Grade Defense

In the following document, I will be justifying our grade for the each of the sections of the rubric.

Functionality - The program runs solely off of keyboard inputs and we ran a variety of tests to make sure that everything worked properly and that there was nothing the user could do (within reason) that would return an error or cause problems within the program. The game works as expected, and every part of it functions. *20/20*

Design - Our game is very well designed. We spent a lot of time designing the graphical parts of the game as well as picking the proper texts colors for each part so that the user can easily differentiate between different parts and so that it looks appealing to look at. It does at times look a bit amateurish, but I think that given our prior experiences and knowledge in graphical design that this looks very good. All images and graphics were designed by us. *19/20.*

Creativity - I think that our idea for a game is very creative. While it is a game that exists in real life, there are not any programs that exist that we were able to find that allow the user to easily play games of pong. *18/20.*

Sophistication - Our game is very sophisticated. We spent a lot of time designing the best way for the computer to take its turn and to make it so that the computer would not beat the user too easily but also so that the user would still be challenged by the game. We also put in a lot of work into make the program flow well and properly keep track of whose turn it currently is. It has smooth animations and also robustley handles inputs from the keyboard. It also includes code that we have learned throughout the entire semester and also took many painstaking hours to design and create. The game also utilizes advanced code that requires lots of research to understand and implement. *17/20.*

Broadness - I think that the broadness of our project is probably where it takes its biggest hit. We were only able to justify the use of 4/6 categories. We struggled to find ways to include other categories without making it forced or without making the program uselessly complicated and introduce new errors. However, we were able to properly and effectively integrate categories 1, 4, 7, 8. *14/18.*

Code Quality - The quality of our code was another place where our project shined. We used very self-explanatory names for our variables and methods when possible. This makes the code very easy for someone on the outside to follow. We also organized our code in different named sections and used comments to explain what different parts did

at times. We also made sure that our game would run in a variety of different scenarios even if the user inputted things they were not supposed to. 20/20.

Total - I think that overall our project fulfilled most of the main requirements of the project and shows how much we are capable of coding and creating after dedicating many hours to making the game. The few areas where I think our game falls short such as in broadness are justified and mostly reasonable.