|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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.
 |  |