| Category (Points) | Rejected | Major Concerns | Minor Concerns | Meets expectations | Exemplary | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Introduction (50) | The introduction is poorly constructed, incorrect, or incomplete (0 – 34) | There is a introduction but it is largely unclear and focused on specific study. Not clearly distinct from methods or hypotheses (35-38) | The presenter has an introduction, yet it focuses specifically on their study and does not set up a broader context OR Background examples are not clearly connected to the presented study (38 – 43) | The presenter uses ecological ideas and brief context to set up their study question. They introduce a knowledge gap where they plan to fill in information with their research. (43-47) | The presentation clearly sets up the project with examples from an ecological context. There is sufficient information to introduction the audience to the topic, assuming a broad-ecology background. The presenter uses clear examples from other studies or systems to introduce why they are interested in this topic and how their study fits in a boarder context (47-50) | |
| Statement of Hypotheses and Main Questions (25) | Portion is missing; Completely unclear and/or illogical (0-17) | Just questions or hypothesis are presented; The presenter is jumbled or unclear in their hypotheses; Hypotheses are not logically sound. (18-20) | Questions and hypotheses are stated, but somewhat abruptly or lacking a clear connection to background (20-23) | Questions are hypotheses are clear, follow from introduction (23-24) | Main questions and hypotheses are clearly laid out. They follow logically from the introduction/background. Hypotheses are sound and interesting and are clearly testable within the context of the study. The presenter provides a main hypotheses, but alternatives as well! (24-25) | |
| Presentation of Methods (31.25) | Methods are absent, unclear, or confusing (0 – 21) | Methods are presented but student does not clearly explain activities or | Methods are presented yet missing important | Methods are presented. Data which are collected are mentioned. However, they may be | Study system and methods are clearly presented. The collection of data is discussed with sampling methodology. The student explains why each | |

| | | motivation behind the data collection. Major elements missing (22 – 25) | context in some areas. (25 – 27) | missing how certain activities were done or relate to critical data. (27 – 29) | activity was done and clearly explains how it relates to the activity. (29 – 31.25) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Core Results (31.25) | Figures are absent, or clearly inappropriate for their own data, there is not an understanding of what is being presented (0 – 21) | Figures are shown but not well explained. Formatting of figure is unclear or illegible or student did not present the critical data (22 – 25) | Figures are shown yet some minor details are not well explained, axes are not introduced (25 – 27) | Figures are shown and data are explained. There is possibly a small lack of discussing important patterns (27 – 29) | Figure of core results are presented; data are clearly explained on each slide. Figures are correctly formatted and large/legible. Trends in the data are discussed while the figure is present. (29 – 31.25) | |
| Presentation of Statistics (31.25) | Statistics are absent or incorrect. They do not clearly match the figure/data presented (0 – 21) | Stats are there but not well explained. Student may not have chosen appropriate test for the data or lacks an understanding of their presentation (22 – 25) | Statistics are presented but not in context with corresponding figures. Presenter is not clearly confident in their interpretation (25 – 27) | Statistical test results are given, yet maybe not with corresponding figures or slightly unclear (27 – 29) | Statistics are presented correctly. They are given in conjunction with the corresponding figures. (29 – 31.25) | |
| Evaluation of Results (18.75) | Results are not clearly addressed, completely missing connection to the original | Results are given but lacking a clear connection to the hypotheses and evaluation of findings. OR | Results are given but may be missing some important details or rushed connection to | Results are given, all important trends are shared. However, possibly not mixed throughout the presentation (16-17.5) | Result are evaluated clearly, if appropriate at times with the figures/statistics. Evaluations of results are intermixed with the presentation of core data/stats. Interesting and unexpected findings are highlighted. Results | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | study, or incorrect interpretation of own data (0-13) | results are not clear from the figures/stats previously shared (13.5-14.5) | hypotheses and context (14.5-16) | | are clearly related back to the hypotheses and broader ecological concepts. (17.5-18.75) | |
| Discussion of Results, Limitations, Future Directions (12.5) | Absent or incorrect (0 – 8) | Limitations are addressed but the student will not address how the limitation directly effected the data or are slightly incorrect. (8 -10) | Results are discussed but there is some minor issues with connecting to broader ideas – forced concept (10 -11) | The results are related back to the main concepts in the presentation and there is some acknowledgement of how to improve/further the study (11-11.5) | Student clearly relates the results to broader ecological ideas and implications on the field are acknowledged. Limitations are discussed in meaningful ways that relate to interpretation of the data and ideas of ways to futher the study are briefly addressed. (11.5 – 12.5) | |
| Presentation Style (25) | Presentation is clearly not rehearsed, too short or too long. (0-18) | Presentation needs rehearsal and refinement. Overall timing is poor (18-20) | Presentation is clear and rehearsed. Yet, some minor issue – rushing or timing slightly poor.  Perhaps looking too much at screen rather than crowd (20-23) | Presentation is straightforward and well-rehearsed. Figures are always introduced. (23-24) | Presentation style is clear and concise. The student demonstrates a solid understanding of the material and has rehearsed the presentation. The student talks to the crowd and does not rush. (24-25) | |
| Slide Formatting (25) | Some major issue with display of information (0 – 18) | Slides are over-filled with small text and illegible figures (18-20) | Generally good but still too much text or small formatted figures (20-23) | Nice balance of images and text. Everything is legible and clear. Figures are big and clear (23-24) | Exceptional formatting with considerable clarity. Delayed delivery is utilized visual aids to guide audience (24-25) | |
| **Total (250)** | | | | | | |