

CSCI 265 Team Charter

Team name: We Be Daves

Project/product name: See a Neevle, Hear a Neevle

Members and contact email

note which person has been designated the main contact person for questions from the instructor

- Dave Narealdave, nareal@somewhere.ca *main contact*
- David Naughtdave, dndve@geemail.dv
- Davey Fakedave, fakedave111@alldaves.net
- Duhyve Reeldave, dave1234567@oldemailserver.ne

Project intro

See a Neevle, Hear a Neevle (SaNHaN) is a top-down 2D multiplayer team game focused on cooperative puzzle solving and combat survival. It is intended to blend light hearted gameplay with unique challenges that require the players to work together to move forward. Many aspects of the game mechanics and interface have been deliberately kept simple to allow the team to focus on a sound overall design and to explore the unique puzzle system we are trying to introduce.

Team philosophy

All members of the team are avid gamers, and one of the major driving factors in choosing this project is that it provides us with an opportunity to try game design and development on a practical scale. We are aware that attempting a multiplayer game creates significant challenges, both in design and implementation, but feel the team has the drive and skills to successfully complete at least the core level of features.

From a team perspective, we want to create a supportive environment where we can all learn from and support each other. Some of the key points we want to emphasize are:

- regularly discussing what each of us are working on, the hurdles faced, and the solutions attempted
- helping one another both with technical problems and with workload/deadline issues
- reviewing one another's code and documents where-ever possible
- creating a blameless environment to design and implementation (avoiding finger pointing when things go wrong and instead focusing on helping to find and implement solutions to said problems)
- keeping discussions (and minds) open and genuinely listening to and considering each other's opinions

Team roles/responsibilities

The team's initial breakdown of roles and responsibilities was decided in our weekly meetings after reviewing the list of project deliverables and discussing our interests and when in the term each of us expects to be busiest.

For each role we have assigned a lead person with the primary responsibility for things that fall under the role, but we have also assigned an understudy: someone who can help pick up the slack or take over the lead role if the primary person becomes overwhelmed with other tasks at some point, or in the case where someone leaves the team during the term. (In the event of someone new joining the team then it is possible they could be assigned the understudy role in a couple of areas while they come up to speed.)

At each of the team's weekly meetings we plan to start by having each team member give a 2-3 minute summary of what they've been working on, what they're just about to work on, and how they're doing with respect to workload (are they feeling underworked? overworked? hating the particular tasks they're signed up for?). That should allow us to recognize and react to potential problems in the roles and responsibilities in a timely fashion.

The lead roles assigned to the team members are as follows:

- Dave:
 - organizational lead (management)
 - version control lead (git/repo management)
 - presentation lead (presentations, demos)
- David:
 - development lead (coding, technical design)
- Davey:
 - user interface lead (screen/map/menu design)
 - user guidance lead (user manual and in-game help)
- Duhve:
 - puzzle and plot lead (design of individual puzzles and overall game flow)
 - testing lead (test plan development and test infrastructure)

The understudy roles assigned to the team members are as follows:

- Dave:
 - development understudy
 - user guidance understudy
- David:
 - organizational understudy
 - user interface understudy
- Davey:
 - version control understudy
 - puzzle and plot understudy
- Duhve:
 - presentation understudy
 - testing understudy

Planned team meeting time(s) and communication plans

The team's primary communication mechanism outside of meetings will be through a discord server to be set up and managed by the organizational lead. All team members are expected to check the server on a daily basis and to respond to queries promptly. All team members have shared their contact information for email and text in the event that more urgent communication is needed.

The primary weekly meeting time will be Mondays 5-6pm, with a shorter meeting held each Friday after the lab. The preference is to have all team members attend in person, but Zoom is an option if someone is absolutely unable to be there in person.

For each Monday meeting the organizational lead will set an agenda (posted to the discord) at least 48 hours in advance so team members have a chance to prepare for any discussions around their lead/understudy roles. As mentioned earlier, each meeting will begin by having each team member give a short update on their recent and upcoming work and any problems/issues encountered, expected, or resolved.

The organizational understudy will take notes at each meeting, summarizing the topics discussed and any decisions made during the meeting. These notes will be posted to the discord for future reference and for anyone who was unable to attend the meeting.

While missing a meeting once or twice in the term is expected (and often unavoidable), if a team member is regularly absent that becomes a much bigger cause for concern and will be brought up with the individual involved (by discord, email, or text if they cannot be found in person). If the problem persists then the issue will be raised with the course instructor.

Deadlines and deliverables

The Monday meetings are the primary planning point for the current and upcoming deadlines, with the short Friday sessions providing a chance to check that everything is proceeding as planned. As a team we have agreed that each person will have their parts of each deliverable completed and turned over to the group at least a full 24 hours prior to the deadline, with 48 hours being the preferred target.

For documentation components the organizational lead is the point person to do a final check before submission, for coding components it is the development lead, and for the lab presentations it is the presentation lead. (With the corresponding understudy members assisting as needed.)

As with missed meetings, missing a deadline once may be forgivable (depending on the circumstances), but repeatedly missing deadlines puts an unfair load and stress on the other team members. Should the need arise, we will attempt to resolve this in team meetings first, with a fallback plan of bringing the situation to the instructor's attention.

Conflict resolution scheme

As per the opening discussion on team philosophy, we hope that most disagreements can be resolved by open-minded discussion. In the event that not all parties can reach agreement then the matter will be decided by an in-meeting vote. In the event of a tie the lead for the relevant role casts the tie-breaking vote and all team members have agreed to abide by this process.

Team AI policies

Some members of the team do not wish the rights/integrity of the product content to be compromised by either feeding content into an AI or by embedding AI-generated content into the product. As such the team members are in agreement that AI use for the project will be restricted to investigatory applications, e.g.:

- exploring possible languages, features, tools, technologies, and techniques
- getting clarification on the correct use of languages, tools, etc
- investigating error messages (but *not* through copying code content into the AI)

Discussion of team strengths/weaknesses

As mentioned earlier, one of the great team strengths for this project is that we are all avid gamers and we have all, on an informal basis, followed discussions of game design and development in the context of our favourite games. We are all enthusiastic about the opportunity to learn more in an applied setting and to see what we are capable of creating.

On the flip side, one of the great team weaknesses is that none of us have any actual game design or development experience.

In terms of strengths with respect to individual skills:

- Dave and David both have decent programming experience outside of the first-year CS courses plus some prior experience with git/github,
- Davey has the strongest artistic skills of the team and is currently taking CSCI 310 (which may help in the interface design aspects),
- Duhve was the leading proponent for a puzzle based game and is eager to design some challenging (but hopefully balanced) puzzles.

In terms of areas where the team as a whole may be lacking:

- none of us have experience in network programming, which may lead to issues in handling the multiplayer aspects of the game,
- none of us have experience in leading a team or managing others, so there is some concern as to how we'll fare in that regard,
- similarly none of us have any experience in game testing, leaving another area of possible concern.

Overall we're cautiously optimistic about our abilities to complete an interesting workable game.