**SP4: Presentation of Project and Results**

**- Rubric (50 pts) -**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Excellent** | **Average** | **Poor** |
| ***Points*** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| *Group evaluation*: Timing (8-10 minutes) | Presentation finished between 8-10 minutes; presentations were well practiced ahead of class. | Presentation finished between 7 or 11 minutes; presentations were practiced ahead of class. | Presentation finished sooner than 7 minutes and later than 11 minutes; little evidence that presentations were not practiced outside of class. |
| ***Points*** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| *Group evaluation*: Overall visual appeal of slides | Slides display critical information in a meaningful way with minimal distractions and unnecessary features accessible by all audiences (e.g. assistive technology appropriate). | Slides display most information in a meaningful way with several distractions and unnecessary features and not entirely accessible to all audiences (e.g. not compatible with assistive technology). | Slides display some information in a meaningful way with several distractions and unnecessary features and not accessible to all audiences. |
| ***Points*** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| *Group evaluation*: Use of figures to enhance communication of major points of the presentation | Figures are elegant and informative with precise labels and intuitive structure. They should be accessible to a broad audience including assistive technology software. Figures borrowed from publications are cited and annotated in some way to better communicate the main message. | Figures are more complicated lacking precise labels and intuitive structure. They are not entirely accessible to a broad audience. Figures borrowed from publications are not well-cited and not fully annotated to support the message being communicated. | Figures are complicated without clear purpose and hindering interpretation of the data. They are not accessible to a broad audience. Figures from the literature are cited nor annotated. |
| ***Points*** | **4** | **2** | **0** |
| *Group evaluation*: Overall presentation (organization, engaging, clear, well-referenced) | Presentation has a simple, strong narrative based on scientific research which is easy for all audience members to follow and interpret. | Presentation has a more complicated narrative with few scientific references which is not easy for all audience members to follow and interpret. | Presentation has an obtuse narrative with no scientific references and is difficult for all audience members to follow and interpret.  |
| ***Points*** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| *Group evaluation*: Discussion of natural history of **butterfly and the host plant** | Information on butterfly and host plant natural history is completely accurate and concise. | Information on butterfly and host plant natural history has a few mistakes is and/or redundant. | Information on butterfly and host plant natural history has many mistakes and is disorganized and redundant. |
| ***Points*** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| *Group evaluation*: Discussion of natural history of the butterfly host plant **interaction** | Information on the plant-insect interaction is completely accurate and concise. | Information on plant-insect interaction is mostly accurate and concise. | Information on plant-insect interaction is not accurate or concise with many mistakes. |
| ***Points*** | **4** | **2** | **0** |
| *Group evaluation*: Presentation and comparison of observation maps and SDM for butterfly, host plant, and pairwise interactions | Distribution models are represented as clear, concise maps of both butterfly and host plant accessible to broad audience. Comparison between these maps should highlight the plant-insect interaction impacts and processes. | Distribution models are represented as mostly clear, concise maps of both butterfly and host plant accessible to a broad audience. Comparisons between these maps capture most but not all plant-insect interaction impacts and processes. | Distribution models are represented as unclear, inaccurate maps of both butterfly and host plant and are not accessible to a broad audience. Comparisons between these maps capture few plant-insect interaction impacts and processes. |
| ***Points*** | **5** | **3** | **1** |
| *Group evaluation*: Presentation of hypothesis and rationale | Hypothesis and rationale is well reasoned, insightful, and supported by observation and natural history. | Hypothesis and rationale is reasoned and mostly supported by observation and natural history. | Hypothesis and rationale is not well reasoned and is not based on observation or natural history. |
| ***Points*** | **4** | **2** | **0** |
| *Group evaluation*: Presentation and explanation of results of forecast maps | Presentation and explanation of results of forecast models is well reasoned, insightful and supported natural history. | Presentation and explanation of results of forecast models is mostly well reasoned, insightful and mostly supported natural history. | Presentation and explanation of results of forecast models is mostly well reasoned, insightful and mostly supported natural history. |
| ***Points*** | **4** | **2** | **0** |
| *Group evaluation*: Evaluation of hypothesis | Evaluation of hypothesis will incorporate the results from the various SDMs and have an insightful interpretation of why or why not the hypothesis was supported by the data. | Evaluation of hypothesis will mostly incorporate the results from the various SDMs and have a limited interpretation of why or why not the hypothesis was supported by the data. | Evaluation of hypothesis will not incorporate the results from the various SDMs and will not interpret why or why not the hypothesis was supported by the data. |
| ***Points*** | **5** | **3** | **1** |
| *Group evaluation*: Discussion - (refer to assignment for suggestions) | Discussion moves beyond evaluating the hypothesis to use the natural history, abiotic environment, etc. to help interpret the findings. Efforts made to include references to support the argument. | Discussion limited in moving beyond evaluation of the hypothesis and does not fully explore relevant information from the natural history, abiotic environment, etc. that may affect the butterfly-host plant interaction. | Little to no discussion of the hypothesis or misinterpretation of ancillary evidence. No references included in the argument. |
| ***Points*** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| *Individual evaluation*: Presentation was easily understood and audible, refrained from excessive repetition and presented at a good pace | Individual presents material with a clear speaking voice in concise and professional language and demeanor. | Individual mostly presents material with a clear speaking voice in concise and professional language and demeanor. | Individual barely presents material with a clear speaking voice in concise and professional language and demeanor. |
| ***Points*** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| *Individual evaluation*: Did not read from slides or was not heavily dependent on notes | Individual presents material entirely with poise and grace without reading directly from notes or slides. | Individual presents material with poise and grace while reading some material directly from notes or slides. | Individual presents material without poise and grace while reading most material directly from notes or slides. |
| ***Points*** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| *Individual evaluation*: Knowledgeable during presentation and in answering questions | Individual is poised and professional using clear elocution and charisma to engage the audience. Individual responds politely and concisely with the correct information to questions. | Individual is mostly poised and professional using clear elocution and charisma to engage the audience. Individual responds politely and concisely with the mostly correct information to questions. | Individual is scattered and disorganized failing to engage the audience. Individual responds impolitely and inaccurately to questions. |
| ***Points*** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| *Individual evaluation*: Asked questions of other presentations | Individual asks a minimum of two thoughtful questions demonstrating an integrated understanding and interpretation of the data presented. | Individual asks one thoughtful questions somewhat demonstrating an analytic understanding and interpretation of the data presented. | Individual asks less than 2 questions without clear understanding and interpretation of the data presented. |