WILD WISE: COEXISTING WITH CARNIVORES
SHARING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Presentation Rubric 2017-2018

Date: *Interviewer:*   *School/Teacher:*   *Period:*

Investigative Question:

Points	2 - Meets Expectations	1 - Approaching Expectations	0 - Below Expectations	Total
Question				
• What question were you trying to answer with your investigation? • What observations (from your community mapping or adult interview) did you use to design your question? • What were your manipulated and responding variables?	❐ Clearly state an investigative question related to **both** natural or human-made landscape features **and** carnivores. ❐ Link community observations with investigative question. ❐ Presenter explicitly defines manipulated & responding variables.	❐ State an investigative question, related to **either** carnivores **or** to natural or human-made landscape features. ❐ Link general observations with investigative question. ❐ Manipulated and responding variables can be inferred, but are not explicitly defined by presenter.	❐ State an investigative question related **neither** to carnivores **nor** to natural or human-made landscape features, **OR** did not state an investigative question. ❐ Did not link any observations with investigative question. ❐ Presented question does not have a manipulated and/or responding variable.	
Methods				
• What methods did you use for your investigation? • Why did you choose the methods you did? • Why did you choose not to use other methods?	❐ Explain why research method(s) was selected **and** other method(s) that they considered but chose not to use. ❐ Describe your research method(s) in enough detail that the methods can be replicated.	❐ Explain **either** why research method(s) was selected **or** other method(s) that they considered but chose not to use. ❐ Describe research method(s) in broad categories with few details.	❐ Did not explain why research method(s) was selected **or** other method(s) that they considered but chose not to use. ❐ Did not describe method(s).	

Points	2 - Meets Expectations	1 - Approaching Expectations	0 - Below Expectations	Total
Data				
• What were your results? • What did you find? • What kinds of things (variables) affected your data? • Would your results be different if you did your investigation on another day or a different time of year? How?	❐ Data summarized and shared in a logical way. ❐ Data presented in an appropriate visualization (e.g. chart or graph). ❐ Identify at least two variables that could affect their investigation (confounding factors).	❐ Raw data presented but not summarized. ❐ Data presented in an unclear or inappropriate visualization. ❐ Identify one variable that affected or could affect their investigation.	❐ Data not presented. ❐ Data not presented in a visualization. ❐ Did not identify confounding factors.	
Conclusion				
• Does your conclusion answer your investigative question? • What investigation data did you use to develop your claim? • How does your evidence support your claim?	❐ **Claim**: Conclusion statement presented that addresses the investigative question. ❐ **Evidence:** Support claim by directly citing their investigation data. ❐ **Reasoning:** Presents a logical explanation for *how* their evidence supports their claim.	❐ **Claim**: Conclusion statement presented, but it does not address the investigative question. ❐ **Evidence:** Support claim using outside evidence and/or prior knowledge **only** (not their investigation data). ❐ **Reasoning:** Presents a vague or unclear explanation for *how* their evidence supports their claim.	❐ **Claim:** No conclusion statement presented. ❐ **Evidence:** No evidence cited. ❐ **Reasoning:** Does not present an explanation for *how* their evidence supports their claim.	
Recommendation				
• Why do you think your recommendation will work? • Why does it make sense based on what you learned? • What evidence would you use to support your recommendation?	❐ Share an actionable recommendation for coexisting with carnivores that can be completed by community members. ❐ Provides a clear explanation connecting their investigation and conclusion to their recommendation.	❐ Share a recommendation that cannot be completed by members of their community. ❐ Provides an explanation for their recommendation, but their recommendation does not connect to their investigation and conclusion.	❐ Did not share a recommendation for coexisting with carnivores. ❐ Does not provide any explanation for their recommendation.	
Further Questions and/or Insights				
• If you were to do this again, would you do anything differently? If so, what and why? • What other questions does your investigation raise?	❐ Explain what change(s) they would make to their investigation method(s) and why. ❐ Share questions inspired by their completed investigation.	❐ Explain what change(s) they would make to their investigation, **but not** why. ❐ Share other questions they want to investigate, but not related to their project.	❐ Do not explain any changes they would make. ❐ Do not share further questions.	
Total Points	**Final Score Key: [0-17] Below Expectations [18-26] Approaching Expectations [27-30] Meets Expecations**			