

## 2010 Utah Envirothon Oral Component Scoring Sheet

Team Letter \_\_\_\_\_ Room Number \_\_\_\_\_ Judges Initials \_\_\_\_\_

160 pts possible	Content	20 points	10 points	5 points
	Impacts	The team understands and explains several (3+) possible reasons for declining water quality, declining water table, and how to improve or recharge these.	The team understands and explains less than 3 possible reasons for declining water quality, declining water table, and how to improve or recharge these. Or the team identifies more than 3 reasons, but cannot explain them.	The team can identify 1-3 reasons for declining water quality. However, the team does not understand and cannot explain any possible reasons for declining water quality, declining water table, and how to improve or recharge these.
	Impacts	Team gives 3+ examples as to how they would collect data or run tests to determine the causes (i.e. water samples, soil surveys, plant and animal surveys).	Team gives 1-3 examples as to how they would collect data or run tests to determine the causes (i.e. water samples, soil surveys, plant and animal surveys).	When prompted, the team can provide an example as to how they would collect data or run tests to determine the causes (i.e. water samples, soil surveys, plant and animal surveys).
	Values	The team demonstrates a strong understanding of the interactions of reservoirs, aquifers, springs, rivers, and human uses in a watershed (i.e. knowledge of the hydrology from reservoir to the river below the town; knowledge of how each human use would impact each of these aquatic environments; they can explain how the use of one water source can affect another water source).	The team demonstrates a moderate understanding of the interactions of these systems. The team can explain one or two interactions of the example aquatic system, but not the entire situation. The team identifies 1-3 impacts to the system and can explain how the use impacts an aquatic environment.	The team demonstrates a weak understanding of the interactions of reservoirs, aquifers, springs, rivers, and human uses in a watershed. The team can identify 1-3 impacts to the system but cannot explain how the use impacts an aquatic environment. The team cannot explain the interactions of uses among water sources.
	Needs	The management plan adequately addresses needs of many (5+) different user groups (i.e. consumptive vs. nonconsumptive groups, farming, hunting, recreation, wildlife and fisheries species, watershed management, city planning and management).	The management plan addresses needs of a few (2-4) different user groups.	The management plan addresses needs of <2 user groups .
	Needs	The management plan demonstrates a strong knowledge of the key players in determining water use and management (i.e. city planners, hydrologists, USFWS, agriculture, recreation groups, USFS, etc.).	The management plan identifies 1-3 key players and can explain their role in water and aquatic environmental quality. Or the management plan identifies 3+ key players but fails to explain all of their roles in water and aquatic environmental quality.	The management plan identifies 1-3 key players but does not explain their role in water and aquatic environmental quality.
	Management Plan	Management plan has a high potential for success and is very realistic. It has a clear introduction and a strong conclusion.	Management plan has a moderate potential for success with mostly realistic elements.	Management plan has a low level of success and/or is unrealistic.
	Interaction	Team demonstrates strong understanding of the interactions between human uses of water, habitat health, wildlife and fisheries needs, and watershed health.	Team explains a few interactions between human uses of water, habitat health, wildlife and fisheries needs, and watershed health.	When prompted the team can explain a few interactions between human uses of water, habitat health, wildlife and fisheries needs, and watershed health.
	Reasoning	The team clearly explained and justified all of their recommendations to allow/prohibit all management actions proposed in management plan.	The team explained and justified most of their recommendations to allow/prohibit all management actions proposed in management plan.	The team did not clearly explain and/or justify their recommendations in their management plan.

40 pts possible		Presentation		10 points	5 points	1 point
	Style/ Creativity	Team comfortably used (5) style characteristics to enhance the presentation (i.e. voice inflection, enthusiasm, eye contact, gestures, postures, fluency, humor, analogies, props, elaboration, etc.).		Team comfortably used (2-3) style characteristics consistently to enhance the presentation.		Team did not use style characteristics consistently or effectively.
	Visual Aids	Visual aids were used to make major points and show conclusions. They were correct, eye appealing, readable, neat, etc.		Team demonstrated creativity in (2) ways.		Presentation generally lacked a creative approach.
	Participation	All (5) team members participated in the presentation equally and answered questions fully and factually.		Most (3-4) team members participated in the presentation and/or questions were answered adequately.		Team presentation was dominated by 1 or 2 individuals and/or questions were not answered completely.
	Time	Team completed presentation in 12 minutes		Team completed presentation in 8-11 minutes or over 13 minutes.		Team completed presentation in under 8 minutes.
_____ TOTAL		Judges Comments:				