Xplorer Squads – Assessment Rubric (0–3)

An assessment tool for the "Xplorer Squads" lesson. It uses a simple **0–3 rubric across four criteria**–Evidence Use; Comparison Accuracy; Explanation of Change; Communication & Presentation. Designed for quick marking in Bangkok school contexts; aligns with the lesson's map/photo analysis, field observation, and poster/video presentation.

This assessment supports the "Xplorer Squads: Reading Bangkok's Urban Change" lesson. Teachers score each team on **four criteria (0–3 each; total 12):**

- **C1 Evidence Use (maps & photos):** points to concrete features on historical maps/photographs and links them to a clear claim.

- **C2 Comparison Accuracy (then ↔ now):** correctly identifies and precisely locates changes/continuities; angles match where possible.

- **C3 Explanation of Change (causes & impacts):** explains why the change happened and its impact on people/space, tied to evidence.

- **C4 Communication & Presentation:** clear claim–evidence–reasoning; readable captions and credits; time and roles managed.

C1. Evidence use (maps & photos) — 0–3 points
How to consider: Look for specific, visible features (e.g., canal line, new road, bridge, block shape, façade detail). Students should point to them (labels/arrows) and tie them to their claim.

Score	What it looks like
3 – Proficient	Cites 2+ precise features correctly (e.g., "the canal shown here was replaced by this road") and shows them with labels/arrows; each feature supports the claim.
2 – Developing	Uses some features, but one is vague/slightly off OR the link to the claim is partial; labels exist but may be incomplete.
1 – Emerging	Talks in general terms ("old vs new") with no clear features or mislabels; the audience can't see what supports the claim.
0 – Not yet	No relevant evidence or evidence is incorrect.

C2. Comparison accuracy (then ↔ now) — 0–3 points
How to consider: Judge what they compare and how precisely. You want correct items (changes or continuities), clear location, and, where possible, matching camera angle.

Score	What it looks like
3 – Proficient	Names 2+ accurate changes/continuities and locates each precisely (street/corner/near landmark); then–now angle is well matched.
2 – Developing	Names 1–2 items correctly but location or angle is incomplete; description is partly precise.
1 – Emerging	Gives vague or mixed-up comparisons; mismatched angle makes the comparison hard to verify.
0 – Not yet	Comparison is incorrect or missing.

C3. Explanation of change (causes & impacts) — 0–3 points

How to consider: Look for a cause (e.g., road building, zoning, commerce, flood/drainage, public health) linked to their evidence, and a realistic impact (traffic flow, market life, river use, public space).

Score	What it looks like
3 – Proficient	Gives plausible cause(s) that refer back to the map/photo evidence and states at least one concrete impact on people/space.
2 – Developing	Gives either a cause or an impact (not both), or the link to the evidence is weak/general.
1 – Emerging	Lists a change but does not explain why it happened or what it affects.
0 – Not yet	No explanation of cause or impact.

C4. Communication & presentation — 0–3 points

How to consider: Judge the clarity of claim–evidence–reasoning, readability (titles/captions), credits/sources, time management, and whether roles were shared.

Score	What it looks like
3 – Proficient	Clear **claim–evidence–reasoning**; readable titles/captions; **sources/credits shown**; **on time**; multiple voices contribute confidently.
2 – Developing	Mostly clear but with **minor layout/caption issues**; a little **over time** or roles uneven.
1 – Emerging	Hard to follow; **missing captions/credits**; poor time control; delivery unclear.
0 – Not yet	**Unclear and incomplete** output.

Quick scoring box

Total (out of 12)	Band	Teacher comment (one next step)
	☐ Proficient (10–12) ☐ Developing (7–9) ☐ Emerging (0–6)	

Tip for consistency: If a group is strong on one comparison but weak on another, **average within the criterion** rather than jumping bands— keep scoring anchored to the **dominant quality** you observed.