**Grading rubric for final project presentations**

Spatial Ecology

WILD 7970

37/40 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 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 6/6 |  | Adequate description of methods, particularly of tools/principles learned in class |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 6/6 |  | Presentation of results that demonstrate your comprehension of tools/principles from class |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 4/5 |  | Analysis and interpretation of your findings in the context of your question and relevant literature |
|  |  | While you were presenting all of the boxplots, it was hard for us to keep our eyes on the big picture. Next time I’d suggest presenting fewer figures and walking through them more slowly while relating them back to the questions at hand. |
|  |  |  |
| 3/3 |  | Effective conclusion of take-home message |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **10 points** | **Clarity and delivery** | |
|  |  | |
| 2/3 |  | Use of graphics and figures that enhance understanding |
|  |  | All of the figures were pretty hard to follow. Next time consider condensing them into a few important ones. |
|  |  |  |
| 1.5/2 |  | Minimal text |
|  |  | A bit wordy in some places |
|  |  |  |
| 0.5/1 |  | Appropriate pace of delivery (roughly hits the 12-minute mark) |
|  |  | A little bit long |
|  |  |  |
| 2/2 |  | Engages with audience to maintain interest (i.e., not reading off the slides or paper) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2/2 |  | Answers questions effectively |