**Grading rubric for final project presentations**

Spatial Ecology

WILD 7970

24/40 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 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2/6 |  | Adequate description of methods, particularly of tools/principles learned in class |
|  |  | You talked about the datasets you’re using but didn’t seem to provide any information about analyses you did. |
|  |  |  |
| 1/6 |  | Presentation of results that demonstrate your comprehension of tools/principles from class |
|  |  | Besides a short flip book of temperature images, you didn’t seem to present any results of your own at all |
|  |  |  |
| 0/5 |  | Analysis and interpretation of your findings in the context of your question and relevant literature |
|  |  | On your “purpose” slide, you had two objectives, but didn’t relate any of the work back to those questions at the end. |
|  |  |  |
| 1/3 |  | Effective conclusion of take-home message |
|  |  | We really weren’t given much besides some things you intend to do in the future. |
|  |  |  |
| **10 points** | **Clarity and delivery** | |
|  |  | |
| 3/3 |  | Use of graphics and figures that enhance understanding |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2/2 |  | Minimal text |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1/1 |  | Appropriate pace of delivery (roughly hits the 12-minute mark) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2/2 |  | Engages with audience to maintain interest (i.e., not reading off the slides or paper) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2/2 |  | Answers questions effectively |