The Team Presentation Competition

The team presentation segment contains twice as many points as the individual testing stations. New this year, all teams must use a power point presentation no limit on slides but no animation or linking to videos allowed. No other props, costumes, or digital displays are allowed. All members of the team must verbally participate in the oral presentation. Your team will have ten minutes to present accompanied by three to five minutes of judges’ questions. Presentations may be conducted in an indoor setting. You may cite outside reference materials and sources. The score sheet and rubric to be used by the judges are attached.

The Scenario

Fish Lake is a 164-acre seepage lake located near Hancock in Waushara County, Wisconsin. It has no surface water inlets or outlets; surface runoff and groundwater contribute most of the water to the lake. In 2013 and 2014, lake study reports\(^1\)\(^2\) were completed on Fish Lake. Scientists at the University of Wisconsin – Stevens Point found that Fish Lake has concerns related to both water quality\(^3\) and water quantity\(^4\).

The lake has a Lake Management District in place. In 2015, a Lake Management Plan\(^5\) was developed for Fish Lake. The Fish Lake Management District has hired your team, a private environmental consulting firm, to help them further understand the current state of the water resources, both surface water and groundwater, in the Fish Lake watershed and the most effective actions that could be taken at the local level to protect and improve Fish Lake water quality and quantity. They have hired a separate team that will report back to them on the Fish Lake fishery and aquatic invasive species in Fish Lake, so your team need not focus on those.

---

Background Information from Lake Studies:

The lake study provided a detailed look at the watersheds and land use around Fish Lake\(^6\).

A citizen survey was conducted for Fish Lake. All respondents indicated that water quality affected their personal enjoyment and the economic value of the lake. Sixty percent of respondents believed water quality had deteriorated during their time visiting or living at the lake\(^7\).

Nutrients (phosphorus and nitrogen) are a water quality issue for Fish Lake\(^8\). Algae and aquatic plants use nutrients for growth. Phosphorus is present naturally throughout the watershed. Common sources from human activities include soil erosion, animal waste, fertilizers and septic systems. Total phosphorus concentrations in Fish Lake ranged from 30 ug/L in April 2011 to 8 ug/L in August 2012. Wisconsin’s phosphorus standard is 20 ug/L for deep seepage lakes such as Fish Lake.

Nitrogen enters lakes in runoff or groundwater from human-related sources such as fertilizer, septic systems, animal waste, and soil erosion. In Fish Lake, concentrations of inorganic nitrogen measured during the study were slightly elevated. Spring concentrations above 0.3 mg/L provide enough nutrients for summer algae blooms.

Fish Lake has experienced declining water levels in recent years\(^9\). In Waushara County, some seepage lakes have historically experienced fluctuations in water levels. Human withdrawals of groundwater can add to these natural fluctuations.
**Your Task**
The District’s questions include:

1) What actions at the local level in the next five years would be most effective at protecting or improving the water quality in Fish Lake?

2) What actions at the local level in the next five years would be most effective at minimizing human impacts on water level fluctuations in Fish Lake?

3) What tests or observations should the District use to evaluate the effectiveness of these actions?

4) How might the actions that you recommend affect the ecosystems of Fish Lake?

5) What stakeholders are affected by your management recommendations, and how may they implement or assist with the recommended actions?

6) How may various levels of governments (lake management districts, town, counties, state, or federal) assist, require, or help implement the recommended actions?

After considering these questions, prepare an 8-10-minute presentation that will help members of the Fish Lake Management District (the judges) understand the most effective actions to take in the next five years to protect or improve Fish Lake.

**Your Objective**
Choose one or more of the above actions and provide details on where, how, and by whom they should be implemented, and what benefit(s) you expect will occur. Identify the role that local governments may play in requiring stakeholders to act, and in providing those stakeholders with assistance.
**Additional resources located at:**

**Resources Specific to Fish Lake**


Fish Lake Water Quality Powerpoint Presentation: [https://www.co.waushara.wi.us/docview.aspx?docid=16826](https://www.co.waushara.wi.us/docview.aspx?docid=16826)


**General Lake Management Resources**


Wisconsin’s Nutrient Reduction Strategy – Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources [https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/surfacewater/nutrientstrategy.html](https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/surfacewater/nutrientstrategy.html)


**Envirothon Current Issue Resources**

[https://envirothon.org/the-competition/current-competition/](https://envirothon.org/the-competition/current-competition/)
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## Team Presentation Evaluation Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5=excellent</th>
<th>4=very good</th>
<th>3=good</th>
<th>2=adequate</th>
<th>1=inaadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application of Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of environmental and resource management challenge</td>
<td>The team clearly, concisely and thoroughly conveyed a solid understanding of all of the learning objectives outlined in the advisor handbook relevant to the environmental and resource management aspects of this scenario.</td>
<td>The team clearly, concisely conveyed a thorough understanding of all relevant learning objectives.</td>
<td>The team clearly, concisely and thoroughly conveyed a thorough understanding of most of the relevant learning objectives.</td>
<td>The team clearly, concisely and thoroughly conveyed only some of the relevant learning objectives.</td>
<td>The team’s presentation was missing many relevant learning objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of technical issues related to topic</td>
<td>The team clearly, concisely and thoroughly conveyed a solid understanding of the technical issues related to the problem. Benefits of solution presented for the farmer/producer and the natural resources were covered and well understood.</td>
<td>The team clearly, concisely and thoroughly conveyed an understanding of the issues related to the problem and an appropriate solution was provided.</td>
<td>The team clearly, concisely and thoroughly conveyed an understanding of the issues related to the problem and attempted to provide a solution.</td>
<td>The team clearly, concisely and thoroughly conveyed only some understanding of the issues related to the problem.</td>
<td>The team’s presentation lacked an understanding of the issues related to the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the planning process affecting stakeholders and relevant parties</td>
<td>The team clearly, concisely and thoroughly conveyed an understanding of the planning process, stakeholders and relevant political issues related to the problem. The team identified parties affected in the scenario and considered the concerns of all these parties.</td>
<td>The team clearly, concisely and thoroughly conveyed an understanding of the planning process, stakeholders and relevant political issues related to the problem. The team attempted to identify and consider the concerns of all relevant parties.</td>
<td>The team clearly, concisely and thoroughly conveyed an understanding of the planning process, stakeholders and relevant political issues related to the problem. The team identified and considered some of the concerns of relevant parties.</td>
<td>The team conveyed only a basic understanding of planning, stakeholders and relevant political issues related to the problem.</td>
<td>The team’s presentation did not convey an understanding of planning, stakeholders and relevant political issues related to the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion &amp; recommendation support, definition and conviction</td>
<td>Ideas, statements, predictions, conclusions and recommendations were clear and logical, supported by data, were convincing to the audience, and expected results were comprehensible.</td>
<td>Conclusions and recommendations were supported by data, clearly defined and were convincing to the audience.</td>
<td>Conclusions and recommendations were supported by data and clearly defined.</td>
<td>Conclusions and recommendations were supported by data.</td>
<td>No data was used or data was presented in an unclear fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to respond to questions</td>
<td>Audience questions after the presentation were answered logically and fully. The team demonstrated a collaborative effort to answer questions when possible.</td>
<td>Audience questions after the presentation were answered sufficiently, but not always fully, and the team attempted to use a collaborative effort to answer.</td>
<td>Audience questions after the presentation were answered sufficiently, but not always correctly, logically or fully, OR some team members tended to dominate the response.</td>
<td>Audience questions after presentation were answered, but not always correctly, logically or fully, OR some team members clearly dominated the response.</td>
<td>Audience questions after presentation were answered inadequately, OR some team members clearly dominated the response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Presentation</td>
<td>5=excellent</td>
<td>4=very good</td>
<td>3=good</td>
<td>2=adequate</td>
<td>1=ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>The team demonstrated an understanding of the level of complexity of the scenario and successfully reduced the complexity for the audience by structuring the presentation in a way that facilitated the audience’s understanding of concepts. Questions from panel resulted from a thought provoking presentation and did not result from a need to clarify components of the presentation.</td>
<td>The presentation was logically organized so that only a few minor clarifications were necessary after the presentation OR the audience comprehension could have been aided by slight reorganization.</td>
<td>Most of the presentation was logically organized, but some key clarifications were necessary after the presentation.</td>
<td>Only some of the presentation was logically organized, and so many key clarifications were necessary after the presentation.</td>
<td>The presentation was not logically organized and did not facilitate the audience’s comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant enhancement of presentation</td>
<td>The presentation mechanics allowed the team’s points to be very effectively conveyed because they satisfied these key criteria: the rate, flow and clarity of delivery by each speaker was appropriate; each speaker’s voice was loud enough to be heard by all judges; each speaker spoke to the audience in a narrative style, avoiding distracting mannerisms; transitions between speakers were smooth and helped audience follow the presentation.</td>
<td>The presentation mechanics satisfied all but one or two of the key criteria.</td>
<td>The presentation mechanics satisfied most of the key criteria.</td>
<td>The presentation mechanics satisfied only some of the key criteria.</td>
<td>The presentation mechanics satisfied very few of the key criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually</td>
<td>The PowerPoint slides accompanying the oral narrative were necessary and very effectively conveyed the research because they satisfied these criteria: 1. Content was relevant; 2. Overall appearance was pleasing to the eye but did not distract from the content; 3. Font and figure sizes were adequate; 4. Visuals were filled with just enough information to be informative without looking overcrowded; 5. Figures were clearly labeled, had titles.</td>
<td>The slides used satisfied all but one of the key criteria.</td>
<td>The slides used satisfied most of the key criteria.</td>
<td>The slides used satisfied only some of the key criteria.</td>
<td>The slides used were unnecessary or satisfied very few of the key criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Effective teamwork contributed to the success of the presentation because it met these criteria: 1. Each team member’s contribution to the presentation was equivalent; 2. Each team member contributed answers to questions asked after the presentation to the best of their ability; 3. Teammates were respectful of each speaker and did not interrupt them.</td>
<td>Teamwork was largely effective; 2 of the 3 criteria were fully met.</td>
<td>Teamwork was somewhat effective; 1 of the 3 criteria was fully met.</td>
<td>Teamwork was not effective because none of the three criteria was fully met.</td>
<td>No teamwork was evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of time</td>
<td>Team made effective use of time throughout the presentation. Presentation took 9-10 minutes.</td>
<td>The team made effective use of time during the presentation. Presentation took 8-10 minutes.</td>
<td>The team made effective use of time during the presentation. Presentation took less than 8 minutes or had to be stopped by the moderator at 10 minutes.</td>
<td>The team made fairly effective use of time during the presentation. Presentation took less than 7 minutes or had to be stopped by the moderator at 10 minutes.</td>
<td>The team did not make effective use of time during the presentation or overall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Team Name ___________________________  Start time  ________

End time  _________
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Team Presentation Evaluation Form

Judges — Please provide brief written evaluation to supplement your scoring.
(Scale for scoring: high score = outstanding; low score = poor)

PART 1 – APPLICATION OF DATA

1. Team demonstrated a solid understanding of the environmental and resource management challenge.  5  4  3  2  1

2. Team demonstrated a solid understanding of the technical issues related to the topic.  5  4  3  2  1

3. Team demonstrated a solid understanding of the planning process, affected stakeholders and relevant parties to the topic.  5  4  3  2  1

4. Conclusions drawn and recommendations given were supported by data and clearly defined and convincing to the audience.  5  4  3  2  1

5. Team responded to questions about the content of its presentation in an accurate, concise, and logical manner.  5  4  3  2  1

PART 2 – QUALITY OF PRESENTATION

1. Presentation was well organized. Main points were clearly stated and supported. Presentation included a clear introduction and strong conclusion.  5  4  3  2  1

2. Participants used appropriate volume, eye contact, gestures, voice inflection, and pace. Participants also avoided distracting mannerisms and exhibited originality and professionalism during the presentation and question period.  5  4  3  2  1

3. Team made a good use of PowerPoint slides to present information in support of the presentation. PowerPoint slides met standards and were appealing, concise, and appropriate to support the presentation.  5  4  3  2  1

PART 3 – TIMING AND PARTICIPATION

1. All team members participated orally in the presentation with smooth transitions. (Each team member gets 1 point for equal participation).  5  4  3  2  1

2. Team made effective use of the allotted time.  5  4  3  2  1

JUDGE’S COMMENTS: ____________________________________________________________

________________________

FINAL SCORE: ___________________ out of 50 points.  JUDGE’S NUMBER (1-4): ________
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