**Grading rubric (3\*100 points/**20% of final semester grade**)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task** |  |  | **Earned Points** |
| Pre-module quiz | Completed  | Did not complete  | /10 |
| Survey completion | Completed  | Did not complete  | /100 |
| Video documentary (bonus) | Completed  | Did not complete  | /4 |
| Mandatory Homework (excel) | Completed  | Did not complete  | -4/0 |

**Project**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task** | **7.5 Points** | **5 Points** | **3 Points** | **0 Points** | **Earned Points** |
| ***Mapping Hazards***  | Identified and accurately placed top three hazards in SC. Credible data sources provided. | Identified top hazards but did not accurately place them. Hazards correctly placed but credible data sources not provided. | Identified 1 hazard or less. Credible data sources not provided. | Did not complete assignment | /7.5 |
| ***Mapping Vulnerability*** | Identified and accurately placed 3–5 important vulnerabilities. Credible data sources provided. | Identified 2–3 important vulnerabilities but missed at least one important vulnerability. Or vulnerability correctly identified but credible data sources not provided. | Identified <2 vulnerabilities. Credible data sources not provided. | Did not complete assignment | /7.5 |
| ***Mapping Risk*** | Students identified risk based on their mapping of hazards and vulnerability.  | One or more hazardous areas that overlap with vulnerabilities were not ranked in terms or risk. | More than three hazardous areas that overlap with vulnerabilities were not ranked in terms or risk. Students did not demonstrate understanding of risk | Did not complete assignment | /7.5 |
| ***Map Reasoning*** | Students clearly used reasonable logic in their explanation behind assigning risk levels. | Students did not clearly use logic in their explanations of how they assigned risk levels. | Students did not use logic or reasoning for their explanations of how they assigned risk levels. | Did not complete assignment | /7.5 |
| **Total Points**  | **/30** |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation content** | **5 Points** | **0 Points** | **Earned Points** |
| Risk map presented and justified | Included | Not included | /5 |
| Stakeholder visually stated | Included | Not included | /5 |
| Group selected research questions and conclusions with supporting graphs (3 questions/3 graphs) | Included | Not included | /5 |
| Suggestions for additional useful data | Included | Not included | /5 |
| *Professional* suggestions for future natural hazard mitigation strategies | Included | Not included | /5 |
| Cited all sources for map data | Included | Not included | /5 |
| **Total Points** | **/30** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation delivery** | **10 Points** | **6 Points** | **3 Points** | **0 Points** | **Earned Points** |
| Connections | Clear connections made between maps, research questions, and graphs. Original answers with supporting explanations, and details made in suggestions. | New ideas and connections made, but lack of supporting explanations or detail provided in comparing maps, research questions and graphs and providing suggestions. | Limited, if any connections, and vague generalities made in comparing maps, research questions and graphs. Vague suggestions. | No connections made and off topic; not a lot of thought provided in answering question and lacking suggestions. | /10 |
| Visuals | Excellent map and graphs tell a story on their own. Eye- pleasing. Explained very well (axes, labels, trends, etc).  | Very good map and graphs. Visuals explained well, though axes / labels not always explained.  | Map and graphs of mediocre quality or missing. Complement talk, but not explained well or put in context.  | Incomplete and confusing map. Missing, incorrect, or poor graphs. Visuals distract from talk. Visuals not explained.  | /10 |
| Format of delivery | Within 5% of allotted time. Conveys the “so what” in just a few seconds. Very helpful and respectful in suggestions. | Within 10% of allotted time. “So what” is there but may take a moment to see. Respectful in suggestions. | Within 15% of allotted time. Explains the “what” but not the “so what.” Somewhat respectful in suggestions. | Length is more than 20% too long or too short. Does not explain the “what” or the “so what.” Disrespectful in suggestions. | /10 |
| **Total Points** | **/30** |
| **Delivery** | **10 Points** | **6 Points** | **3 Points** | **0 Points** | **Earned Points** |
| Professional attire | All team members were professionally dressed. | Most team members were professionally dressed. | Only a couple or less team members were professionally dressed. | All team members were casually dressed and/or some members did not show up for the presentation. | /**10** |

**TOTAL PROJECT 100 points (10%)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task** | **90 Points** | **0 Points** | **Earned Points** |
| Post-module quiz | Completed  | Did not complete  | /90 |