Sustainable City Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Points | 0 – no points  Requirements missing. | 1 – Poor  Fulfills at least 20% of requirements. | 2 – Fair  Fulfills at least 50% of requirements. | 3 – Good  Average quality. Fulfills 85% of requirements. | 4 – Very Good  Fulfills 95% of requirements. | 5 – Excellent  Fulfills 100% of requirements. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| City Design | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Includes at least 3 zones: residential, commercial, industrial, agriculture | No evidence of zoning. | Zoning unclear. | At least one zone clearly labeled. | 2 zones but areas are not clearly labeled. | 2 zones that are clearly defined and labeled. | 3 or more zones that are clearly labeled & defined. |
| Clearly recognizable elements, identifiable structures, zones | No variety of structures. | Little variety of structures. | Small variety of structures. |  | Some variety of structures. Could be more comprehensive | Very good variety of recognizable structures. |
| Includes essential infrastructure (water, roadways, power, utilities, etc.) | No infrastructure | Shows very little infrastructure. | Few infrastructure components. | Some infrastructure. Not all essential to city operations. | Several infrastructures. Not all essential to city operations. | Several infrastructure essential to city operation. |
| Includes variety of essential city services (public safety, health, education, etc.) | No services listed. | Show very little services. | Few service components. | Some service components. Not all essential to city operations. | Several infrastructures. Not all essential to city operations. | Several infrastructure essential to city operation. |
| Interconnectivity of zones & infrastructure. | No Interconnectivity | Little interconnectivity. | Some interconnectivity, but awkward design. | Adequate interconnectivity. | Good interconnectivity. | Very good interconnectivity of the city. |
| Transportation modes: pedestrian, public, goods & services | No Interconnectivity | Little interconnectivity. | Few transportation modes shown. | Adequate transportation modes shown | Good interconnectivity. | Very good interconnectivity of the city. |
| Considers livability concepts (neighborhoods, green spaces, accessibility) | No planning | Little planning & consideration of livability concepts. | Some planning is obvious. A few livability elements included. | Planned design. Incorporates some livability concepts. | Well planned design. Incorporates several livability elements. | Excellent planning. Excellent design and highly livable. |
| Renewable solutions to problems such as transportation, power, environment, services, solid waste. Etc. | No solutions. | One solution, not innovative. | One solution, Somewhat innovative. | More than one solution. Somewhat innovative and plausible. | More than one solution that is innovative. | Several innovative & plausible solutions. |
| Completion of background questions. | No steps completed. | 1 - 2 Steps completed. | 3 steps completed | 4 steps completed | 5 steps completed | 6 steps completed |
| Appearance: Use of color, graphics, shapes, etc. realistic elements and good use of available space. | No aesthetics. | Poor aesthetics. | Fair aesthetics. | Good aesthetics, enhance the model. | Very good aesthetics, enhance the model. | Excellent aesthetics, enhance the model. |
| Model Scale: appropriate scale chosen to create the model. | Scale not used. | Inconsistent scale for majority of model. | Fair scale choice. Some scale inconsistencies. | Good scale choice; city elements easy to identify. Scale consistently applied over majority of model. | Very good scale choice; city elements easy to identify. Consistent application. | Exceptional scale choice; city elements very easy to identify. Consistent application of chosen scale across entire model. |