|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Exemplary** | **Basic** | **Nonperformance** |
| Melt day anomaly  direction (2 points) | 2 points: States that NW study area exhibited fewer days of melting in 2010 than the 1979–2009 average/negative melt day anomaly *and*  Correctly identifies that SE study area exhibited more days of melting in 2010 than the 1979–2009 average/positive melt day anomaly | 1 point: Correctly characterizes one study area's melt day anomaly direction (+ or -), but the other study area's melt day anomaly direction is incorrect *or* Correctly characterizes both study area's melt day anomaly direction (+ or -) but uses positive and negative melt day anomaly terminology incorrectly (i.e., more days of melting = negative anomaly or fewer days of melting = positive anomaly) | 0 points: Incorrectly characterizes both study areas' melt day anomaly directions (+ or -)  *or*  Does not mention melt day anomaly directions (+ or -) |
| Melt day anomaly magnitude (2 points) | 2 points:  States that the SE study area exhibited a larger melt day anomaly than the NW study area | 0 points: States that the NW study area exhibited a larger melt day anomaly than the SE study area *or* No mention of melt day anomaly magnitude |  |

**Ice-Sea Level Unit 4 – Example Assessment Rubric #1A**