## **Grading Rubric for Project 2:**

Agile Computing Methodology (10%)	
	/5
	/ 5
CODITM COLUMN CO	/5
SCRUM meetings scheduled and attended	/5
Burndown charts useful for monitoring progress	/5
Retrospective Reports provide insight into process	/5
Meeting Sprint Backlog Goals (10%)	
	/ <b>Q</b>
*	/ 8
Sprint 2 Backlog Goals met	/10
Sprint 3 Backlog Goals met	/ 12
Completeness/Quality of Game Manager and Interface (30%)	
Game manager in place to manage games for players and AI	/5
	/ 5
Check for tie outcome (turn limit	
Al. 11'test a least the sufficient least the sufficient	/5
	/7
Capable of handling advances/withdrawals	/6
Capable of handling paika moves only if allowed	/6
	/ 6
	/ 5
	/3
Client-server: server side working	
	/7
User interface to manage game options	/5
User interface to allow users to see current board status	/5
	/5
	/ 10
(ease of use, completeness, etc.) – subjective score should	, 10
evaluate allowing people to set parameters for program easily	
and straightforwardly, easily make moves, set up client/server	
game, etc.	
*** NOTE: 4-person teams should be held to a MUCH higher star	ndard, here
•	
Completeness/Quality of AI (30%)	
Basic AI in place (AI can make a valid move)	/5
AI can enumerate all valid moves	
·	/10
	/ 10
	/ 15
Time limits checked	/5
Iterative Deepening or other approach used to make use of time	/ 10
(i.e. adapts search to do better job if more time available)	
	/ 5
Most basic board evaluation function exists (identify wins/losses)	
Basic board evaluation function exists (count pieces)	/5
Improvements to Minimax tree and/or board function evaluation:	/ 25
Suggested options (full credit only if they made significant	
improvement over base; one or two of these probably not enough	
for full credit): Alpha/beta pruning implemented. Alpha/beta	

pruning over whole tree, not just one level. Ordering of moves to make pruning more efficient. Beam searching or similar approach to limit breadth/gain depth.

Evaluation/weighting/analysis of board position in evaluation function.

\*\*\* NOTE: 4-person teams should be held to a MUCH higher standard, here

Additional Features Added on (10%)	
Additional features added to system	/ 30
Subjective evaluation: teams must have implemented	
specific improvements to the AI (tree and/or board evaluation),	
interface, gameplay, etc. that are beyond what was suggested.	
Examples might include multithreading for search, new options	
for game mechanics, "booked" opening and/or closing	
sequences, cached data for faster future evaluation, help systems,	
animations of moves, better graphics, etc. "Basic"	
improvements to search such as pruning and ordering of moves	
should be included in the earlier score.	
*** NOTE: 4-person teams should be held to a MUCH higher standard, here	
Code style: naming/layout/commenting (10%)	
Good modularity of code/choice of classes/etc.	/6
Good choices for variable/function/class/etc. naming	/ 6
Comments are appropriate and used throughout code	/6
Layout of code is conducive to following program flow	/ 6
Consistent style throughout application	
TOTAL:	/ 300
Scrum Master Grades (grade on quality and completeness of reports, not actual accomp	
Scheduling and holding scrum meetings as required	/ 10
Product backlogs maintained consistently throughout	/ 15
Product burndown maintained consistently throughout	/ 15
Sprint 1 backlog and burndown charts well maintained/presented	/ 15
Sprint 1 retrospective well-written and descriptive	/5
Sprint 2 backlog and burndown charts well maintained/presented	/ 15
Sprint 2 retrospective well-written and descriptive	/5
Sprint 3 backlog and burndown charts well maintained/presented	
Sprint 3 retrospective well-written and descriptive	/5
TOTAL:	/ 100

Notes: