WORLD GEOGRAPHY 30

PROJECT 1 RUBRIC

Score Levels	QUALITY OF MAPS (10 MARKS)	MAPS DISCUSSION (30 MARKS)	BIBLIOGRAPHY (10 MARKS)
EXCEEDS STANDARD	• Choice of maps demonstrates a clear and complete understanding of the content • Map quality and readability are exceptional • Map resolution makes the image easy to read and access • Organization of content is both empathic and purposeful	• Is well thought out and aptly answers the question posed • Reflects application of critical thinking • Is pulled from a variety of sources • Is accurate	• All map citations and research are cited in APA/MLA format. • 3+ non-map sources are cited and used in your project • No mechanical errors are present in your bibliography
MEETS STANDARD	• Choice of maps demonstrates an adequate understanding of the content • Map quality and readability are passable • Map resolution makes the image easy to read and access • Organization of content is adequate and/or empathic	• adequately addresses the question posed • Evidence of critical thinking is apparent • Is pulled from a couple sources • Is accurate	• All map citations and research are cited in APA/MLA format. • 2 non-map sources are cited and used in your project • 1-2 mechanical errors are present in your bibliography
NEARLY MEETS STANDARD	• Choice of maps demonstrate a questionable understanding of the content • Map quality and readability are inconsistent • Organization of content is adequate and/or empathic	• Analysis is questionable, but mostly sound • Evidence of critical thinking is apparent • Limited support by researched sources • Has some factual errors or inconsistencies	• All map citations and research are cited in something resembling APA/MLA format. • 1-2 non-map sources are cited and used in your project • A few mechanical errors are present in your bibliography
DOES NOT MEET STANDARD	• Choice of maps demonstrate significant misunderstandings or misinterpretations of content • Map quality and readability are not acceptable • Content organization is not acceptable or non-existent	• Discussion is regularly missing key information or analysis • Has no apparent application of critical thinking • Has no clear goal • Has significant factual errors, misconceptions, or misinterpretations	• No attempt at any citation formatting is attempted • No non-map sources are cited • Significant mechanical errors are present in your bibliography