**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 |
|  |  |  |
| 4/5 |  | Clear explanation of the research question’s scientific background |
|  |  | You talked a lot about spatial autocorrelation, but weren’t ever terribly clear regarding what variable you were talking about… what did you expect to be spatially autocorrelated? Also, I could have used a bit more pointing to why it is important to account for spatial autocorrelation in relation to your question. How would ignoring it affect your outcomes? |
|  |  |  |
| 6/6 |  | Adequate description of methods, particularly of tools/principles learned in class |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 4/6 |  | Presentation of results that demonstrate your comprehension of tools/principles from class |
|  |  | When reporting results from your models, you discussed things that were statistically significant or non-significant, but gave us no sense of the magnitude of those effects. In addition, try to remind the viewer what your covariates are significantly affecting (here, presence of cormorants). In addition, you’re not including any covariates in your correlogram… you’re modeling occupancy as a function of those covariates, then testing for spatial autocorrelation in the residual deviance. |
|  |  |  |
| 4/5 |  | Analysis and interpretation of your findings in the context of your question and relevant literature |
|  |  | I wanted to know WHY your analysis removed the spatial autocorrelation in the occupancy data. Definitely try to speculate on that in your paper. |
|  |  |  |
| 3/3 |  | Effective conclusion of take-home message |
|  |  |  |
| **10 points** | **Clarity and delivery** | |
|  |  | |
| 2/3 |  | Use of graphics and figures that enhance understanding |
|  |  | Don’t put code on your slides. I get you were trying to show how you executed your analyses, but it’s much better to just tell us. |
| 1/2 |  | Minimal text |
|  |  | A bit wordy at the end of the presentation. |
|  |  |  |
| 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 |