**Grading rubric for final project presentations**

Spatial Ecology

WILD 7970

34/40 points

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **30 points** | **Content and organization** | |
|  |  | |
| 5/5 |  | Introduction outlining the purpose and goals of the presentation |
|  |  |  |
| 5/5 |  | Clear explanation of the research question’s scientific background |
|  |  |  |
| 4/6 |  | Adequate description of methods, particularly of tools/principles learned in class |
|  |  | I needed to see you explicitly link your approach to the SDM methods we discussed and give me some more information about why you chose the scales at which you aggregated your covariates |
|  |  | It also would have been nice to hear a clearer description of how you decided what was a wetland |
|  |  |  |
| 5/6 |  | Presentation of results that demonstrate your comprehension of tools/principles from class |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 5/5 |  | Analysis and interpretation of your findings in the context of your question and relevant literature |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1/3 |  | Effective conclusion of take-home message |
|  |  | You ran out of time to really drive the point home |
|  |  |  |
| **10 points** | **Clarity and delivery** | |
|  |  | |
| 3/3 |  | Use of graphics and figures that enhance understanding |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2/2 |  | Minimal text |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 0/1 |  | Appropriate pace of delivery (roughly hits the 12-minute mark) |
|  |  | Too long |
|  |  |  |
| 2/2 |  | Engages with audience to maintain interest (i.e., not reading off the slides or paper) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2/2 |  | Answers questions effectively |