|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **StoryMap** | 30% Content Clarity:  Does the StoryMap present a succinct description of desired content? | 35% Memorable/Creative:  Does the StoryMap engage the audience? How well does the StoryMap keep the reader’s attention? | 35% Production:  What is the overall quality? |  |
| 5 Points | **The reader is left with an exceptional understanding of the topic/research.**   * StoryMap highlights the capabilities of NASA Earth observations to meet partner needs and the use of supporting data or methods were succinctly explained. * Audience was well-informed about the problem, need for work being done, and how the project could improve decision-making. Results are clear and convincing. * Project has reached a clear end point (product is easily understood and clearly meets partner’s needs / benefits). * Each member of the team, DEVELOP, and the node were identified in the StoryMap (more than just below / in the title). | **The audience will remember research, content, and feels like they want to learn more. An exceptionally creative or memorable StoryMap.**   * Visual themes work well with the presentation of material and aid in the viewer's understanding of the topic/ research. * The StoryMap is original, creative, and unique (can contain audio clips or video clips). | **StoryMap is exceptionally well planned.**   * The flow of the StoryMap is exceptionally well done. It presents all of the information to the audience in a clear and creative structure. * All visuals coincide with the overall tone of the research/topic. * All required elements are clearly present, easy to identify, and are highlighted in a creative way (NASA Earth observations, partners, team, node, DEVELOP, references, legal statements) |  |
| 4 Points | **The reader is left with a strong understanding of the topic/research.**   * StoryMap highlights the capabilities of NASA Earth observations to meet partner needs and some supporting data or methods is explained in the StoryMap. * Audience was well-informed about the community concern, the project end-user and how the project could improve decision-making. Results are clear. * Partner needs / benefits are clearly identified. * Each member of the project and node were identified in the StoryMap (more than just below the title). | **The audience will remember research and key content. A highly creative and memorable StoryMap.**   * Visual themes are consistent and relevant to the presentation of the topic/research. * The StoryMap has original thought and is creative. | **StoryMap is well planned, with some clarity.**   * The flow of the StoryMap is clear and provides the audience with easy transitions. * Most elements blend with the overall tone of the research/topic. * Visuals are properly placed within flow of the StoryMap. * All required elements are clearly present and highlighted in a creative way (NASA Earth observations, partners, team, node, DEVELOP, references, legal statements) |  |
| 3 Points | **The reader is left with general understanding of the topic/research.**   * StoryMap highlights the capabilities of NASA Earth observations. * Team vaguely presents supporting data or methods used. * Audience was informed about the problem and need for work being done, with some details missing or not described in full. * Partner needs / benefits were described but not succinctly. Results are apparent, with some detail missing. * Each member of the team is identified only in the opening. | **The audience is likely to remember some parts but not all key concepts presented in the StoryMap. The StoryMap contains creative elements.**   * Visual themes are relevant to the presentation of the topic/research, and some but not all the key concepts are memorable. * The StoryMap has some original thought and is somewhat creative. | **StoryMap is somewhat planned.**   * The flow of the StoryMap is somewhat clear. * Visuals are reasonably placed within flow of the StoryMap. Some elements (pictures, text or background color, etc.) are distracting. * All required elements are present (NASA Earth observations, partners, team, node, DEVELOP, references, legal statements) |  |
| 2 Points | **The reader is left with a little understanding of the topic/research.**   * Audience was informed about the problem and need for work being done, with some details missing or not described in full. * Project is somewhat successful in fulfilling objectives as described. * Results are addressed but not in a clear manner. | **Some introduced visual themes may distract from viewer’s understanding of the topic/research.**   * The StoryMap has some original thinking but is only focused on the research. * It relies on preformatted layouts and the visuals / content do not match the topic. | **StoryMap is not well planned. Design is of poor quality.**   * The flow of the StoryMap is not clear and needs to be rearranged. * Many elements distract from the presentation of the research. |  |
| 1 Point | **The reader is left with little understanding of the topic/research.**   * No NASA Earth observation data. * Supporting data is shown but not described. * Audience was not well-informed about the problem, need for work. * Project falls short of fulfilling objectives and provide a full project arc. * The team / node is not identified. | **StoryMap is only slightly memorable.**   * The StoryMap addresses the research to a degree but is not focused on the key concepts. It is only slightly memorable. | **StoryMap has poor quality overall.**   * The flow of the StoryMap does not make sense. * Visuals / elements of the StoryMap do not add value to the research. * Image references are missing. |  |
| 0 Points | **The reader is left with no understanding of the topic/research.**   * The StoryMap is not informative. The topic/research is not addressed. * Much of the supporting information in the StoryMap is irrelevant to the project and/or the project’s objectives. * The StoryMap fails to convey key project information. | **StoryMap is neither memorable nor creative.**   * The StoryMap has no originality (e.g., mostly text with very few images). * The StoryMap is unmemorable (or memorable for negative reasons). * Theme or visual style is unappealing to the intended general audience. | **StoryMap does not meet the requirements.**   * There is no clear flow to the StoryMap. * Visuals / elements of the StoryMap do not relate to the research. * References are missing or incomplete. |  |