

Video Presentation Rubric

1. Sources:

Well Done: exact sources stated

Medium: stating "Google" as the source of information

Raw: no sources cited

2. Visuals:

Well Done: Camera steady and held 'landscape' and "portrait" chosen on purpose

Medium: Camera work a mix of steady and bouncy

Raw: Unfocused, poor camera work

3. Audio:

Well Done: Can hear everything, and if it did get tough, subtitles were inserted

Medium: Most audio was fine

Raw: Multiple/long times of unintelligible audio, no subtitles

4. Math:

Well Done: Math correct, and clearly and concisely *shown* for understanding (a viewer of the video can always hit pause to examine the finer details of the mathematical steps) A focus is on the end result and the point of the math (its meaning, message and interpretation of data), not the step-by-step detail.

Medium: Math correct, but recited number for number in an disengaging way

Raw: Math not done, or incorrect and recited number for number, audience tunes out

5. Physics:

Well Done: All physics terms used in a correct, clear manner

Medium: Most physics terms used in a correct manner, but with some mixups

Raw: Physics either not really focused on, or almost all incorrect

6. Connections:

Well Done: Bridges built between the math/physics concepts portrayed and several other factors such as society, people, the future, economics, etc.

Medium: Some bridges built with the above, but were a bit flimsy

Raw: Very little attempt made to bridge physics and/or math with other topics

7. Communication:

Well Done: Information delivered in engaging, clear manner, audience wants to listen

Medium: Information general delivered in a clear way, but some unnecessary laughter/inside jokes present

Raw: Information given in robotic manner, lots of nervous laughter, lots of inside jokes

8. Editing:

Well Done:All clips put together in a logical sequence

Medium: Most clips pieces together in a logical way

Raw:The editing made the video close to unwatchable

9. Teamwork:

Well Done: Every group member contributed fairly to the video

Medium: Most group members were constructive but disconnects negatively influenced the video

Raw: Absences of 1 group member ground the whole team to a stop

10. Process:

Well Done: All group members were involved in note taking, organization of materials and sequence of video and general planning

Medium: 1 group member was not involved in note taking, organization of materials and sequence of video and general planning. Provided that other team members attempted to motivate the lone unengaged individual, this would only negatively influence the grade of the lone individual.

Raw: The group was generally disorganized, lack of coherent action on a plan, absences meant that member present could not make forward progress

11. Other:

Well done: Content delivered in a novel, creative way that students thought of themselves

Medium: Content delivered in a creative way, but such was the focus on humor/creativity, that the details course content itself is unclear

Raw: Content delivered in ways that include reading long passages verbatim from sources, unengaging/dispassionate presentation of ideas, content delivered out of context, video looks rushed for completion rather than done to maximize learning

