Content Clarity: Does the video present a succinct description of the community concerns and how it is addressed with the uses of NASA Earth observations, supporting data or other technology?	Memorable/Creativity: How well does the video draw and keep the listener's attention? Does the team engage with the audience?	Production: What is the overall quality of production (including visua and sound elements)?	Social Media
These three sections are scored by a panel of judges who were nominated by the DEVELOP locations		Be apart of the DEVELOP network and help improve our brand	
4 POINTS	4 POINTS	4 POINTS	#nasadevelop
The viewer is left with an exceptional understanding of the topic/research.	The audience will definitely remember research and video contents, and feels like they want to learn more. An very creative or memorable video.	Video is extreamly well planned, with smoothtransitions and edits. Sounds are excellently balanced and easy to hear.	Social Media Interaction (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube)
<ul> <li>Video highlights the capabilities of NASA Earth observations to meet partner needs and the use of supporting data or methods were succinctly explained</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Visual themes work well with the presentation of material and aid in the viewer's understanding of the topic/ research</li> </ul>	Elements blends with the overall tone of the research/topic	When you share your work on social media use #nasadevelop
Was well-informed about the problem, need for work being done, and how the project could  improve decision-making. Final results are clear and convincing	<ul> <li>The video has original through, is creative, and unique</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Video visuals and transitions are clear and of high-quality</li> </ul>	•Facebook = #nasadevelop
<ul> <li>Project has reached a clear end point (end product is easily understood and clearly meets/exceeds partner's needs)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Video was engaging and kept audience attention</li> </ul>	Music is appropriate for theme and research	• Twitter = #nasadevelop
Each member of the team was identified during the video, either in filmed footage, in a photo, or with by their names appearing during a voice over		Video audio and voiceovers are clear and of high-quality with little to not background noise	YouTube = #nasadevelop
		It is clear where all footage, images, and music is originally from. There is a citations list at the end of the video     A video has mandatory DEVELOP clips *	
3 POINTS	3 POINTS	3 POINTS	
Viewer is left with general understanding of the topic/research.	The audience is likely to remember most but not all key concepts of the video and research. The video contains creative elements.	Video is planned, with competent edits. Soundis well balanced and easier to hear. Transitions and edits are rudimentary.	
Audience was informed about the problem and community concers with some details missing or not described in full	<ul> <li>Visual themes are relevant to the presentation of the topic/research, and some but not all of the key concepts are memorable</li> </ul>	Sounds are reasonably balanced. Some elements (lighting, music, etc.) are distracting	
Partner decision-making activity was described but not succinctly. Final results are apparent, with some detail missing     Introductions were made, viewer not clear on who is the project team	The video has some original thought and is moderately creative	A video may not be ranked higher than a '3' in this category if it exceeds the maximum length of 4:20(4 minutes, 20 seconds)     A video has mandatory DEVELOP clips *	
Introductions were made, viewer not clear on who is the project team     Video highlights the capabilities of NASA Earth observations to meet partner needs but vaguely presents how data or methods were used to do this		A video has mandatory DEVELOP clips *	
2 POINTS	2 POINTS	2 POINTS	
2101110			
Viewer is left with a little understanding of the topic/research.	Some introduced visual themes may distract from viewer's understanding of the topic/research.	Video is not well planned and has poor quality edits. Sound is of poor quality.	
Viewer is left with a little understanding of the topic/research.  • Audience was informed about the community concerrns, problem, and need for work being done, with some details missing or not described in full			
Audience was informed about the community concerms, problem, and need for work being	understanding of the topic/research.  • Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does	quality.	
<ul> <li>Audience was informed about the community concerrns, problem, and need for work being done, with some details missing or not described in full</li> </ul>	understanding of the topic/research.  • Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace	quality.  • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research	
Audience was informed about the community concerms, 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	understanding of the topic/research.  • Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace	quality.  • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research  • Music selection or volume changes are too distracting	
Audience was informed about the community concerns, 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     Final results are addressed but not in a clear manner	understanding of the topic/research.    Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace   Video uses the same stock footage throughout the video	quality.  • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research  • Music selection or volume changes are too distracting  • Viewer does not know original author of footage and audio	
Audience was informed about the community concerrns, 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     Final results are addressed but not in a clear manner     I POINT     Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.	understanding of the topic/research.   Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace  Video uses the same stock footage throughout the video  I POINT Video is slightly memorable.  The video addresses the research to a degree, but is not focused on	quality.         • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research         • Music selection or volume changes are too distracting         • Viewer does not know original author of footage and audio         1 POINT         Technical difficulties seriously interfere with the viewer's ability to understand content.	
Audience was informed about the community concerns, 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     Final results are addressed but not in a clear manner     I POINT     Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.     No explanination of NASA Earth observation used	understanding of the topic/research.  Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace  Video uses the same stock footage throughout the video <b>1 POINT</b> Video is slightly memorable.  The video addresses the research to a degree, but is not focused on the key concepts. The video is only slightly memorable.	quality.         • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research         • Music selection or volume changes are too distracting         • Viewer does not know original author of footage and audio <b>1 POINT</b> Technical difficulties seriously interfere with the viewer's ability to understand content.         • The camera work and/or transitions are overly distracting         • Sound and visual files are distorted, titles and any text that appear are	
Audience was informed about the community concerrns, 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      Final results are addressed but not in a clear manner      I POINT      Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.      No explanination of NASA Earth observation used      Supporting data is shown but not described	understanding of the topic/research.   Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace  Video uses the same stock footage throughout the video  I POINT Video is slightly memorable.  The video addresses the research to a degree, but is not focused on	quality.         • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research         • Music selection or volume changes are too distracting         • Viewer does not know original author of footage and audio <b>1 POINT</b> Technical difficulties seriously interfere with the viewer's ability to understand content.         • The camera work and/or transitions are overly distracting	
Audience was informed about the community concerns, 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     Final results are addressed but not in a clear manner     I POINT     Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.     No explanination of NASA Earth observation used     Supporting data is shown but not described     Project falls short of fulfilling objectives stated or outlined in the approach     The video reaches the intended audience, but the video is not informative, need for work	understanding of the topic/research.  Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace  Video uses the same stock footage throughout the video <b>1 POINT</b> Video is slightly memorable.  The video addresses the research to a degree, but is not focused on the key concepts. The video is only slightly memorable.	quality.         • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research         • Music selection or volume changes are too distracting         • Viewer does not know original author of footage and audio <b>1 POINT</b> Technical difficulties seriously interfere with the viewer's ability to understand content.         • The camera work and/or transitions are overly distracting         • Sound and visual files are distorted, titles and any text that appear are	
Audience was informed about the community concerns, 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     Final results are addressed but not in a clear manner     I POINT     Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.     No explanination of NASA Earth observation used     Supporting data is shown but not described     Project falls short of fulfilling objectives stated or outlined in the approach     The video reaches the intended audience, but the video is not informative, need for work     No locational information is provided (e.g. study area, team introduction)	understanding of the topic/research.  Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace  Video uses the same stock footage throughout the video <b>1 POINT</b> Video is slightly memorable.  The video addresses the research to a degree, but is not focused on the key concepts. The video is only slightly memorable.  Viewer has no understanding of the community concern	quality.         • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research         • Music selection or volume changes are too distracting         • Viewer does not know original author of footage and audio         1 POINT         Technical difficulties seriously interfere with the viewer's ability to understand content.         • The camera work and/or transitions are overly distracting         • Sound and visual files are distorted, titles and any text that appear are illegible	
Audience was informed about the community concerns, 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      Final results are addressed but not in a clear manner      I POINT      Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.      No explanination of NASA Earth observation used      Supporting data is shown but not described      Project falls short of fulfilling objectives stated or outlined in the approach      The video reaches the intended audience, but the video is not informative, need for work	understanding of the topic/research.  Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace  Video uses the same stock footage throughout the video <b>1 POINT</b> Video is slightly memorable.  The video addresses the research to a degree, but is not focused on the key concepts. The video is only slightly memorable.  Viewer has no understanding of the community concern  O POINTS	quality.         • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research         • Music selection or volume changes are too distracting         • Viewer does not know original author of footage and audio <b>1 POINT</b> Technical difficulties seriously interfere with the viewer's ability to understand content.         • The camera work and/or transitions are overly distracting         • Sound and visual files are distorted, titles and any text that appear are	Image: Control of the second
Audience was informed about the community concerns, 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     Final results are addressed but not in a clear manner     I POINT     Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.     No explanination of NASA Earth observation used     Supporting data is shown but not described     Project falls short of fulfilling objectives stated or outlined in the approach     The video reaches the intended audience, but the video is not informative, need for work     No locational information is provided (e.g. study area, team introduction)	understanding of the topic/research.  Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace  Video uses the same stock footage throughout the video <b>1 POINT</b> Video is slightly memorable.  The video addresses the research to a degree, but is not focused on the key concepts. The video is only slightly memorable.  Viewer has no understanding of the community concern	quality.         • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research         • Music selection or volume changes are too distracting         • Viewer does not know original author of footage and audio         1 POINT         Technical difficulties seriously interfere with the viewer's ability to understand content.         • The camera work and/or transitions are overly distracting         • Sound and visual files are distorted, titles and any text that appear are illegible	0 POINTS Team does not share video using #NASADEVELOP
Audience was informed about the community concerns, 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     Final results are addressed but not in a clear manner     I POINT     Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.     No explanination of NASA Earth observation used     Supporting data is shown but not described     Project falls short of fulfilling objectives stated or outlined in the approach     The video reaches the intended audience, but the video is not informative, need for work     No locational information is provided (e.g. study area, team introduction)     O POINTS	understanding of the topic/research.  Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace  Video uses the same stock footage throughout the video <b>1 POINT</b> Video is slightly memorable.  The video addresses the research to a degree, but is not focused on the key concepts. The video is only slightly memorable.  Viewer has no understanding of the community concern  O POINTS  Video is neither memorable (or memorable for negative reasons) nor creative.	quality.         • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research         • Music selection or volume changes are too distracting         • Viewer does not know original author of footage and audio <b>1 POINT</b> Technical difficulties seriously interfere with the viewer's ability to understand content.         • The camera work and/or transitions are overly distracting         • Sound and visual files are distorted, titles and any text that appear are illegible         O POINTS         Copyrightedmaterials are used in the video without credits.	
Audience was informed about the community concerrns, 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     Final results are addressed but not in a clear manner     I POINT     Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.     No explanination of NASA Earth observation used     Supporting data is shown but not described     Project falls short of fulfilling objectives stated or outlined in the approach     The video reaches the intended audience, but the video is not informative, need for work     No locational information is provided (e.g. study area, team introduction)     O POINTS	understanding of the topic/research.  Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace  Video uses the same stock footage throughout the video <b>1 POINT</b> Video is slightly memorable.  The video addresses the research to a degree, but is not focused on the key concepts. The video is only slightly memorable.  Viewer has no understanding of the community concern  O POINTS  Video is neither memorable (or memorable for negative reasons) nor	quality.         • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research         • Music selection or volume changes are too distracting         • Viewer does not know original author of footage and audio         1 POINT         Technical difficulties seriously interfere with the viewer's ability to understand content.         • The camera work and/or transitions are overly distracting         • Sound and visual files are distorted, titles and any text that appear are illegible         0 POINTS	
Audience was informed about the community concerns, 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     Final results are addressed but not in a clear manner     I POINT     Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.     No explanination of NASA Earth observation used     Supporting data is shown but not described     Project falls short of fulfilling objectives stated or outlined in the approach     The video reaches the intended audience, but the video is not informative, need for work     No locational information is provided (e.g. study area, team introduction)     O POINTS     Viewer is left with no understanding of the topic/research.	understanding of the topic/research.  Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace  Video uses the same stock footage throughout the video <b>1 POINT</b> Video is slightly memorable.  The video addresses the research to a degree, but is not focused on the key concepts. The video is only slightly memorable.  Viewer has no understanding of the community concern  O POINTS  O POINTS  Video is neither memorable (or memorable for negative reasons) nor creative.  The or visual style is unfit for intended general audience, no time	quality.         • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research         • Music selection or volume changes are too distracting         • Viewer does not know original author of footage and audio <b>1 POINT</b> Technical difficulties seriously interfere with the viewer's ability to understand content.         • The camera work and/or transitions are overly distracting         • Sound and visual files are distorted, titles and any text that appear are illegible         O POINTS         Copyrightedmaterials are used in the video without credits.         • Team uses copyrighted materials, such as photos, graphics and music, in	Team does not share video using #NASADEVELOP
Audience was informed about the community concerns, 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     Final results are addressed but not in a clear manner <u>1 POINT     Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.     Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.     Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.     Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.     Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.     Viewer falls shown but not described     The video reaches the intended audience, but the video is not informative, need for work     No locational information is provided (e.g. study area, team introduction)     O POINTS     Viewer is left with no understanding of the topic/research.     No NASA Earth observation data used     No NASA Earth observation data used     The topic/research is not addressed. Much of the supporting information in the video is </u>	understanding of the topic/research.  Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace  Video uses the same stock footage throughout the video <b>1 POINT</b> Video is slightly memorable.  The video addresses the research to a degree, but is not focused on the key concepts. The video is only slightly memorable.  Viewer has no understanding of the community concern  O POINTS  O POINTS  Video is neither memorable (or memorable for negative reasons) nor creative.  The or visual style is unfit for intended general audience, no time	quality.         • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research         • Music selection or volume changes are too distracting         • Viewer does not know original author of footage and audio <b>1 POINT</b> Technical difficulties seriously interfere with the viewer's ability to understand content.         • The camera work and/or transitions are overly distracting         • Sound and visual files are distorted, titles and any text that appear are illegible         O POINTS         Copyrightedmaterials are used in the video without credits.         • Team uses copyrighted materials, such as photos, graphics and music, in	Team does not share video using #NASADEVELOP  • Team members does not use #NASADEVELOP
Audience was informed about the community concerns, 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     Final results are addressed but not in a clear manner     I POINT     Vieweris left with very little understanding of the topic/research.     No explanination of NASA Earth observation used     Supporting data is shown but not described     Project falls short of fulfilling objectives stated or outlined in the approach     The video reaches the intended audience, but the video is not informative, need for work     No locational information is provided (e.g. study area, team introduction)     O POINTS     Viewer is left with no understanding of the topic/research.     No NASA Earth observation data used     No NASA Earth observation data used     No NASA Earth observation data used	understanding of the topic/research.  Video is predominantly focused on detailed methodology that does not communicate well to a general audinace  Video uses the same stock footage throughout the video <b>1 POINT</b> Video is slightly memorable.  The video addresses the research to a degree, but is not focused on the key concepts. The video is only slightly memorable.  Viewer has no understanding of the community concern  O POINTS  O POINTS  Video is neither memorable (or memorable for negative reasons) nor creative.  The or visual style is unfit for intended general audience, no time	quality.         • Many elements distract from the presentation of the research         • Music selection or volume changes are too distracting         • Viewer does not know original author of footage and audio <b>1 POINT</b> Technical difficulties seriously interfere with the viewer's ability to understand content.         • The camera work and/or transitions are overly distracting         • Sound and visual files are distorted, titles and any text that appear are illegible         O POINTS         Copyrightedmaterials are used in the video without credits.         • Team uses copyrighted materials, such as photos, graphics and music, in	Team does not share video using #NASADEVELOP