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| **Person:** Brittany Kirkham | | **Topic:** The Concept of Data Structures | | |
| **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 paper’s purpose is well developed and very easy to see. All of the sections were very well laid out and seemed to work well with each other. | | | |
| **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** | I think that the sources are awesome. It is evident that Brittany worked hard to take the source material and make it more digestible for a less technical consumer. I came across things that I had been taught in earlier programming classes that were not quite clear to me that I now understand a bit better. | | | |
| **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. |
| **19/20** | For the most part the paper is a very smooth read. There are a couple of places where you can obviously see that Brittany was leading up to something later on in the paper and then the thread just goes no further. Over all the paper is well developed, sections are well marked and you never walk into a section not knowing what is going to be discussed, and it flows from one subject to another without any major issues following along. | | | |
| **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. |
| **15/15** | I found no grammar issues in this paper and neither did words spell check, Other than a few places where fewer words could have been used to get the same point across I would say that the writing quality of this paper is very good. | | | |
| **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. |
| **14/15** | There was one Diagram outlining data structures which was very informative, it’s placement was well done as it gave me an overview of the upcoming topics so I could see where they fit in the scheme of things. I would have liked to seen more diagrams especially for the flow of data in and out of the different data structures. The verbal descriptions were really well written but sometimes I, for one, am very much a visual learner. | | | |
| **98/100** | 🡨TOTAL (add up the scores in each part) | | | |

Additional comments:

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 |