful and provided great feedback on our deliverables.

- For the SRS Informal Discussion, TA Chris was not available after for two consecutive weeks for this because he was travelling. Also because our team didn't seek to schedule the meeting.

- Teammate Ammar Sharbat missed the TA document discussions (on VnVPlan) due to family reasons.

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]