|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Unit 2.1 Example Grading Rubric** | | | | |
| Component | Grading Elements | Exemplary | Basic | Nonperfor-mance |
| *Topographic contour map (25%)* | * Neat and legible * Reasonable contour spacing * Accurate representation of ground topography * Map elements present (Title, N-arrow, Legend, Scale) * Layout (main feature should be the topographic map) | >22.5 | 19–22.5 | <18.5 |
| *A longitudinal profile sections (10%)* | * Neat and legible * Road level should be clearly shown * Map elements present (Title, Orientation, Legend, Scale with no vertical exaggeration) * Layout (main feature should be the longitudinal section) | >9 | 7.5–9 | < 7.5 |
| *Kinematic analysis results (field collected data) with stereonets (5%)* | * Correct interpretation of kinematic analysis * Clearly labeled stereonets | >4.5 | 3.75–4.5 | <4.5 |
| *Kinematic analysis results (SfM-extracted data) with stereonets and write-up comparing results with field collected data (10%)* | * Adequate discussion on differences in discontinuity data distribution * Adequate discussion on differences in kinematic analyses results * Clearly labeled stereonets | >9 | 7.5–9 | < 7.5 |
| *Slope cut design cross-sections (25%)* | * Neat and legible * Proposed slope cut profile shown * Map elements present (Title, cross-section orientation, Legend, Scale with no vertical exaggeration) * Layout (main feature should be the longitudinal section) | >22.5 | 19–22.5 | <18.5 |
| *A 2-page summary write-up including (25%)* | * Organization (introduction, geology, discontinuity sets genesis, kinematic analysis, slope design justification) * Clearly and concisely written * Slope design recommendations are well supported by the data and analysis | >22.5 | 19–22.5 | <18.5 |