

Rubrics for recurring assignments

The rubrics I describe in this document are going to be used for all assignments of this type throughout the semester. Thus, refer to this sheet every time you are writing a letter to Uncle Don, making a work flow, working on a map review, or finishing the maps or written part of a lab assignment.

Letters to Uncle Don

These are exercises to explain to your Uncle Don what you did in lab (or another question related to GIS that I ask). The goal is for you to step back and explain, specifically, what you learned without using technical jargon. It is also a space for you to reflect on how you did on the assignment you are turning in – what are you happy with, what would you like to improve on, and so on.

Uncle Don is your uncle who really likes to know what you’re doing in school; he gets cranky if you don’t stay in regular touch with him or if your emails aren’t written as real letters. He graduated from MIT with a mechanical engineering degree in 1952; his career was at Hamilton Standard working in finance. He is technically minded and loves building things and tinkering with them. Although not fabulous with computers, he does like email, playing Scrabble online, and managing his investments. He is interested in what you are learning and wants to know all the details about how you can do this spatial analysis stuff on computers. Although new to him, he is smart and hates being talked down to. All lab assignments will include writing a short letter to Uncle Don where you explain what you did in the lab.

Rubric

3 points	Letter concisely explains the assignment to Uncle Don with no jargon; letter is grammatically correct and in a proper letter format; letter contains self-reflection.
2 points	Letter explains the basics of what we did but uses some jargon OR letter does not contain self-reflection; letter is grammatically correct and in a proper letter format.
1 point	Letter does not synthesize assignment OR is so jargon heavy that Uncle Don wouldn’t be able to follow it.

Work flows

Every assignment we do in class will require you to complete a work flow that outlines the analysis you did for the lab.

Rubric

3 points	You could easily replicate your analysis from this workflow; it will jog your memory about what you did at each step enough that you can find that you need to do in your lab handouts.
2 points	Workflow is not as useful as it could be because EITHER there are too many details OR there are far too few details.
1 point	Workflow is incomplete and analysis could not be replicated from looking at this flow chart.

Lab maps

The rubric below outlines how I will grade lab maps. Lab assignment maps (as opposed to map review maps) will be graded on the analysis done in addition to the aesthetics and design of the map. If maps don't include all required map bits (e.g., legend, north arrow, scale), this must be explained to me when you turn it in. Note that to get full points on map analysis you must go beyond the requirements of the lab.

Rubric

Analysis

5 points	All of 4 and goes beyond requirements of the lab.
4 points	Analysis is accurate, appropriate, and addresses the requirements of the lab
3 points	Analysis done meets the minimum required for the lab
2 points	Analysis is inaccurate but the appropriate techniques were used
1 point	Analysis is incomplete OR inappropriate techniques were used

Usability and Aesthetics

5 points	Usability: You can tell at a glance what the map is about; it is easy for the user to see what the map conveys; all the required map bits (scale, legend, north arrow, etc.) are present Aesthetics: Use of space and color are superior; map is legible; overall design is creative and thoughtful
4 points	Usability: 2 of 3 elements for 5 points Aesthetics: 2 of 4 elements for 5 points
3 points	Usability: Most required map bits are present; it is hard to tell what the map is about Aesthetics: Use of space and color are adequate; map is legible; overall design is adequate
2 points	Usability: It is hard to tell what the map is about; most required map bits are present Aesthetics: Use of space and color are mediocre OR map is hard to read OR overall design is clunky
1 point	Usability: Map is confusing and difficult to use OR most required map bits are missing Aesthetics: more than 1 item listed for 2 points

Map review packets

Your map reviews will consist of 4 parts: the original map with annotations and suggestions from your reviewers, the peer review of maps page, the revised map, and a letter to me reflecting on your map making process and the revisions you made for your map. If maps don't include all required map bits (e.g., legend, north arrow, scale), this must be explained to me in the accompanying letter. You should scan the original map with annotations and the suggestions from your reviewers. All 4 items will be turned in to me digitally via Blackboard as a single PDF file. The packets are graded out of 15 points; you will complete three throughout the semester.

Rubric

Original map and suggestions from reviewers: 1 point each for turning them in

Revised map

10 points	Usability: You can tell at a glance what the map is about; it is easy for the user to see what the map conveys; all the required map bits (scale, legend, north arrow, data source, etc.) are present Aesthetics: Use of space and color are superior; map is legible; overall design is creative and thoughtful
8 points	Usability: 2 of 3 elements for 5 points Aesthetics: 2 of 4 elements for 5 points
6 points	Usability: Most required map bits are present; it takes some work to tell what the map is about Aesthetics: Use of space and color are adequate; map is legible; overall design is adequate
4 points	Usability: It is hard to tell what the map is about; most required map bits are present Aesthetics: Use of space and color are mediocre OR map is hard to read OR overall design is clunky
2 point	Usability: Map is confusing and difficult to use OR most required map bits are missing Aesthetics: more than 1 item listed for 2 points

Letter to me about revisions

3 points	Letter is reflective about what you like and don't like about the map; letter explains the changes you made at the suggestion of the reviewers; letter explains any changes you didn't make.
2 points	Letter covers the changes you made and didn't make and your reasons for that OR letter is reflective about what you like and don't like about the map.
1 point	Letter does not explain your reason for changes you made and didn't make and letter is not reflective about what you like and don't like about the map.