SCORING: 5.0 Exceptional; 4.0 Proficient; 3.0 Average; 2.0 Substandard; 1.0 Fail *(Average score of above 3.0 is required in all categories to pass).* Asterisks indicate that N/A is an option. N/A on the form = '---'.

Candidate Name: Christopher Reece

Program Dates:

Active Date: 03/24/2024

Routine Date: 04/05/2024

Call Letters: KSTP - 5 Eyewitness News

City & State: Apple Valley , Minnesota

GRAPHICAL CONTENT: Grade only on the visual presentation and clarity of graphics. (Select N/A if restriction/limitation - N/A on the form = '---')

---

*Current conditions maps and/or panels (temperature, wind, pressure, humidity, dew point, etc.)	5
*Average temperatures, precipitation data, any records, historical weather data for forecasting site, any information that relates the current weather to historical records or climate normals (this does not need to be a traditional almanac graphic)	4
*Forecast panels and/or extended forecast	5
*Watch, warning or advisory maps—if no WWA are in effect, include active weather headlines (i.e. impact-based graphic such as a map or SPC outlook with hazards and timing listed)	5
*Regional/national satellite, radar, or combination satellite/radar maps (Is it clear what product and what time is being displayed?)	5
*Local radar maps (Is it clear what is depicted and what time is being displayed?)	5
*Maps showing fronts, high, low, etc. (on a surface map or futurecast, for example)	5
*Explanatory graphics (climate change, radiational cooling, boating, etc.)	5
*Video or live cameras shown during weathercast	5

Total Graphical Score

4.89

Comments:

Phenomenal job Chris! You work with your restrictions very well by explaining each color on your map and providing context.
Loved you Snow total map with the zooms and the shoveling tips and tricks. What a great way to make the forecast accessible and relatable.
Good job weaving in climate info with your restrictions by explaining the snow to date.

EXPLANATION: Grade on the overall explanation to the local weather. (Select N/A if restriction/limitation - N/A on the form = '---')

*Is radar information explained (what is happening and why)?	5
Is the risk of hazardous weather, or lack thereof, clearly explained?	5
Are watches, warnings, advisories, or active weather headlines given appropriate emphasis?	5
Are any regional differences adequately explained (city/suburbs, coastal/inland, valley/mountain, etc.)?	5
Is the content appropriate for the day chosen, including the amount of content? Is there too much/little?	5
Is the information meteorologically and/or scientifically correct?	5
Do the graphics and explanations lead to the evolution of the upcoming weather?	5
Is the viewer left with a clear understanding of everything in the forecast, including comparisons to climo?	5
Does the presentation help to teach atmospheric processes without being overly scientific?	5
Given the accompanying almanac information and pattern, did you find this to be a good forecast?	5

Total Explanation Score

5.00

Comments:

Great work, keep shining!!!
Awesome job explaining smog, spot on and simple. Way to make a quiet weather day interesting and teaching the viewer something.

PRESENTATION

Does the applicant demonstrate confidence in the information conveyed?	5
Does the applicant appear relaxed and conversational in front of graphics and during anchor cross talk?	4
Does the applicant present graphics well on and/or off camera?	5
Does the applicant speak at an understandable pace, using proper grammar, inflection and diction?	5
Does the applicant portray a professional appearance?	5

Total Presentation Score

4.80

Comments:

I know for your active day there wasn't time for cross talk, and with the quiet weather day it was clear your anchor was given a note for the toss. I'd love to get some natural conversation in there, you are an excellent communicator and this is one of the best submissions I have seen. So Just try and work some personality in with your anchor and you'll be 150% versus 145%!!! Seriously can't wait to see your career grow!

Grader Signature

I certify that I am aware of no conflict of interest between myself and the applicant I have evaluated:

Board Review for: [redacted]

Completed - Jun 7 2024
Score: 100% (120/120)

CBM Review

SCORING: 5.0 Exceptional; 4.0 Proficient; 3.0 Average; 2.0 Substandard; 1.0 Fail *(Average score of above 3.0 is required in all categories to pass).* Asterisks indicate that N/A is an option. N/A on the form = '---'.

Candidate Name: Christopher Reece

Program Dates:

Active Date: 03/24/2024

Routine Date: 04/05/2024

Call Letters: KSTP - 5 Eyewitness News

City & State: Apple Valley , Minnesota

GRAPHICAL CONTENT: Grade only on the visual presentation and clarity of graphics. (Select N/A if restriction/limitation - N/A on the form = '---')

---

*Current conditions maps and/or panels (temperature, wind, pressure, humidity, dew point, etc.)	5
*Average temperatures, precipitation data, any records, historical weather data for forecasting site, any information that relates the current weather to historical records or climate normals (this does not need to be a traditional almanac graphic)	5
*Forecast panels and/or extended forecast	5
*Watch, warning or advisory maps—if no WWA are in effect, include active weather headlines (i.e. impact-based graphic such as a map or SPC outlook with hazards and timing listed)	5
*Regional/national satellite, radar, or combination satellite/radar maps (Is it clear what product and what time is being displayed?)	5
*Local radar maps (Is it clear what is depicted and what time is being displayed?)	5
*Maps showing fronts, high, low, etc. (on a surface map or futurecast, for example)	5
*Explanatory graphics (climate change, radiational cooling, boating, etc.)	5
*Video or live cameras shown during weathercast	5

Total Graphical Score

5.00

Comments:

Just great, I really love his work. Nicely done!

EXPLANATION: Grade on the overall explanation to the local weather. (Select N/A if restriction/limitation - N/A on the form = '---')

*Is radar information explained (what is happening and why)?	5
Is the risk of hazardous weather, or lack thereof, clearly explained?	5
Are watches, warnings, advisories, or active weather headlines given appropriate emphasis?	5
Are any regional differences adequately explained (city/suburbs, coastal/inland, valley/mountain, etc.)?	5
Is the content appropriate for the day chosen, including the amount of content? Is there too much/little?	5
Is the information meteorologically and/or scientifically correct?	5
Do the graphics and explanations lead to the evolution of the upcoming weather?	5
Is the viewer left with a clear understanding of everything in the forecast, including comparisons to climo?	5
Does the presentation help to teach atmospheric processes without being overly scientific?	5
Given the accompanying almanac information and pattern, did you find this to be a good forecast?	5

Total Explanation Score

5.00

Comments:

Fantastic, I really like his choice of maps. He shows the Water Vapor imagery and does a great job explaining why he is showing it and what it means to the viewer. Great work.

PRESENTATION

Does the applicant demonstrate confidence in the information conveyed?	5
Does the applicant appear relaxed and conversational in front of graphics and during anchor cross talk?	5
Does the applicant present graphics well on and/or off camera?	5
Does the applicant speak at an understandable pace, using proper grammar, inflection and diction?	5
Does the applicant portray a professional appearance?	5

Total Presentation Score

5.00

Comments:

Looks great and sounds great. Chris is a pro! Great work

Grader Signature

I certify that I am aware of no conflict of interest between myself and the applicant I have evaluated:

Board Review for: [redacted]

Completed - May 16 2024
Score: 73% (88/120)

CBM Review

SCORING: 5.0 Exceptional; 4.0 Proficient; 3.0 Average; 2.0 Substandard; 1.0 Fail *(Average score of above 3.0 is required in all categories to pass).* Asterisks indicate that N/A is an option. N/A on the form = '---'.

Candidate Name: Christopher Reece

Program Dates:

Active Date: 03/24/2024

Routine Date: 04/05/2024

Call Letters: KSTP - 5 Eyewitness News

City & State: Apple Valley , Minnesota

GRAPHICAL CONTENT: Grade only on the visual presentation and clarity of graphics. (Select N/A if restriction/limitation - N/A on the form = '---')

---

*Current conditions maps and/or panels (temperature, wind, pressure, humidity, dew point, etc.)	3
*Average temperatures, precipitation data, any records, historical weather data for forecasting site, any information that relates the current weather to historical records or climate normals (this does not need to be a traditional almanac graphic)	3
*Forecast panels and/or extended forecast	3
*Watch, warning or advisory maps—if no WWA are in effect, include active weather headlines (i.e. impact-based graphic such as a map or SPC outlook with hazards and timing listed)	4
*Regional/national satellite, radar, or combination satellite/radar maps (Is it clear what product and what time is being displayed?)	3
*Local radar maps (Is it clear what is depicted and what time is being displayed?)	4
*Maps showing fronts, high, low, etc. (on a surface map or futurecast, for example)	3
*Explanatory graphics (climate change, radiational cooling, boating, etc.)	3
*Video or live cameras shown during weathercast	4

Total Graphical Score

3.33

Comments:

You had all of the necessary graphics and made them make sense for your weathercast. I enjoyed how you used the camera view of the smog before and after as part of the explainer.

EXPLANATION: Grade on the overall explanation to the local weather. (Select N/A if restriction/limitation - N/A on the form = '---')

*Is radar information explained (what is happening and why)?	4
Is the risk of hazardous weather, or lack thereof, clearly explained?	4
Are watches, warnings, advisories, or active weather headlines given appropriate emphasis?	3
Are any regional differences adequately explained (city/suburbs, coastal/inland, valley/mountain, etc.)?	3
Is the content appropriate for the day chosen, including the amount of content? Is there too much/little?	4
Is the information meteorologically and/or scientifically correct?	4
Do the graphics and explanations lead to the evolution of the upcoming weather?	4
Is the viewer left with a clear understanding of everything in the forecast, including comparisons to climo?	5
Does the presentation help to teach atmospheric processes without being overly scientific?	4
Given the accompanying almanac information and pattern, did you find this to be a good forecast?	3

Total Explanation Score

3.80

Comments:

This is where you really shined in my opinion. I rarely give a "5" score, but you were very thorough but easy to understand in your explanations, especially on the timing and impacts in your active day and the smog explanation in your routine day. You also seamlessly worked in lots of "why", just not "what".

PRESENTATION

Does the applicant demonstrate confidence in the information conveyed?	4
Does the applicant appear relaxed and conversational in front of graphics and during anchor cross talk?	4
Does the applicant present graphics well on and/or off camera?	4
Does the applicant speak at an understandable pace, using proper grammar, inflection and diction?	4
Does the applicant portray a professional appearance?	4

Total Presentation Score

4.00

Comments:

Great job!

Grader Signature

I certify that I am aware of no conflict of interest between myself and the applicant I have evaluated:

Board Review for: [redacted]

Completed - Jun 4 2024
Score: 87% (104/120)

CBM Review

SCORING: 5.0 Exceptional; 4.0 Proficient; 3.0 Average; 2.0 Substandard; 1.0 Fail *(Average score of above 3.0 is required in all categories to pass).* Asterisks indicate that N/A is an option. N/A on the form = '---'.

Candidate Name: Christopher Reece

Program Dates:

Active Date: 03/24/2024

Routine Date: 04/05/2024

Call Letters: KSTP - 5 Eyewitness News

City & State: Apple Valley , Minnesota

GRAPHICAL CONTENT: Grade only on the visual presentation and clarity of graphics. (Select N/A if restriction/limitation - N/A on the form = '---')

---

*Current conditions maps and/or panels (temperature, wind, pressure, humidity, dew point, etc.)	4
*Average temperatures, precipitation data, any records, historical weather data for forecasting site, any information that relates the current weather to historical records or climate normals (this does not need to be a traditional almanac graphic)	4
*Forecast panels and/or extended forecast	4
*Watch, warning or advisory maps—if no WWA are in effect, include active weather headlines (i.e. impact-based graphic such as a map or SPC outlook with hazards and timing listed)	5
*Regional/national satellite, radar, or combination satellite/radar maps (Is it clear what product and what time is being displayed?)	4
*Local radar maps (Is it clear what is depicted and what time is being displayed?)	4
*Maps showing fronts, high, low, etc. (on a surface map or futurecast, for example)	4
*Explanatory graphics (climate change, radiational cooling, boating, etc.)	4
*Video or live cameras shown during weathercast	5

Total Graphical Score

4.22

Comments:

Two very solid submissions, you really shined in the Active weather and demonstrated a masterful use of highlighting the weather ingredients that were relevant to the story to enhance the understanding of the story. Bravo. I thought the reference to climo numbers on the 7 day was especially great at driving home the significant temperature changes behind the impending snow.

EXPLANATION: Grade on the overall explanation to the local weather. (Select N/A if restriction/limitation - N/A on the form = '---')

*Is radar information explained (what is happening and why)?	4
Is the risk of hazardous weather, or lack thereof, clearly explained?	4
Are watches, warnings, advisories, or active weather headlines given appropriate emphasis?	4
Are any regional differences adequately explained (city/suburbs, coastal/inland, valley/mountain, etc.)?	4
Is the content appropriate for the day chosen, including the amount of content? Is there too much/little?	4
Is the information meteorologically and/or scientifically correct?	5
Do the graphics and explanations lead to the evolution of the upcoming weather?	5
Is the viewer left with a clear understanding of everything in the forecast, including comparisons to climo?	5
Does the presentation help to teach atmospheric processes without being overly scientific?	4
Given the accompanying almanac information and pattern, did you find this to be a good forecast?	4

Total Explanation Score

4.30

Comments:

Great job making sure the graphics supported your story, versus letting the graphics lead you. Well done!

PRESENTATION

Does the applicant demonstrate confidence in the information conveyed?	5
Does the applicant appear relaxed and conversational in front of graphics and during anchor cross talk?	4
Does the applicant present graphics well on and/or off camera?	5
Does the applicant speak at an understandable pace, using proper grammar, inflection and diction?	4
Does the applicant portray a professional appearance?	5

Total Presentation Score

4.60

Comments:

Very impressive submission and an excellent example of what AMS strives for and stands for. Nice job respectfully navigating the restrictions from your parent company while still getting factual information on the air in a meaningful way to your viewer. Judging this submission was a joy.

Grader Signature

I certify that I am aware of no conflict of interest between myself and the applicant I have evaluated:

American Meteorological Society Board of Broadcast Meteorology
Weathercaster Evaluation Form

Candidate	**Christopher Reece**	Program	**3/2/24 & 4/5/24**
Call Letters	**KSTP**	City & State	**St. Paul, MN**

SCORING: 5.0 Exceptional 4.0 Proficient 3.0 Average 2.0 Substandard 1.0 Fail

(Average score of above 3.0 is required in all categories to pass) Asterisks indicate that N/A is an option.

GRAPHICAL CONTENT: Grade only on the visual presentation and clarity of graphics. (Select N/A if restriction/limitation)

*Current conditions maps and/or panels (temperature, wind, pressure, humidity, dew point, etc.)	3
*Average temperatures, precipitation data, any records, historical weather data for forecasting site, any information that relates the current weather to historical records or climate normals (this does not need to be a traditional almanac graphic)	3
*Forecast panels and/or extended forecast	4
*Watch, warning or advisory maps—if no WWA are in effect, include active weather headlines (i.e. impact-based graphic such as a map or SPC outlook with hazards and timing listed)	3
*Regional/national satellite, radar, or combination satellite/radar maps (Is it clear what product and what time is being displayed?)	3
*Local radar maps (Is it clear what is depicted and what time is being displayed?)	3
*Maps showing fronts, high, low, etc. (on a surface map or futurecast, for example)	3
*Explanatory graphics (climate change, radiational cooling, boating, etc.)	4
*Video or live cameras shown during weathercast	3

Total Graphical Score 3.22

Comments:

Hi, Chris. Thank you for your submissions. I really enjoyed watching your weathercasts.
Overall, I think you're doing some really awesome work! I hope the few items of feedback I offer here will just help to enhance an already solid on-air product.
I thought your active day submission was great. Sure, it was long. However, those are the days where that is warranted. I also didn't feel like there was anything you didn't need, so I wouldn't worry about the time. The only thing I think you could have left out was the dry air/dry slot information. You and I know the significance of that feature, but your viewers might not. So, I think you could have saved a few seconds by just not mentioning it - you had plenty of other things to touch on, anyway. I also really appreciated how many cities and towns you called out in this submission. We know the importance of that in severe weather, but I'd argue that the same goes for high-impact winter weather, too.
Your routine day submission was also really nice. The smog explainer was perfectly timed and tied in so nicely to the overall weather story.
I appreciate how well you use your graphics to tell a good weather story for your viewer. You keep your graphics simple, but not boring. They're easy to understand and have everything your audience needs.
I think you have a very strong on-air presence and it's clear to me that you enjoy your work.
Keep up the good work and thank you again for your submissions. Best of luck going forward!

EXPLANATION: Grade on the overall explanation to the local weather. (Select N/A if restriction/limitation)

*Is radar information explained (what is happening and why)?	4
Is the risk of hazardous weather, or lack thereof, clearly explained?	5
Are watches, warnings, advisories, or active weather headlines given appropriate emphasis?	4
Are any regional differences adequately explained (city/suburbs, coastal/inland, valley/mountain, etc.)?	3
Is the content appropriate for the day chosen, including the amount of content? Is there too much/little?	3
Is the information meteorologically and/or scientifically correct?	3
Do the graphics and explanations lead to the evolution of the upcoming weather?	4
Is the viewer left with a clear understanding of everything in the forecast, including comparisons to climo?	4
Does the presentation help to teach atmospheric processes without being overly scientific?	4
Given the accompanying almanac information and pattern, did you find this to be a good forecast?	3

Total Explanation Score 3.70

Comments:

Please see graphical content section.

PRESENTATION

Does the applicant demonstrate confidence in the information conveyed?	4
Does the applicant appear relaxed and conversational in front of graphics and during anchor cross talk?	4
Does the applicant present graphics well on and/or off camera?	4
Does the applicant speak at an understandable pace, using proper grammar, inflection and diction?	5
Does the applicant portray a professional appearance?	5

Total Presentation Score 4.40

Comments:

Please see graphical content section.

I certify that I am aware of no conflict of interest between myself and the applicant I have evaluated:

[redacted]