# Surface Process Hazards Unit 5 Summative Assessment example rubric (29 pnts)

## Inclusion of structural elements (5)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Included (1 point) | Not included (0 points) |
| Color scale with high, medium, low |  |  |
| Shaded map |  |  |
| Factors that contribute to mass wasting in the field area |  |  |
| Summary of map interpretation |  |  |
| Specific suggestions for preparation |  |  |

## Map annotation (3)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Exemplary (3 points) | Basic (1–2 points) | Nonperformance (0 points) |
| Areas of high, medium, and low hazards are justified using specific evidence from environmental and built characteristics. AND Areas of high, medium, and low hazard areas are accurate based on the environmental and built characteristics of the area. | Areas of high, medium, and low hazards are justified using specific evidence from environmental and built characteristics. AND Areas of high, medium, and low hazard areas are mostly accurate based on the environmental and built characteristics of the area, perhaps with 1–2 debatable areas. | Insufficient evidence is given to justify areas of high, medium, and low hazards.  AND/OR Significant inaccuracies regarding areas of high, medium, and low hazard areas. |

## Writing style and organization (5)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exemplary  (5 points) | Good  (4 points) | Basic  (3 points) | Needs improvement  (1–2 points) | Nonperformance  (0 points) |
| Excellent writing style and organization. Written report is clear and well organized. AND  Structure is conducive to the logical progression of ideas.  AND No spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | Very good writing style and organization: Written report is clear and well organized. AND  Structure is conducive to the logical progression of ideas.  AND 1–2 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | Adequate writing style and organization: Overall report is clear and well organized. AND Most ideas progress logically. AND/OR Several spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors that do not detract substantially from report. | Writing style and organization need improvement: Issues with organization and clarity of writing. AND/OR Ideas do not progress logically through the report. AND/OR Spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors detract from quality of report. | Unacceptable writing style and organization: Written report is unclear and disorganized. AND/OR Ideas do not progress logically through the report. AND/OR Major spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors throughout that detract from report quality. |

## Clarity for intended audience (3)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Exemplary (3 points) | Basic (1–2 points) | Nonperformance (0 points) |
| Report content is explained in a way that is easy for reader to understand and retain. | Majority of the report content is such that the reader can understand and retain content. | Substantial portions of report content are difficult to understand. OR Some portions of report are incomprehensible. |

## Thoroughness and rigor (5)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exemplary  (5 points) | Good  (4 points) | Basic  (3 points) | Needs improvement  (1–2 pnts) | Nonperformance (0 points) |
| Excellent content.  Multiple lines of evidence are insightfully and creatively addressed with an exemplary level of detail. AND Multiple examples of environmental and built characteristics are used as lines of evidence. AND Uncertainties/ambiguities in the data are explicitly discussed in the report. AND Includes concepts, ideas, and terminology in addition to those addressed during previous module exercises. Additional work and research has been done to enhance report. | Content is very good.  Multiple lines of evidence are addressed with an above average level of detail. AND Both environmental and built characteristics are used as lines of evidence. AND Uncertainties/ ambiguities are mentioned in the report. AND Includes concepts, ideas, and terminology addressed during module exercises. | Content is adequate.  Multiple lines of environmental and/or built characteristics are addressed as evidence. AND Includes concepts, ideas, and terminology addressed during module exercises. | Content needs improvement.  Only one line of evidence is addressed.  AND Content does not include concepts, ideas, or terminology addressed during module exercises. | Content is unacceptable.  Report does not provide evidence to support the conclusions made about mass-wasting hazards in the Boulder Creek area. |

## Accuracy (5)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exemplary  (5 points) | Good  (4 points) | Basic  (3 points) | Needs improvement  (1–2 points) | Nonperformance  (0 points) |
| Scientifically accurate report with no content errors. | 1 minor content error. | 1–2 minor content errors that do not detract significantly from overall presentation. | Several minor content errors OR 1–2 major content errors. | Major content errors throughout report. |

## Part 3 Reflection (3)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Exemplary (3 points) | Basic (1–2 points) | Nonperformance (0 points) |
| Reflection clearly states how the student’s understanding has evolved  AND  How that might affect future action or thinking  AND  Statements are clearly but concisely linked to evidence or experience. | Reflection states how the student’s understanding has evolved  AND  How that might affect future action or thinking  BUT  The supporting evidence is not strongly and/or clear stated. | Reflection not effectively tied to course experience  OR  Completely lacking supporting evidence  OR  Missing |