

TEAM \_\_\_\_\_

**2023-2024 FORESTRY CHALLENGE CHAMPIONSHIP  
 JUDGE'S SCORE SHEET FOR FOCUS TOPIC PRESENTATION**

Part 1 – Application of data (105 points)					
The team demonstrated a solid understanding of:					
• location, size, and purpose of the Stanislaus Landscape Project (SLP)	1 None	2 Minimal	3 Adequate	4 Good	5 Impressive
• definition of a fuelbreak and the use of fuelbreaks in the SLP	1 None	2 Minimal	3 Adequate	4 Good	5 Impressive
• the importance of coordination between multiple ownerships when creating fuelbreaks	1 None	2 Minimal	3 Adequate	4 Good	5 Impressive
• why it is important to maintain fuelbreaks	1 None	2 Minimal	3 Adequate	4 Good	5 Impressive
The team explained the options for fuelbreak maintenance and the pros and cons of each	3 None	6 Minimal	9 Adequate	12 Good	15 Impressive
The team discussed treatments seen during the fieldtrip	2 None	4 Minimal	6 Adequate	8 Good	10 Impressive
The team described landscape and ecological features to consider when choosing maintenance options	2 None	4 Minimal	6 Adequate	8 Good	10 Impressive
The team presented and explained a flowchart to guide decision making for fuelbreak maintenance and why it is organized the way it is	3 None	6 Minimal	9 Adequate	12 Good	15 Impressive
The team applied their flowchart to the fuelbreak in need of maintenance they visited during the fieldtrip	2 None	4 Minimal	6 Adequate	8 Good	10 Impressive
The team had good comprehension of the focus topic and interpretation of key concepts and data	3 None	6 Minimal	9 Adequate	12 Good	15 Impressive
The information piece(s) were based on interviews, observations, & data the team collected, with specific reference sources cited	2 “Don’t know who we talked to”	4 “A forester...”	6 1-2 sources: “John something...”	8 2+ sources: “John Nicoles”	10 2+ sources: Including people and references

TEAM \_\_\_\_\_

**2023-2024 FORESTRY CHALLENGE CHAMPIONSHIP  
JUDGE'S SCORE SHEET FOR FOCUS TOPIC PRESENTATION**

<b>Part 2 – Quality of the presentation (35 points)</b>					
Participants introduced themselves and made eye contact during the entire presentation	1 No introductions	2 Introductions, no eye contact (i.e., reading from slides, not looking at/toward judges)	3 Intros, little eye contact, read from cue cards	4 Introductions, eye contact often, read from cue cards	5 Introductions, eye contact throughout presentation, referenced cue cards
The presentation was well organized, with a clear introduction and a strong conclusion	2 None/Neither	4 Difficult to follow	6 Organized, but lacking intro and conclusion	8 Organized, good intro and conclusion	10 Very clear, easy to understand, followed outline
The PowerPoint presentation visually pleasing	1 Unorganized, small font, few to no graphics	2 Lacking effort in design and/or organization	3 Design could be better	4 Nice design, easy to read	5 Well designed. Very visually pleasing
Judges' questions were answered logically & concisely	3 Could not answer any of judge's questions	6 Incomplete answers	9 Generally answered questions	12 Answered questions thoughtfully and completely	15 Answered all questions clearly and knowledgeably
<b>Part 3 – Required Elements (10 points)</b>					
All team members participated relatively equally in giving the presentation	1 Only one team member participated	2 Mostly one team member participated	3 Most team members participated, unequally	4 Most team members participated equally	5 All team members participated equally
The team made effective use of their time	1 Under 15 minutes - mediocre	2 Under 15 minutes - adequate	3 Under 15 minutes - good	4 15-20 minutes - good	5 15-20 minutes - impressive

Total \_\_\_\_\_