Rubric for Modeling Essay Questions

Question 1: Explain why you chose each component depicted. Describe the relationships among all your components. What ecological process or processes does your model best depict?

| Content Understanding Goal: Ecological diversity | |
|--|--|
| Level | Examples |
| 0: Not score-able; no response. | "I don't know." |
| 1 point: Poorly applies diversity, very | Interactions between biotic and abiotic |
| general | factors |
| 2 points: Minimally applies one diversity | The insect diversity in the meadow is |
| concepts | greater because of more moisture. |
| 3 points: Adequately applies diversity | Meadows tend to have greater diversity of |
| concepts to research project | primary producers due to increased |
| | sunlight than forested site |
| 4 points: Shows mastery of diversity | The presence of large woody debris may |
| concepts, appropriately applies several | have more significantly impacted arthropod |
| concepts to research project | diversity than the absence of a canopy. |

Question 2: Develop hypothesis, (or re-write hypothesis) using components in model. Describe how hypothesis (or secondary hypothesis) will be tested.

| Learning Goal: Understand how to develop a testable hypothesis | |
|--|--|
| Level | Examples |
| 0: Not score-able; no response. | "I don't know." |
| 1 point: Poor | The clear cut will better handle disturbance |
| | because it has greater diversity. |
| 2: Minimal, needs restructuring. | What is the diversity in the meadow v.s. a |
| | forest? |
| 3: Adequately forms a testable hypothesis. | How does log decomposition effect |
| | arthropod diversity? |
| 4: Shows mastery in forming a clear, | Species richness in fungivore arthropods |
| testable hypothesis and describe method of | will be greater in the forest opening than |
| testing hypothesis. | the forest. Measure species richness of |
| | fungivore arthropods captured in forest |
| | opening and in the forest at the same time, |
| | same experimental design. |

Question 3: Choose I biotic component. List or describe as many subcomponents within that. Explain if redundancy might apply or not.

| Learning Goal: Understand Ecological hierarchy and redundancy | |
|---|---|
| Score | Examples |
| 0: Not score-able; no response. | "I don't know." |
| 1: Poorly applies understanding of | Although the species might not be the |
| subcomponents | same, there were approximately the same |

| | number of species |
|---|---|
| 2: Minimally applies understanding of subcomponents, no mention about redundancy | The guild with the largest biomass was predaceous arthropods. |
| 3: Adequately applies subcomponents, some misconceptions about redundancy | Herbivore species richness was higher in the meadow, with large populations of different any species. |
| 4: Shows mastery of understanding subcomponents and redundancy | The forested site had a g a number of predators unique to the forest, including two types of harvestmenproviding resiliency to allow it to function as a system in a disturbance. |

Question 4: Discuss and illustrate feedback. Choose one component in your system and describe one change over short-term period. Describe any indirect effects you could expect. How could the patterns appear differently over longer time scales?

Learning Goal: Understanding complexity in Ecosystems, show Feedback and trace through possible indirect effects

| Score | Examples |
|---|---|
| 0: not score-able; no response. | "I don't know." |
| 1: Poor understanding of feedback and | One example of feedback is the vegetation |
| indirect effects, | in the meadow. |
| 2: Shows minimal understanding of and | A change in arthropods would ricochet up |
| application of feedback, minimal ability to | the food web and the entire ecosystem. |
| describe indirect effects, | |
| 3: Shows good understanding of and | Ecosystems function through varied array |
| application of feedback, but less proficient | of relationships that are usually nonlinear |
| describing indirect effects. Only describes | and include many complex feedback |
| one plausible pattern of change (short term) | loops |
| 4: Expertly understands and applies both | Feedback loops may have negative impacts |
| feedback and indirect effects (4 points). | (competition) placing limits on growth of |
| Describes plausible patterns of changes | herbivoresit may accelerate the rate of |
| over short and long time spans (4 points) | growth of plants over the short term, but |
| | due to feedback, not in the long term. |

Question 5: Add specific disturbance, show how effects are propagated through system. Predict consequences of disturbance, describe experiment to test your prediction.

| Learning goal: Ability to make accurate predictions, design a secondary experiment. | |
|---|--|
| Score | Examples |
| 0: Not score-able; no response. | "I don't know." |
| 1: Poor effects, no predictions, no | The meadow could handle the effects of a |
| experiment | drought better than the forest because the |
| | forest would become more susceptible to |

| | disease. |
|--|---|
| 2:. Minimally shows effects, poor | Fire could change the soil respiration. You |
| predictions, poor experiment | could collect data in a patch before and |
| | after a fire |
| 3: Adequately shows how effects are | After a hot "crown: fire, fungal and |
| propagated through system, makes modest | bacterial elements of soil will have been |
| predictions, designs ok experiment to test | eliminated, and the forest will take a longer |
| this. | time to recover its intricate relationships |
| | than the meadowpost-fire experiments |
| | could quantify the loss of soil microbes |
| 4: Expertly shows how effects are | A fire would immediately increase light |
| propagated through the ecosystem, makes | reaching the ground, and burning would |
| plausible predictions, designs plausible | release nutrients, stimulating herbaceous |
| experiment to test this. | growthshort term, plants are not |
| | dependent upon symbiants, may no longer |
| | feed the microbesburn a test plot and |
| | take measurements over time |

Question 6: How do you think complex ecosystems function? Explain yourreasoning, the better able it might be to withstandLearning Goal: Understand ecological complexity

| Learning Goal: Understand ecological complexity | |
|---|---|
| Level | Examples |
| 0: Not score-able; no response. | "I don't know." |
| 1: Poor response | Complex systems are interdependent and, |
| | like lasagna, you can't tell the function of |
| | one part by just observing the final product. |
| 2: Makes some errors in discussing aspects | Complex ecosystems move in and out of |
| of complexity | balance |
| 3: Adequately discusses several aspects of | Patch level dynamics may play a |
| complexity | significant role in succession at local |
| | sites what happens over time in each |
| | patch may not conform to typical |
| | successional trajectories |
| 4: Expertly describes the causal | The greater the order of complexity, the |
| mechanisms of systems, i.e., feedback, | better able it will be to withstand |
| direct and indirect and multiple effects, | degradationfungi providing nutrients to |
| pattern over different time and space | vegetation provides positive feedback |
| scales, subcomponents, | loopmultiple levels of relationships |
| | might provide compensatory pathways to |
| | overcome the loss of other species over |
| | time |