

## 2018 Connecticut Envirothon Oral Presentation Scoring Form Grassland Management

Judge ID	Session #	Team #	Score
<b>Part One</b>	<b>Introduction (5 points)</b>		<b>Circle score</b>
<b>1</b>	The team commented briefly on the <b>purpose of their presentation</b> and their land use management plans.		<b>1 2 3 4 5</b>
<b>Part One Subtotal :</b>			
<b>Part Two</b>	<b>Presentation (68 points)</b>		
<b>2</b>	Accurately described the <b>range</b> (geographic distribution) and <b>habitat needs</b> of bobolink and described the <b>threats</b> that have put the bobolink at risk.		<b>2 4 6 8</b>
<b>3</b>	Described how <b>grazing and hay production affect bobolink</b> and other grassland birds and described <b>management practices</b> that would help support bobolink.		<b>2 4 6 8 10</b>
<b>4</b>	Described the <b>current habitat conditions</b> of Horsebarn Hill, gave an <b>assessment of the suitability</b> for bobolink and identified bobolink <b>nesting areas</b>		<b>2 4 6 8</b>
<b>5</b>	Identified the <b>goals of the farm</b> and presented and <b>justified a plan</b> for allowing bobolink to fledge while allowing the farm to achieve its goals		<b>2 4 6 8 10</b>
<b>6</b>	Included a <b>plan to encourage recreational users</b> to use Horsebarn Hill in a manner that <b>protects agricultural and natural resources</b> .		<b>2 4 6 8</b>
<b>7</b>	Identified how <b>management</b> of pastures and hayfields affects <b>water quality and soil health</b> .		<b>2 4 6 8</b>
<b>8</b>	Described the <b>differences</b> between <b>ownership, goals, habitat and farming practices</b> of Horsebarn Hill, Topsmead State Forest and Pomfret Audubon.		<b>2 4 6 8</b>
<b>9</b>	Identified <b>organizations that provide assistance</b> to agricultural landowners to help conserve wildlife, and <b>suggested actions</b> that ordinary citizens can take to help protect threatened and endangered wildlife		<b>2 4 6 8</b>
<b>Part Two Subtotal:</b>			

<b>Part Three</b>		<b>Quality of the Presentation (15 points)</b>		<b>Circle score</b>				
<b>10</b>	Visual Aids used to enhance the presentation were clear, readable, attractive, effective and readable: <b>titles</b> were at least <b>2 inches</b> high <b>subtitles</b> were at least <b>0.5 inches</b> high <b>content</b> was at least <b>0.25 inches</b> high.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>		
<b>11</b>	Presentation was <b>well organized</b> with a <b>clear introduction</b> and a <b>strong conclusion</b> .	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>		
<b>12</b>	Presentation was enhanced by effective public speaking skills: professionalism, eye contact, gestures, voice inflection and originality.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>		
<b>Part Three Subtotal :</b>								
<b>Part Four</b>		<b>Required Elements (12 points)</b>						
<b>13</b>	Add up to five points for team member participation in presentation (Team members get one point each for significant oral participation.)	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>		
<b>14</b>	Add two points if the presentation was completed in the 9 to 11 minutes allotted. 0 points if outside of time allotted.	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>					
<b>15</b>	Question and Answer Portion: Answers were clear, logical and concise with all team members participating.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>		
<b>Part Four Subtotal :</b>								
<b>Part One Score</b>		<b>(5 possible points)</b>						
<b>Part Two Score</b>		<b>(68 possible points)</b>						
<b>Part Three Score</b>		<b>(15 possible points)</b>						
<b>Part Four Score</b>		<b>(12 possible points)</b>						
<b>TOTAL SCORE out of possible 100 points</b>								