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| **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 |