

Self Evaluation Template

Please complete your final project self-evaluation with the following template. The [self-evaluation guidelines](#) provides benchmarks to help you complete this self-evaluation. This template is also available as a blank PDF or as a blank Word document on the course Moodle page.

Component 1: The final project (15 points total)

- **Scientific accuracy and specificity of the message conveyed**

- Grade out of 4 points: _____
- Justification:

- **Effort and creative process**

- Grade out of 4 points: _____
- Justification:

- **Aesthetic quality**

- Grade out of 4 points: _____
- Justification:

- **Professionalism and engagement**

- Grade out of 3 points: _____
- Justification:

Component 2: Participation at the Project Fair (5 points total)

- **Sharing your project with other students**

- Grade out of 2.5 points: _____
- Justification:

- **Engagement with other students' projects**

- Grade out of 2.5 points: _____
- Justification:

Component 3: Project description and reflection essay (15 points total)

- **Quality of research, information, and message**

- Grade out of 6 points: _____
- Justification:

- **Creative process**

- Grade out of 3 points: _____
- Justification:

- **Self-reflection on the semester project experience**

- Grade out of 3 points: _____
- Justification:

- **Quality of writing**

- Grade out of 6 points: _____
- Justification:

Self evaluation guidelines

Component 1: The final project (15 points total)

Scientific accuracy and specificity of the message conveyed

This section is to be graded out of 4 points.

- A score of 4 indicates that your project conveys scientifically accurate information about the focal ecological community, and that the message you are conveying is supported by the scientific literature. There are specific aspects of the system you have learned that are represented in the project.
- A score of 3 indicates that your project conveys generally correct information, but that the message can't be traced back specifically to the scientific literature (e.g. instead it comes from general purpose web-resources, documentaries, etc., where it has already been 'translated' once).
- A score of 2 indicates that your project conveys generally correct information about your focal ecological community, but the information is vague (e.g. just a general impression of ecological degradation, but hard to point to specifics).
- A score of 1 indicates that your project conveys incomplete or misleading information about your focal community, and the information is largely based on material from unreliable sources.

Effort and creative process

This section is to be graded out of 4 points.

- A score of 4 indicates that your project pushed you to explore new media (or new techniques in media that you were previously familiar with), and that you invested considerable time and energy learning or refining new skills to pull it together.
- A score of 3 indicates that you learned a few new things and pushed your creative horizons to develop this project, but that you did not hold yourself to learn the skills to a high standard.
- A score of 2 indicates that you largely applied previous skills to develop your project, but learned a few things at the margins.
- A score of 1 indicates that you did not push your creative horizons as part of this project, and that your project submission had the feel of a rough draft that you did not spend time on refining.

Aesthetic quality

This section is to be graded out of 4 points.

- A score of 4 indicates that you feel your project *should* be publicly displayed (e.g. aired on a podcast feed, hung up in a gallery, included in a poetry collection, etc.) because it conveys an important message and is likely to grab the attention of a wide audience
- A score of 3 indicates that you feel your project *could* be displayed publicly because it conveys an important message, but needs some more work before it is likely to grab the attention of a wide audience
- A score of 2 indicates that you feel your project is a long way away from being displayed publicly to a wide audience

- A score of 1 indicates that you feel that even with substantial effort, your work is unlikely to be fit for public display.

Professionalism and engagement

This section is to be graded out of 3 points.

- A score of 3 indicates that you treated this Semester Project as you would a professional project, by sticking to the stated deadlines, completing all requirements, asking clarifying questions as needed, requesting accommodations (e.g. deadline extensions) when the need arose, and engaging with feedback.
 - A score of 2 indicates that you were largely professional with the semester project, but were sloppy with some of the requirements, deadlines, etc.
 - A score of 1 indicates that you were unprofessional with aspects of the semester project.
-

Component 2: Participation at the Project Fair

Note: If you have a scheduling conflict that keeps you from attending the Project Fair, please email Gaurav before Nov. 30th to arrange for accommodations.

Sharing your project with other students

This section is to be graded out of 2.5 points.

- A score of 2.5 means that you were present at the Project Fair and engaged with classmates to get them excited about your work

Engagement with other students' projects

This section is to be graded out of 2.5 points.

- A score of 2.5 means that you were present at the Project Fair and engaged with your classmates to learn about their focal ecological communities and creative process.
-

Component 3: Project description and reflection essay (15 points total)

Quality of research, information, and message

This section is to be graded out of 6 points.

- A score of 6 indicates that the Ecological/Environmental description of the focal community provides meaningful and accurate information that is well-cited, including at least 5 sources from the primary literature.
- A score of 4 indicates that the Ecological/Environmental description of the focal community largely provides useful information, but misses out on important biotic or abiotic factors. Or, the information is largely accurate but vague and sourced primarily from secondary sources.
- A score of 2 indicates that the Ecological/Environmental description of the focal community provides insufficient information and does not give adequate context for the final project. Or, the information in this section is misleading or inaccurate.

Creative process

This section is to be graded out of 3 points.

- A score of 3 indicates that the Accompanying Essay (*i*) thoroughly explains how you approached the challenge of synthesizing scientific information into your final project (e.g. how did you go from reading a paper about a particular predator-prey interaction, to writing about it in a poem?); and (*ii*) explains some of the lessons learned from this creative exercise.
- A score of 2 indicates that the Accompanying Essay partially addresses the process of synthesizing scientific information into a creative project, and/or does not present any reflection about the creative medium chosen for this project.
- A score of 1 indicates that the Accompanying Essay does not provide any meaningful insight into converting information about the scientific literature into a creative medium, and provides no reflection on the medium as a whole.

Self-reflection on the semester project experience

This section is to be graded out of 3 points.

- A score of 3 indicates that the Self Reflective portion of the essay thoroughly addresses the questions listed in Part 4 of the essay guidelines (some reflection on what you learned about through the project, reflection on what you can take away from this project to your future lives, and reflections on the UnEssay format generally). *Remember that for a self-reflection to be meaningful, it should represent more than just the first thoughts that entered your mind about the central question.*
- A score of 2 indicates that the Self Reflective portion of the essay addresses some of the questions listed in Part 4 of the essay guidelines (some reflection on what you learned about through the project, reflection on what you can take away from this project to your future lives, and reflections on the UnEssay format generally), or addresses each of the questions but only at a surface-level
- A score of 1 indicates that there is no meaningful self-reflection on the questions raised in this topic.

Quality of writing

This section is to be graded out of 3 points.

- A score of 3 indicates that the writing in your Accompanying Essay is clear, concise, well-cited, and edited.
- A score of 2 indicates that the writing in your Accompanying Essay largely has a coherent structure, but some sentences are sloppy (e.g. run-ons, fragments, other issues that complicate comprehension) or repetitive.
- A score of 1 indicates that the writing is of poor quality, akin to submitting a first-draft without revisions.