|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Person: Tracy Harvey** | | **Topic: Augmented Reality, an Educational Tool** | | |
| **Criteria** | **Exemplary 100%** | **Accomplished 90%** | **Developing 80%** | **Beginning 60%** |
| **Paper Focus:** **Purpose/Position** **(Thesis)**  **25%** | Research paper's purpose or position statement is well-developed, readily apparent, and clearly stated. Consistently maintains the focal point throughout the paper. | Paper's central purpose or position statement is apparent and is the focal point of the paper for the most part, but may digress from it on occasion. | Paper's central purpose or position statement is somewhat unclear and needs to be developed further; focus of paper is not consistently clear | Paper's central purpose or position statement is generally unclear and paper lacks focus overall. |
| **25/25** | This was great, very clear. I felt throughout each section it was clearly laid out what would be discussed and equally as important what might differ or not fall under this section. | | | |
| **Depth and Evidence (Sources)**  **25%** | Central purpose or position is supported in-depth with at least 5 sources that are highly relevant, accurate, reliable, and primary, and each adds to the strength of the paper. Sources are skillfully referenced throughout the paper. | Central purpose or position is supported with at least 5 sources that are mostly relevant, accurate, reliable, and primary. Sources are integrated well into the paper for the most part. | Central purpose or position is largely supported but with less than 5 sources and/or some sources may not be relevant, accurate, reliable, or primary, and/or some sources are not integrated well in the paper. | Central purpose or position is not supported with sufficient research sources and/or are generally not relevant, accurate, reliable, or primary, and/or sources are generally not integrated well in the paper. |
| **25/25** | The sources were great. I think Tracy did a good job of working them into his own wording. I found myself quoting all my sources which may work, or may not I’ll see later, but the way these were integrated and cited was very digestible. | | | |
| **Organization**  **20%** | Paper is well-organized. Ideas are arranged logically, flow smoothly, with a strong progression of thought from paragraph to paragraph connecting to the central purpose or position statement. Includes all required components. | Paper is organized for the most part. Ideas are arranged logically and usually linked clearly from paragraph to paragraph connecting to the central purpose or position statement. Includes required components for the most part. | Paper is organized in general, although occasionally ideas from paragraph to paragraph may not make sense to the central purpose or position statement and/or be clear as a whole and/or may be lacking a required component. | Paper lacks logical organization and impedes readers' comprehension of ideas. Central purpose or position statement is rarely evident from paragraph to paragraph, and/or is missing required components. |
| **20/20** | Great start covering AR vs VR, common mistakes, and I liked having two very different sources that defined AR to give the reader a separate perspective of it’s form and function. The changing of themes and topics was very easy to follow, each time a topic changed or theme it was addressed and made clear to the reader where we were going next. | | | |
| **Writing Quality & Adherence to Format Guidelines**  **15%** | Paper is well written and clear using standard English characterized by elements of a strong writing style and basically free from grammar, punctuation, spelling, usage, or formatting errors. 8-15 pages in length, not including cover, abstract, or additional materials. | Paper shows above average writing style and clarity and uses standard English with little errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, usage, and/or formatting. 8-15 pages in length, not including cover, abstract, or additional materials. | Paper shows an average or casual writing style based on standard English with some errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, usage, and/or formatting. Under 8 or over 15  pages in length, not including cover, abstract, or additional materials. | Paper shows a below average or poor writing style based on appropriate standard English with frequent errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, usage, and/or formatting. Under 8 or over 15  pages in length, not including cover, abstract, or additional materials. |
| **14/15** | I think I saw a missing period, but other than that it was fine. It flowed well and the use of more complex terms or phrases was clearly explained and grammatically correct so that I could understand and follow along. | | | |
| **Diagrams & Illustrations**  **15%** | Diagrams and illustrations are neat, accurate, appropriately sized, captioned, placed, and add to the reader's understanding of the topic. | Diagrams and illustrations are accurate, and are mostly neat, appropriately sized, captioned, and placed; for the most part, they add to the reader's understanding of the topic. | Diagrams and illustrations are accurate, and are usually appropriately sized, captioned, and placed; they sometimes add to the reader's understanding of the topic. | Diagrams and illustrations are not present or not accurate, and/or generally are not appropriately sized, captioned, or placed; they seldom add to the reader's understanding of the topic. |
| **13/15** | There weren’t any diagrams but those might not lend much to this sort of topic. The images showing how AR could look were neat and showed one of the main themes, learning and on the job use. I think some extra visuals would be nice. When explaining the mapping of areas and positioning the technology uses to process how the user is tracked might have been neat. Not knowing the topic though, that may not be well represented by an image so it could have been a choice to leave them out. | | | |
| **97/100** | 🡨TOTAL (add up the scores in each part) | | | |

Additional comments: Great read, I learned some things. I’ve seen VR used for training and really think there’s a benefit in there that I hope to see used in the professional environments more and more. As for the learning side, it made me think of how kids could be learning from this as they are growing up in a smart tech world where phones can support some VR for a science class or other. That would have helped me a lot as I like to learn by doing or seeing.

Note: you can award any # of points up to the max for the category, including fractional points. So, for example, if you think the work was half-way between accomplished and exemplary, you would award 95% of the points in that category. Always explain why you provided the points you provided, even if you award 100% of the points. What made the work exemplary in that category? Reflect on your peer’s work and give the justification you’d like to see if it was your work.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Key | 100 (Exemplary) | 95 | 90 (Accomplished) | 85 | 80 (Developing) | 75 | 70 | 65 | 60 (Beginning) |
| 25 | 25 | 23.75 | 22.5 | 21.25 | 20 | 18.75 | 17.5 | 16.25 | 15 |
| 20 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 12 |
| 15 | 15 | 14.25 | 13.5 | 12.75 | 12 | 11.25 | 10.5 | 9.75 | 9 |