

Category	Full Marks (3 Points)	Partial Credit (2 Points)	Partial Credit (1 Points)	No Marks (0 Points)	Score
<b>Quality of Work</b>	Work (e.g., code) looks correct and organized. The project's readme file is clear, intelligible, and give a good idea of what the project is about.	Work (e.g., code) looks mostly correct and organized. The code could be better structured. OR the project readme file is somewhat unclear.	Work (e.g., code) is mostly disorganized. OR the project readme file is very unclear.	No code is given.	3
<b>Comments (e.g. Give an example of what could be improved. How can the code or readme file be improved?, etc.)</b>	Readme tells the user what the program is and the technologies used, but could give more details into how the game will work				
<b>Intellectual Merit</b>	The project looks interesting, creative, and/or substantial.	The project is interesting, creative, and/or substantial, but does not seem feasible to do in a semester.	The project lacks substantial complexity.	No code is given or the project description is too vague to determine if the research has merit.	3

<b>Comments (e.g. Give an example of what could be improved. If the project is too complex, what parts of the project could feasibly be done? If the project is too simple, what features could be added?)</b>	The project looks good, but there is not a lot of information				
<b>Video</b>	The video gives a helpful, clear depiction of the project.	The video gives a helpful, clear depiction of the project, but is confusing or vague in parts.	The video does not give a helpful, clear depiction of the project.	The video is missing or is inappropriate.	3
<b>Comments (e.g. Give constructive feed back to help improve the presentation style.)</b>	The video was good, and provided a lot of information on the project and the code you have working now				