Team Contributions: Crazy 1-0s Game POC Demo

Team #25, The Crazy Four

Ruida Chen
Ammar Sharbat
Alvin Qian
Jiaming Li

February 2, 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

2.1 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

3.1 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 Game Design and project management (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

4.1 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

5.1 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

Time Period : Beginning of Course - November 26 (POC Demo)

Student	Commits	Percent
Total	144	100%
Ruida Chen	47	32.63889%
Jiaming Li	31	21.52777%
Ammar Sharbat	35	24.30554%
Alvin Qian	31	21.52777%

6.1 Explanation

- The commit counts above include all commits made to the main branch until November 26, 2025 (our POC Demo). The commits were counted manually.
- **Note: Different teammates use different commit styles.** Some prefer batching changes into a few large commits after completing a section, while others commit incrementally. As a result, the number of commits does not necessarily correspond directly to workload or contribution size.
- Keep in mind, pull requests and merge / automated commits are included in these counts as well, especially for Teammate Ruida, Ammar and Alvin.

7 Issue Tracker

Time Period : Beginning of Course - November 26 (POC Demo)

Student	Authored (O+C)	Assigned (C only)
Ruida Chen	21	46
Jiaming Li	20	58
Alvin Qian	2	39
Ammar Sharbat	57	48

7.1 Explanation

- **Note: Future issues (work finished after the POC Demo) is NOT included in the issue counts and totals in the above table. Though, the tallying for issues for work that happened before the POC is a bit nuanced (see below reasons).**

- Many issues in our repo were created before our POC Demo but were closed long after, either due to delay in resolution or due to being left open unintentionally.
- Similarly, many project tasks (e.g. deliverable work, lectures) were finished before our POC, but were authored (and hence created) long after the POC. They needed to be made for accurate tracking / traceability purposes, but the dates are not accurate to before our POC.
- In both of these cases, the mentioned issues were ignored from the tally above (for before POC Demo). The tally above is only concerned with authored (opened + closed) and assigned (closed) issues for project work or coursework (like lectures, deliverables) that happened **before our POC Demo**. Rest assured, our issue tracking and counting is very diligent and accurate.
- Teammate Alvin has the lowest issue tally among team members, but this is primarily because he focused more on deliverables and programming and less on issue tracking.
- You may notice that the assigned tally (181 total) is much higher than the authored tally (100 total). This is because many issues (like all lectures, and all meetings) were assigned to everyone, and not individually.

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]