Name of Wildfire Case: _____   Presented by Student Groups: _____   ATSC 413 – v12

Step 1: Before the presentation starts, write all the presenters' names on page 3, and fill in the lines above on page 1. Do NOT write your name.

Step 2: Write suggestions for improvement in the Group Points column below. Please frame your comments as positive suggestions, not negative complaints.   Also, Please circle the appropriate box in each row, as applies to the whole group.

GROUP POINTS (write any suggestions/comments in the spaces below)	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Beginning
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.

GROUP POINTS	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Beginning
E. Special Meteorological Aspects of this Case (might be identified by the instructors, such as pyrocb, diablo winds, smoke dispersion, etc.)	(6 points) Thorough, concise, clear. Appropriate use of maps, charts, soundings, tables, photos, movies, etc. Logical explanation of how these aspects of atmospheric behavior apply to the fire.	(4 points) Recognizes the special meteorological situations that were relevant, but are unable to provide appropriate weather maps, charts, or other relevant data.	(2 points) Unable to explain the special meteorological aspects, or why they are relevant to this case.	(0 points) No presentation of special meteorological aspects.
F. Impacts of the Fire (and Smoke where relevant) on People, Industry, Environment	(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.	(4 points) Did not touch on all relevant aspects (people, industry, environment), but gave good presentation and arguments about the remaining aspects. Missed important news reports or scientific findings.	(2 points) Only a small subset of impacts were presented. Or some misunderstanding of the relationship between the fire, meteorology, and impacts.	(0 points) No info was presented on the impacts of this specific fire.
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 mitigation of future fires.	(2 points) Has somewhat clear purpose. Some evidence only partly supports the conclusions. Poor connection between findings and possible future mitigation.	(1 point) Lack of insight into the connection between the meteorology and the fire. Recommendations are generic and not relevant to this specific fire.	(0 points) No conclusions, recommendations or insights. Most presenters did not grasp the material or its significance.
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.	(0 points) Organization of presentation was disjointed. Little or no evidence of teamwork. Seems like they forgot to practice the presentation.
I. Answering Questions	(2 points) One or more members gives accurate, thorough, clear, concise answers to all questions, based on knowledge of the fire case and weather.	(1.5 points) One or more members gives an adequate answer to most questions.	(1 point) Roughly half of the audience questions are not answered well. Or insufficient time to answer all questions.	(0 points) No one in the group has reasonable answers to any of the questions. Or no time available to answer any questions.

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 (write any suggestions for improvement in the spaces below)	Exemplary Delivery	Proficient Delivery	Developing	Beginning
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. Some enthusiasm. Speaks with good variation in tone & inflection. Sometimes not loud enough.	Displays minimal eye contact with audience, while reading mostly from notes. Or speaks too softly with little or no inflection.	Holds no eye contact with the audience, as entire report is read from notes. Or 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 on the back of this page.