# Rubric

*You will be graded on the assignment according to the following rubric.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Exemplary** | **Good** | **Basic** | **Nonperformance** |
| **Overview and selection reason** (10 points) | 9–10 points: Clearly shows chosen region and specific GPS stations and provides specific geologic and scientific and/or personal reasons for site selection. | 7–8 points: Shows chosen region/GPS stations and provides geologic and scientific and/or personal reasons for site selection. | 5–6 points: Some understandable explanation site locations and reason for site selection. | 0–4 points: No reference to site locations and reason for site selection OR location and reason given were not understandable. |
| **Accurate calculations** (15 points) | 14–15 points: Strain calculator used entirely correctly. | 11–13 points: Strain calculator results have minor error. | 8–10 points: Strain calculator results have minor errors. | 0–7 points: Strain calculator results mostly or entirely wrong. |
| **Required maps** (15 points) | 14–15 points: All maps specified in the original assignment are included with very clear and accurate vectors and other required components. | 11–13 points: All maps specified in the original assignment are included with mostly clear and accurate vectors and other required components. | 8–10 points: Most or all of the maps are included with the required components but messy or inaccurate items hinder understanding. | 0–7 points: Multiple maps missing or required components not included to the point that little is understood by the audience. |
| **Geological interpret-ation** (15 points) | 14–15 points: Interpretation is clearly stated and directly tied to GPS velocities and regional faults. Surprising results are discussed. | 11–13 points: Reasonable interpretation is stated and tied to GPS velocities and regional faults. | 8–10 points: Interpretation is stated and tied to GPS velocities and regional faults but details may be confused or unclearly stated. | 0–7 points: Key elements of the interpretation are missing, wrong, or unclearly stated to the point that little is understood by the audience. |
| **Hazard-risk assessment** (15 points) | 14–15 points: Direct and specific evidence is provided to link geologic interpretation to correct earthquake hazard, particular risks faced by local communities, and possible mitigation and implementation challenges. | 11–13 points: Geologic interpretation is tied to correct earthquake hazard, risks faced by local communities, and possible mitigation and implementation challenges. | 8–10 points: Geologic interpretation is tied to mostly correct earthquake hazard and risks faced by local communities. Mitigation not included or not fully relevant. | 0–7 points: Little or no mention of earthquake hazard, community risk, and mitigation OR the mention is incorrect. |
| **Slide composition** (5 points) | 5 points: Slides are very visually appealing with very clear but concise text. | 4 points: Slides have both graphics and text and are definitely understandable. | 2–3 points: Slides have both graphics and text and but are somewhat hard to understand. | 0–1 points: Missing or poorly composed graphics/text impede understanding. |
| **Slide notes** (5 points) | 5 points: Thorough and accurate notes accompany all slides. | 4 points: Reasonably complete and accurate notes accompany all slides | 2–3 points: Mostly understandable notes accompany most or all slides. | 0–1 points: Notes absent or poorly written to the point of being not understandable. |
| **Talk delivery style** (5 points) | 5 points: Excellent delivery with all of the following: clear diction, easy-to-follow transitions, audience eye contact, confident tone, and voice modulation. | 4 points: Good delivery with most of the following: clear diction, easy-to-follow transitions, audience eye contact, confident tone, and voice modulation. | 2–3 points: Talk was largely understandable but lacked compelling delivery style. | 0–1 points: Talk was very hard or impossible understand due to poor delivery style. |
| **Time limit** (5 points) | 5 points: Finished talk within 30 seconds of time limit. | 4 points: Finished talk within 1 minute of time limit. | 2–3 points: Finished talk within 1.5 minutes of time limit. | 0–1 points: Had to be stopped or >1.5 short of limit. |
| **Reflection** (10 points) | 9–10 points: Detailed and thoughtful answer about learning experience with supporting evidence. | 7–8 points: Question answered with at least some supporting evidence. | 5–6 points: Some answer about the learning experience but may lack thoughtfulness or supporting evidence | 0–4 points: Answering lacking or inadequate and incomplete. |