

	pts	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Watershed model - computation	25	25 – correctly computed watersheds, streams and clipping; critical area and outlet centering on model	21-24 – methods are mostly correct; one ancillary step taken within the model (critical area or outlet)	15-20– incorrect or convoluted steps impair model success; no attempt to include ancillary steps	< 15 – incomplete or missing model construction; improper use of tools; no ancillary steps
Watershed model - layout and annotation	5	5 – well organized and compact; all unclear processes (or hidden ones) labeled; process is clear from PNG without opening any elements	4 – organization or readability suffers; some unclear processes (or hidden ones) labeled; had to open tools to see what took place	3 – model display hard to read due to element spread; mostly unclear or unlabeled steps	<3 – impossible to read or analyze model from PNG
Landslide model - computation	15	15 –correctly computed non-Boolean criteria; criteria combination into hazard is thoughtfully done	13-14 –simple but correct criteria construction; computation of hazard simple and successful	10-12 –small omissions or minor mistakes in criteria or hazard computation	<10 – unsuccessful or incorrect criteria creation or hazard computation
Landslide model - layout and annotation	5	5 – well organized and compact; all unclear processes (or hidden ones) labeled	4 – organization or readability suffers; some unclear processes (or hidden ones) labeled; had to open tools to see what took place	3 – model display hard to read due to element spread; mostly unclear or unlabeled steps	<3 – impossible to read or analyze model from snip
Watershed Layout	10	10 – basins and streams correctly and artfully displayed on the hillshade; labels created from existing/joined attributes; all map elements included	8-9 – streams and basins displayed but not artfully; labels hacked or clunky; or an element is missing or incorrect	6-7 –poor choices for display of basins and/or rivers; labels missing or incorrect; not all elements present	<6 – your map, marginalia and labels do not present the information requested or properly
Hazard Layout	10	10 - landslide hazard is clearly represented and overlain on a layer providing spatial reference or visualization; easy to read difference in hazard between basins; good symbology; all elements present	8-9 hazard is correctly visualized but presented in a way that obscures understanding; hazard by basin unclear or difficult to follow; elements mostly correct	6-7 –poor choices for display of hazard; basin hazard not represented; map elements missing or incorrect	<6 – your map, marginalia and labels do not present the information requested or properly
Metadata and project organization	5	5 - metadata requested are sufficient, correctly placed, and snipped	4 - metadata unclear or in the wrong spot	3 - missing some metadata or it is unreadable in Canvas	<3 - you don't "do" metadata
	75				
Parameters Extra Credit	5	5 - all necessary model elements have a parameter that has been annotated in the metadata/help so that the tool is clear and it runs well	4- good effort on most elements needing parameter status; most of the metadata/help info is attempted. It runs	3 - you gave it a shot for a few model elements, but didn't get much past that. It might run....	<3 - you failed to do it correctly...but attempted some parts of it at least.
Downstream Hazard Extra Credit	5	5 – clever methodology plus clear & effective layout (it would make a city council or county planner take notice!)	4- limited method of hazard creation and good layout with respect to population or structures	3 - you gave it a shot but the hazard isn't really well derived or you show it poorly on your layout	<3 - failed to do it correctly or your layout is unrelated to hazard, but you did put some time in.....