|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PHOTOS/VIDEO IMAGES** | **20/20** | **15/20** | **10/20** | **5/20** |
| *Image Quality (****Size and Resolution****): Are the images fuzzy?* *Are they well-lit?* | *Images are crystal clear, professional-looking, proper size; focused on the action or a main character; well lit from back or side, faces clear* | *Some of the shots/photos are blurry but most seem fine. Focus on main figure. Some shaking in video; some shadows* | *Most of the photos are blurry, but a few are really good. Focus tends to be off the main action or figure. Very shaky, choppy video; several are shot into light* | *Images are grainy, fuzzy or pixellated (happens when they are expanded past their shot resolution); Not clear what focus is; many are shot into the light/sun* |
| Image Quality (**Composition**): Have you framed the subject well? Do you have different angles represented? Does the shot jive with rule of thirds? | Well framed, subject is off-center; if a portrait, subject is leaning into the camera; Properly cropped. | Uses at least two composition techniques, but some shots/photos seem without purpose  | Uses at least one composition technique, but in general shots/photos seem unframed and without thought | Does not use "rule of thirds", horizon line, balance, grouping, selective focus, or lighting; no cropping |
| Image content (**Journalistic**): Do the photos/images make sense for the story being told? Can we tell what the purpose of the photos is supposed to be? Do the titles/captions make sense? | Has logical story with beginning, middle, end. Captions are short, informative; main character pictured; a variety of sources. Project has a solid “story” and it is medium-appropriate (i.e. this would not be told better in print)  | Journalism is solid, main character pictured, several sources; content makes sense, but some photos/images seem out of place; | Missing some captions or captions inappropriate; content confusing though there does seem to be some logic there; main character present but too few other sources | Missing title/captions or inappropriate writing; photos do not appear to reflect any story; no characters/action pictured; the content is not best told in video format (e.g. a meeting should be told in text) |
| Image **Originality**: Are the images your own or properly sourced? | All of them are. No copyright issues | Most of them are. No copyright issues | Some of them are; some copyright issues | None of them are. Lots of copyright issues |
| Image **Quantity/Variety** (Do you have enough shots? Have you gotten a mix of long, medium and close-up shots?) | Camera distance appropriate in all photos/images, lots of angles and variety of shots; good number of photos/images; they stayed with each image good duration | Camera distance usually appropriate, but demonstrated little variety in technique; some transitions too fast or choppy | Problems with too few pictures/images with little variety; Distance problems. Redundancy problems. | Not enough of anything, leading to a visually boring project.  |
| **Audio**Is audio generally audible? Are levels consistent? Is music mixed down under narration, up in intervals?Are distractions avoided? | Audio is well-balanced between subjects and interview/narration; music is used well; almost no distracting audio | Audio levels vary between subject and interview/narration; music too loud, or none used; minimal distractions | Audio levels vary greatly, no music, some distracting audio | Audio levels vary greatly, no music, distraction (behind the camera, sounds in the room) are severe |
| **Pacing**Cuts are not too quick; varied from long to short | Stills kept for 4-5 seconds; some longer shots for variety | Some stills/cuts are under43 secs.; some variety in length | Many stills/cuts are under 4 secs. | Many cuts/stills are under 4 secs., all are about the same length |