

## Small Screen Scholars Rubric

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

| ACTIVITY                          | Exemplary   | Proficient  | Partially Proficient   | Incomplete  | Points |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--------|
| <b>Script &amp; Storyboard</b>    | <b>15-20 points</b><br>The storyboard illustrates the video presentation structure with thumbnail sketches of each scene. Notes of proposed transition, special effects, sound, placement, graphics, etc. Notes about proposed dialogue/ narration text are included. | <b>10-14 points</b><br>The storyboard includes thumbnail sketches of each video scene and includes text for each segment of the presentation, descriptions of background audio for each scene, and notes about proposed shots and dialogue. | <b>5-9 points</b><br>The thumbnail sketches on the storyboard are not in logical sequence and do not provide complete descriptions of the video scenes, audio background, or notes about the dialogue. | <b>0-4 points</b><br>There is no evidence of a storyboard or script.  |        |
| <b>Content &amp; Organization</b> | <b>15-20 points</b><br>Video content highly mirrors the research paper in flow, caliber, and topic. Includes many verbal references to scholarly sources.   | <b>10-14 points</b><br>Video content mirrors the research paper in flow, caliber, and topic. Includes some verbal references to scholarly sources.  | <b>5-9 points</b><br>Video content rarely mirrors the research paper in flow, caliber, and topic. Includes few verbal references to scholarly sources.   | <b>0-4 points</b><br>Video content does not mirror the research paper in flow, caliber, and topic. Includes no verbal references to scholarly sources.                      |        |
| <b>Quality</b>                    | <b>15-20 points</b><br>The video was well edited and moves smoothly from scene to scene with proper use of transitions. Quality of the video is not a distraction, but a positive characteristic.   | <b>10-14 points</b><br>Editing could have been better. Some poor frames. Video is somewhat choppy. Enhancements were utilized, but not for maximum effect.  | <b>5-9 points</b><br>Video had very little if any editing. Many poor quality frames. Video was very fragmented and choppy with little to no enhancement reinforcement.                                 | <b>0-4 points</b><br>Video was unedited with no transitions or audio support of any kind.   |        |
| <b>Criteria &amp; Originality</b> | <b>15-20 points</b><br>Student used 6-8 of the video criteria provided in the task description. Students exemplified highly original concepts in their video creation and paper adaptation.   | <b>10-14 points</b><br>Student used 3-5 of the video criteria provided in the task description. Students were mostly original in their video creation and paper adaptation.   | <b>5-9 points</b><br>Student used 1-2 of the video criteria provided in the task description. Students were slightly original in their video creation and paper adaptation.                            | <b>0-4 points</b><br>Student used none (0) of the video criteria provided in the task description. Students were not original in their video creation and paper adaptation. |        |
| <b>Checkpoints</b>                | <b>20 points</b><br>Student cleared all checkpoints.  | <b>10 Points</b><br>Students cleared some checkpoints.  | <b>0 points</b><br>Students did not clear all checkpoints.   |   |        |
| <b>Final Score</b>                |   |   |  |   |        |