

University of California -Riverside Summer Field Geology Rubric

| GEO 102A-B Digital Mapping Assessment Rubric | | | | [Summer 2016] |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | 4 - Highly Competent | 3 - Competent | 2 - Minimally Competent | 1 - Not Competent |
| 1. General Information (5%) | | | | |
| File named as LastNameProjectNameDayMonthYr.kmz; contains a brief description of project | All elements present and correctly portrayed (100%) 1-2 paragraphs include goal of map, location, time spent, layers used, geo description. | Most elements present and correctly portrayed (80-99%) | Some elements present and correctly portrayed (50-79%) | Minimal information (<50%) |
| 2. Presentation and Legibility (15%) | | | | |
| a) Appropriate colors/opacity | Yes | Most colors correct and/or opacity mostly appropriate | Few colors correct and/or opacity too light or too dark | No |
| b) Legible and well edited | Everything neat and legible, appropriate line thicknesses | Most elements are neat and legible | Some elements neat and legible | Disorganized, hard to understand. |
| c) Appropriate symbols | Solid/dashed/dotted lines used correctly | Most elements used correctly | Some elements used correctly | Appropriate symbols disregarded |
| d) Appropriate unit names | All map elements named, e.g. Qoa Older Alluvium | Most units/features appropriately named | Some units/features appropriately named | Units/features not appropriated named |
| 3. Primary Geologic Information (50% to 80%) | | | | |
| a) Contact and unit identifications | Correct units and correct symbology; contacts within acceptable distance of correct location | Correct units and either correct symbology with contacts slightly outside acceptable limits or incorrect symbology with contacts within acceptable limits | Correct units identified but low accuracy of contacts | Incorrect map units identified |
| b) Structures | Proper structural symbol(s) in proper location | Structural symbol(s) present in proper location with minor symbol problem | Structural symbol(s) present but major problems with symbol(s) or location(s) | Lack of agreement between structural symbol(s) and mapped geology |
| c) Strikes & Dips | Adequate number of strikes and dips to define map pattern and structure(s) and symbols plotted correctly | Inadequate number of strikes and dips <u>or</u> incorrect symbols used | Inadequate number of strikes and dips <u>and</u> incorrect symbols plotted | No strike and dip information provided |
| 4. Geologic Cross-Section(s) (0% to 30%) | | | | |
| <small>Optional (turned in separately). Students use Google Earth to generate topo profile along cross section then trace profile and geology into Inkscape or Illustrator file. Students submit as pdf files.</small> | | | | |
| a) Scales, vertical exaggeration, topographic profile | Everything present and correctly labeled | Scales and vertical exaggeration correct but topographic profile accurately traced | One of the scales incorrect | Nothing is correct |
| b) Agreement with map | Perfect (100%) agreement | 80-99% agreement | 50-79% agreement | <50% agreement |
| c) Geologic interpretation | Interpretation sound and unit thicknesses appropriate (strong critical thinking skills exhibited) | Interpretation plausible but suspect and unit thicknesses appropriate | Interpretation plausible but suspect and problems with unit thicknesses <u>or</u> unit thicknesses appropriate but interpretation not feasible | Interpretation not feasible and inappropriate unit thicknesses (weak critical thinking skills exhibited) |