**Grading rubric for final project presentations**

Spatial Ecology

WILD 7970

35/40 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 |
|  |  | It would have been nice to see a bit more in the introduction about how the substrate composition and configuration would be useful in your world. |
|  |  |  |
| 4.5/6 |  | Adequate description of methods, particularly of tools/principles learned in class |
|  |  | Heavy focus in the methods on what Ping Mapper is doing, and less on HOW it is classifying the substrate, how you are quantifying the landscape, and why you chose the metrics you chose. I wanted to see more of that in terms of demonstrating tools/theory from this class. |
|  |  |  |
| 4 /6 |  | Presentation of results that demonstrate your comprehension of tools/principles from class |
|  |  | It felt like you just picked some landscape metrics to report without much information relating them back to biological/ecological questions. |
|  |  |  |
| 5/5 |  | Analysis and interpretation of your findings in the context of your question and relevant literature |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 3/3 |  | Effective conclusion of take-home message |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **10 points** | **Clarity and delivery** | |
|  |  | |
| 3/3 |  | Use of graphics and figures that enhance understanding |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1.5/2 |  | Minimal text |
|  |  | A bit wordy in some places |
|  |  |  |
| 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 |