	Name of Wildfire Case:	Presented by Student Groups:
--	------------------------	------------------------------

ATSC 413 -v11

Step 1: Before the presentation starts, write all the presenters' names on page 3, and fill in the lines above on page 1.

Step 2: Write any positive suggestions in the spaces below. Also, Please circle the appropriate box in each row, as applies to the whole group.

GROUP POINTS	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Beginning
(write any suggestions/comments in the spaces below)				
A. Introduction: First introduce your team members. Then, for the fire, discuss: What? Where? When? Why? Who?	(3 points) Thorough, concise, clear. Appropriate use of maps, charts, tables, photos, movies, etc. Motivates the audience.	(2 points) A mostly thorough and clear introduction. Incomplete coverage of What? When? Where? Why? Who?	(1 point) Too short or too long or unclear introduction. Little motivation of the audience.	(0 points) Little or no introduction, other than introducing their team members. Or intro is irrelevant to the case.
B. Antecedent Conditions : Describe the climate & anomalies, forest & fuel type, moisture codes, etc. in the months and week before the fire.	(6 points) Thorough, concise, clear. Appropriate use of maps, charts, tables, photos, movies, etc. Discussion of moisture codes and fire indices, and how they related to this fire. Discussion of both long (previous year) and shorter (previous recent weeks) antecedent conditions.	(4 points) Aware of antecedent conditions and their relevance, but neglected to show and discuss some of the relevant fire indices and moisture codes . Partially explained how the antecedent conditions might have affected the fire behavior.	(2 points) Presented antecedent conditions because they were required to, but little or no insight into how those conditions might have affected fire behavior.	(0 points) Little or no discussion of antecedent conditions. Or little or no presentation of relevant maps or data.
C. Ignition Source and Associated Synoptic & Mesoscale Weather on the day of ignition.	(6 points) Thorough, concise, clear. Appropriate use of maps, charts, tables, photos, movies, moisture codes, fire indices, etc. Logical arguments relating the weather to the fire initiation.	(4 points) Mostly thorough discussion of the ignition process. Missing some relevant fire indices or some weather conditions. Or missing discussion of weather at the time of ignition, and how it related to the ability of the fire to start.	(2 points) Poor connection of the weather to the fire ignition. Or was too verbose in some explanations. Or presented some of the relevant maps and data, but misinterpreted them. Or missed key factors.	(0 points) Little or no understanding of how the fire started and/or what the weather was on the likely ignition date.
D. Fire Weather & Behavior. Co-evolution of the weather and the fire, and associated dynamics, thermodynamics, synoptics & mesoscale weather.	(12 points) Thorough, concise, clear. Appropriate use of maps, charts, tables, photos, movies, moisture codes, fire indices, soundings, cross-sections, etc. Logical arguments relating weather evolution to fire evolution. Discussion of interesting or surprising events.	(8 points) Presented most of the relevant NWP, satellite, and other resources. Connections missing between some of the fire events and the weather. Presented some special events, but missed others	(4 points) Showed some of the relevant resources, but some were misinterpreted. Poor explanation of the connection between weather and fire. Did not recognize any key events. Or was too verbose in some of the explanations.	(0 points) Showed irrelevant "eye candy" images and maps, not relevant to this case study. Substantial misunderstanding of the relationship between fire and weather.

E. Special Meteorological Aspects of this Case (might be identified by the instructors, such as pyrocb, diablo winds, smoke dispersion, clear. Appropriate use of maps, charts, soundings, tables, photos, movies, etc. Logical explanation of his behavior apply to the fire cand Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment on Industry, Environment on	GROUP POINTS	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Beginning
etc.) maps, charts, soundings, tables, photos, movies, etc. Logical explanation of how these aspects of atmospheric behavior apply to the fire. F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment Mark to the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment Mark to the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment Mark to the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment Mark to the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment) and Irelevant aspects, Or some wind direct and indirect impacts on people, their communities, and commerce. Consider health, economic, and ecological impacts. G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Conclusions & R	E. Special Meteorological Aspects of this Case (might be identified	(6 points) Thorough, concise,	(4 points) Recognizes the	(2 points) Unable to	(0 points) No
Tables, sphotos, movies, etc. Logical explanation of how these aspects of atmospheric behavior apply to the fire.	by the instructors, such as pyrocb, diablo winds, smoke dispersion,	clear. Appropriate use of	special meteorological	explain the special	presentation of special
Logical explanation of how these aspects of atmospheric behavior apply to the fire. F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment G. (6 points) Thorough, concise, clear summary of findings. A misplanats. G. Conclusions & Recommendations	etc.)	maps, charts, soundings,	situations that were	meteorological aspects, or	meteorological aspects.
these aspects of atmospheric behavior apply to the fire: behavior apply to the fire: (6 points) Thorough, concise, clear. Appropriate use of maps, charts, tables, photos, movies, news reports, etc. Logical arguments about direct and indirect impacts on people, their communities, and commerce. Consider health, economic, and ecological impacts. G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. points The overall presentation had a logical progression. Strong evidence of teamwork & collaboration. A unified presentation had a logical progression. Strong evidence of teamwork & collaboration. A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions The overall progression. Strong Content of the progression. Strong or widence of teamwork & (2 points) One or more (1 point) Roughly half of (0 points) No one in the		tables, photos, movies, etc.	relevant, but are unable	why they are relevant to	
Dehavior apply to the fire. Other relevant data. Copoints Only a small subset of impacts were presented. Or some more presented on the impacts of this specific fire. Opoints Only a small subset of impacts were presented. Or some misunderstanding of the relationship between the relationship between the fire, ecological impacts. Opoints Opo		Logical explanation of how	to provide appropriate	this case.	
Conclusions & Recommendations Concise, Clear summary of findings & insights, supported with strong evidence. Findings from this case led to recommendations on mitgation of future fires. Findings from this case led to recommendations on Strong evidence. Findings from this case led to recommendations the Department of Earmwork & Collaboration. A unified presentation showing evidence of teamwork & Collaboration. A unified presentation of each slide.		these aspects of atmospheric	weather maps, charts, or		
Clear. Appropriate use of maps, charts, tables, photos, movies, news reports, etc. Logical arguments about direct and indirect impacts on people, their communities, and commerce. Consider health, economic, and ecological impacts. G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Spoints A thorough, concise, clear summary of findings & insights, supported with strong evidence. Findings from this case led to recommendations or mitigation of future fires. H. Overall Organization & Teamwork Capoints Teamwork & collaboration. A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presented: On some missuances (people, industry, environment), but gave good presentation and arguments about the relationship between the fire, meteorology, and impacts. Subset of impacts were presented. Or some missuances (people, industry, environment, but gave good presentation and arguments about the relationship between the fire, meteorology, and impacts. A thorough concise, clear summary of findings and possible findings and possible future mitigation. Capoints Nacorough (population) Nacorough (p		behavior apply to the fire.	other relevant data.		
maps, charts, tables, photos, movies, news reports, etc. Logical arguments about direct and indirect impacts on people, their communities, and commerce. Consider health, economic, and ecological impacts. G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Conclusions G. Conclu	F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People,	(6 points) Thorough, concise,	(4 points) Did not touch	(2 points) Only a small	(0 points) No info was
movies, news reports, etc. Logical arguments about direct and indirect impacts on people, their communities, and commerce. Consider health, economic, and ecological impacts. G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Some evidence only partly supported with strong evidence on mitigation of future fires. G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Sopital Y thorough, concise, clear summary of findings. G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Conclusions G. Conclu	Industry, Environment	clear. Appropriate use of	on all relevant aspects	subset of impacts were	presented on the impacts
Logical arguments about direct and indirect impacts on people, their communities, and commerce. Consider health, economic, and ecological impacts. G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Conclusions & G. (2 points) Has somewhat clear uproses. Some evidence only partly supports the conclusions. G. Conclusions Poor only partly supports the conclusions. G. Conclusions (2 points) House the fire. G. Conclusions (10 points) Has somewhat clear uproses. Some evidence only partly supports the conclusions. G. Conclusions (10 points) House the fire. G. Conclusions (10 points) Hou		maps, charts, tables, photos,	(people, industry,	presented. Or some	of this specific fire.
direct and indirect impacts on people, their communities, and commerce. Consider health, economic, and ecological impacts. G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Sonits) A thorough, concise, clear summary of findings & insights, supported with strong evidence. Findings from this case led to recommendations on mitigation of future fires. G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Points) The overall organization & Teamwork G. Points) The overall organization of the presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. G. Points) One or more G. Conclusions, recommendations are generic and not relevant to this specific fire. G. Points) One or mitigation. G. Points) One or more G. Points) No one in the remaining aspects. Missed important news reports or seltrific findings. G. Points) No one in the remaining aspects. G. Points) No one in the remaining aspects. G. Points) No one in		movies, news reports, etc.	environment), but gave	misunderstanding of the	
people, their communities, and commerce. Consider health, economic, and ecological impacts. G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Conclusions & G. Concitions G. Conclusions & G. Concitions G. Conclusions & G. Concitions of purpors. G. Conclusions on the evidence only partly supports the conclusions. Poor connection between findings and possible quencing and the fire. Recommendations are generic and not relevant to this specific fire. G. Popints Mon-uniform presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. G. Popints M. Concitions on the presentation style. G. Popints M. Concitions on the fire. G. Popints M. Concitions on the fire. G.		Logical arguments about	good presentation and	relationship between the	
and commerce. Consider health, economic, and ecological impacts. G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Conclusions & Conclusions. Floring s and possible with a cubic progression. Strong evidence of teamwork & collaboration. A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. G. Conclusions & Presentation the connection between findings and possible generic and not relevant to this specific fire. G. Points) The overall (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a somewhat clear purpose. Some evidence only partly supports the conclusions. For connection between findings and possible generic and not relevant to this specific fire. G. Points) Non-uniform presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. G. Points) Non-uniform presentation style vidence of good teamwork. Findings and possible future mitigation. G. Points) Non-uniform presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. G. Points) Non-uniform presentation style vidence of good teamwork. G. Points) One or more G. Points) Non-uniform presentation style vidence of good teamwork. G. Points) One or more G. Points) Non-uniform presentation style vidence of good		direct and indirect impacts on	arguments about the	fire, meteorology, and	
health, economic, and ecological impacts. G. Conclusions & Recommendations G. Conclusions & Governmendations G. Conclusions & Governmendations are generic and not relevant to this specific fire. G. Conclusions & Governmendations are generic and not relevant to this specific fire. G. Points) No-uniform presentation style of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. G. Points) No one in the More of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. G. Points) No one in the More of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. G. Points) No one in the More of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. G. Points) No one in the More of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. G. Points) No one in the More of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. G. Points) No one in the More of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or im		people, their communities,	remaining aspects.	impacts.	
Conclusions & Recommendations (3 points) A thorough, concise, clear summary of findings & insights, supported with strong evidence. Findings from this case led to recommendations on mitigation of future fires.		and commerce. Consider	Missed important news		
G. Conclusions & Recommendations (3 points) A thorough, concise, clear summary of findings & insights, supported with strong evidence. Findings from this case led to recommendations on mitgation of future fires. H. Overall Organization & Teamwork (6 points) The overall progression. Strong evidence of teamwork & collaboration. A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. (3 points) A thorough, concise, clear summary of findings & clear purpose. Some evidence only partly supports the conclusions. Poor connection between findings and possible future mitigation. (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. (5 points) No conclusions, recommendations or insights. Most presenters did not relevant to this specific fire. (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. (5 points) No conclusions, recommendations or insights. Most presenters did not relevant to this specific fire. (6 points) The overall progression. Strong evidence of teamwork well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. (6 points) The overall progression. Strong evidence of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. (7 points) No one in the vidence of good teamwork. (8 points) No one in the vidence of good teamwork. (9 points) No one in the vidence of good teamwork. (9 points) No one in the vidence of good teamwork.		health, economic, and			
concise, clear summary of findings & insights, supported with strong evidence. Findings from this case led to recommendations on mitigation of future fires. H. Overall Organization & Teamwork H. Overall Organization & Teamwork A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. L. Answering Questions Clear purpose. Some evidence only partly supports the conclusions. Poor connection between findings and possible future mitigation. (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. Clear purpose. Some evidence only partly supports the conclusions. Poor connection between findings and possible future mitigation. (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions Clear purpose. Some evidence only partly supports the conclusions. Poor connection between flow free. (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. Capoints) One or more (1.5 points) One or more (1.5 points) One or more (1.5 points) Roughly half of points) No one in the		ecological impacts.	findings.		
findings & insights, supported with strong evidence. Findings from this case led to recommendations on mitigation of future fires. H. Overall Organization & Teamwork H. Overall Organization & Teamwork H. Overall Organization & Teamwork A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions Findings & insights, supported with strong evidence of findings and possible findings and possible future mitigation. (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. Poor connection between findings and possible future mitigation. (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions Poor connection between findings and possible future mitigation. (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions Poor connection between findings and possible future mitigation. (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions Poor connection between findings and possible future mitigation. (4 points) Presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Findings and possible future mitigation. (5 points) Non-uniform presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Findings and possible generic and not relevant to this specific fire. Findings and possible generic and not relevant to this specific fire. F	G. Conclusions & Recommendations	(3 points) A thorough,	(2 points) Has somewhat	(1 point) Lack of insight	(0 points) No
with strong evidence. Findings from this case led to recommendations on mitigation of future fires. H. Overall Organization & Teamwork (6 points) The overall presentation had a logical progression. Strong evidence of teamwork & collaboration. A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions supports the conclusions. Poor connection between findings and possible future mitigation. (4 points) Presentation to this specific fire. (5 points) Non-uniform presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Findings from this case led to recommendations are generic and not relevant to this specific fire. (2 points) Non-uniform presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Findings from this case led to recommendations are generic and not relevant to this specific fire. (4 points) Presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Findings and possible future mitigation. (4 points) Non-uniform presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Findings and possible future mitigation. (5 points) One or more Findings and possible future mitigation. (6 points) Non-uniform presentation of presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Findings and possible future mitigation.		concise, clear summary of		into the connection	conclusions,
Findings from this case led to recommendations on mitigation of future fires. H. Overall Organization & Teamwork (6 points) The overall progression. Strong evidence of teamwork & collaboration. A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. Findings from this case led to recommendations are generic and not relevant to this specific fire. (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. Findings from this case led to recommendations are generic and not relevant to this specific fire. (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. Findings and possible future mitigation. (4 points) Presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced.		findings & insights, supported	evidence only partly	between the meteorology	recommendations or
recommendations on mitigation of future fires. H. Overall Organization & Teamwork (6 points) The overall presentation had a logical progression. Strong evidence of teamwork & collaboration. A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. 1. Answering Questions recommendations on mitigation of future fires. (6 points) The overall (4 points) Presentation future mitigation. (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. recommendations on findings and possible future mitigation. (4 points) Presentation to this specific fire. (2 points) Non-uniform presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced.		with strong evidence.	supports the conclusions.	and the fire.	insights. Most presenters
H. Overall Organization & Teamwork (6 points) The overall presentation had a logical progression. Strong evidence of teamwork & collaboration. A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. (2 points) Non-uniform presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. (3 points) Non-uniform presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. (3 points) One or more (1.5 points) One or more (1 point) Roughly half of (0 points) No one in the		Findings from this case led to	Poor connection between	Recommendations are	did not grasp the material
H. Overall Organization & Teamwork (6 points) The overall presentation had a logical progression. Strong evidence of teamwork & collaboration. A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. (4 points) Presentation flows well, but with a small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. (2 points) Non-uniform presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. (5 points) Organization of presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. (8 points) Non-uniform presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. (9 points) Organization of presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. (9 points) Organization of presentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. (9 points) None or imbalanced. (1 point) Roughly half of (1 points) No one in the		recommendations on	findings and possible	generic and not relevant	or its significance.
presentation had a logical progression. Strong evidence of teamwork & collaboration. A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions Descentation had a logical progression. Strong evidence of teamwork well, but with a small number of missteps. Inbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. Descentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Descentation was disjointed. Little or no evidence of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Descentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Descentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Descentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Descentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Descentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Descentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Descentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Descentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Descentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. Descentation style. Or appears that only a subset of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced.		mitigation of future fires.	future mitigation.	to this specific fire.	
progression. Strong evidence of teamwork & collaboration. A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions small number of missteps. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. appears that only a subset of the people did most of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. good teamwork. 1. Spoints) One or more (1.5 points) One or more (1 point) Roughly half of (0 points) No one in the	H. Overall Organization & Teamwork		(4 points) Presentation	(2 points) Non-uniform	(0 points) Organization of
of teamwork & collaboration. A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. Imbalance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. In balance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. In balance between contributions of group members, but evidence of the work. Teamwork is fractured or imbalanced. In balance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. In balance between contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork.		presentation had a logical	flows well, but with a	presentation style. Or	·
A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions A unified presentation style, showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions Contributions of group members, but evidence of good teamwork. good teamwork. (1.5 points) One or more (1 point) Roughly half of (0 points) No one in the		progression. Strong evidence	small number of missteps.	appears that only a subset	disjointed. Little or no
showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions showing excellent teamwork. Page number & presenter's good teamwork. good teamwork. good teamwork. (1.5 points) One or more (1 point) Roughly half of (0 points) No one in the		of teamwork & collaboration.	Imbalance between	of the people did most of	evidence of teamwork.
Page number & presenter's name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions Page number & presenter's good teamwork. 1. Answering Questions (2 points) One or more (2 points) One or more (1.5 points) One or more (1 point) Roughly half of (0 points) No one in the			contributions of group	the work. Teamwork is	
name at bottom of each slide. I. Answering Questions 1. Answering Questions			1	fractured or imbalanced.	
I. Answering Questions (2 points) One or more (1.5 points) One or more (1 point) Roughly half of (0 points) No one in the			good teamwork.		
	I. Answering Questions	(2 points) One or more	(1.5 points) One or more		(0 points) No one in the
members gives accurate, members gives an the audience questions group has reasonable					
thorough, clear, concise adequate answer to most are not answered well. Or answers to any of the		thorough, clear, concise	adequate answer to most		answers to any of the
answers to all questions, questions. questions. insufficient time to answer questions. Or no time			questions.	insufficient time to answer	questions. Or no time
based on knowledge of the all questions. available to answer any		based on knowledge of the		all questions.	available to answer any
fire case and weather. questions.		fire case and weather.			questions.
May total = 50 points					

Max total = 50 points

Step 3: Add all the points from the boxes you circled, and write the total here:

Step 4: On the next page, evaluate the presentation delivery of each individual presenter:

Step 5: Put an "X" in the appropriate column for each individual presenter.

INDIVIDUAL POINTS	Exemplary Delivery	Proficient Delivery	Developing	Beginning
(write any suggestions/comments in the spaces below) Points:	3	2	1	0
Presenter Names, and any suggestions or comments.	Holds attention of audience with direct eye contact. Speaks loudly with high enthusiasm, with fluctuations & inflection to maintain audience interest. Emphasizes key points.	Consistent use of direct eye contact with audience, but still returns to notes. Some enthusiasm. Sometimes not loud enough. Speaks with good variation in inflection & tone.	Displays minimal eye contact with audience, while reading mostly from notes. Speaks too softly with little or no inflection.	Holds no eye contact with the audience, as entire report is read from notes. Speaks too softly and or in a monotonous tone, which causes the audience to disengage.
Example: Jean McWhisper. Please talk more loudly with more enthusiasm. Look at the audience more often.			X	
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				

Step 6: Write any additional suggestions for the team here, or on the back of this page.