# 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.ANDAreas 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.ANDAreas 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/ORSignificant 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. ANDNo 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. AND1–2 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | Adequate writing style and organization:Overall report is clear and well organized.ANDMost ideas progress logically.AND/ORSeveral 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/ORIdeas do not progress logically through the report.AND/ORSpelling, grammar, and punctuation errors detract from quality of report. | Unacceptable writing style and organization:Written report is unclear and disorganized.AND/ORIdeas do not progress logically through the report.AND/ORMajor 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.ORSome 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.ANDMultiple examples of environmental and built characteristics are used as lines of evidence.ANDUncertainties/ambiguities in the data are explicitly discussed in the report.ANDIncludes 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.ANDBoth environmental and built characteristics are used as lines of evidence.ANDUncertainties/ambiguities are mentioned in the report.ANDIncludes concepts, ideas, and terminology addressed during module exercises. | Content is adequate. Multiple lines of environmental and/or built characteristics are addressed as evidence.ANDIncludes concepts, ideas, and terminology addressed during module exercises. | Content needs improvement.Only one line of evidence is addressed.ANDContent 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 evolvedANDHow that might affect future action or thinkingANDStatements are clearly but concisely linked to evidence or experience.  | Reflection states how the student’s understanding has evolvedANDHow that might affect future action or thinkingBUTThe supporting evidence is not strongly and/or clear stated. | Reflection not effectively tied to course experienceORCompletely lacking supporting evidenceORMissing |