



What on Earth is in your stuff?  
WHERE on Earth does it come from?

Presented by: [www.miningmatter.ca](http://www.miningmatter.ca)

### RESEARCH (40%)

Consider the following :

1. Focus: Are the two questions that are the basis of the Challenge answered and how thoroughly?
2. Accuracy: Is the information accurate and relevant to location (a Canadian contest)?
3. Persuasiveness: How effectively did the author deliver the message? Are there facts included to support the message? Are relevant and cohesive connections established?

	(1 point)	(2 points)	(3 points)	(4 points)
1.	Does not address the questions (<50%).	Addresses some of the questions (>50%).	Addresses most of the questions; not all thoroughly.	Addresses each of the questions thoroughly.
2.	Scientific background is consistently inaccurate. There are no Canadian examples provided.	Scientific background contains common inaccuracies. Some of the examples stating where the resources are found are Canadian.	Scientific background is mostly accurate. Most of the examples stating where the resources are found are Canadian.	Scientific background is accurate. All of the examples stating where the resources are found are Canadian.
3.	Entry does not persuade the audience of the importance of Earth's resources or how it relates to everyday life.  Entry fails to present satisfactory arguments and connections.	Entry is somewhat persuasive and presents an incomplete argument and/or connection of the importance of Earth's resources to everyday life.  Argument and/or connections are weak.	Entry is persuasive and provides two connections of the importance of Earth's resources to everyday life.  Argument and/or connections lack detail.	Entry is extremely persuasive and provides more than two clear and detailed connections to the importance of Earth's resources to everyday life.

### INNOVATION – Multimedia Entries (40%) (Contains some form of animation or media)

Consider the following:

4. *Originality*: How novel, original or unexpected is the entry as compared to 2014 submissions? How well does the entry elaborate or reformulate what was known or has been done previously?
5. *Elements and Design\**: How understandable, polished and aesthetic is the final product? How functional or relevant is it? Does the project have the capacity to stimulate positive emotions such as surprise or other relevant feelings, the 'wow' factor?
6. *Craftsmanship*: How well does the entry achieve its purpose? How well does the final product, as presented operate as a 'whole', an outcome that has integration or synthesis?

	(1 point)	(2 points)	(3 points)	(4 points)
4.	Video is neither creative nor original in its design. (Exact same as 2014 entry)	Video is creative but is not original in its design. (Similar to 2014 entry)	Video is both creative and original in its design. (Refreshing but familiar)	Video is extremely creative and original in its design. (Completely novel)
5.	Video content lacks a central theme, clear point of view and logical sequence of information. Much of the supporting information is irrelevant to the overall message.  Sparse notes about proposed dialogue/narration text (script) are included.	Video content does not present a clearly stated theme, is vague, and some of the supporting information does not seem to fit the main idea or appears as a disconnected series of scenes with no unifying main idea.  The thumbnail sketches on the storyboard are not in a logical sequence and do not provide complete descriptions of the video scenes, audio background, or notes about the dialogue.	Information in the video is presented as a connected theme with supporting information that contributes to understanding the project's main idea.  The storyboard includes thumbnail sketches of each video scene and includes text for each segment of the presentation, descriptions of background audio for each scene, and notes about proposed shots and dialogue. Some notes about proposed dialogue/narration text are included.	A rich variety of supporting information in the video contributes to the understanding of the project's main idea.  The storyboard illustrates the video presentation structure with thumbnail sketches of each scene. Notes of proposed transition, special effects, sound and title tracks includes: text, color, placement, graphics, etc. Notes about proposed dialogue/narration text are included.
6.	There was no movie, or tape was totally unedited with no transitions or audio support of any kind.	Movie was made, but had very little if any editing. Many poor shots remain. Video was very fragmented and choppy with little to no audio reinforcement.	Editing was not done as well as it should have been. Some poor shots remain. Movie is still somewhat choppy. Audio and other enhancements were utilized, but not for maximum effect.	Video was well edited and moves smoothly from scene to scene with proper use of transitions. Audio and other enhancements were well used

**MECHANICS (20%)**

7. Expression: Correct grammar, punctuation and spelling are key elements of good writing skills. Does the text as presented communicate the message with clarity and ease?
8. Citation: Is the origin of the ideas, facts and content clearly identified? Has an attempt been made to use a recognisable format /style?
9. Fair Use Guidelines<sup>\*</sup>: Was material included from sources that require permission? Does the entry respect educational Fair Use practices?

(1 point)	(2 point)	(3 points)	(4 points)
Poorly written. Obvious and numerous errors (> 4) in spelling, punctuation or grammar.	Some errors (2-4) in spelling, punctuation or grammar.	Well written. Good insights. Few errors (<2) in spelling, punctuation, or grammar.	Articulate and insightful. No errors in spelling, punctuation or grammar.
Poor sentence structure and/or flow.	Choppy sentence structure. Minor errors in sentence structure and/or flow.	Errors, if present, are not distracting to the reader.	Consistent use of effective sentence length and structure (fluidity).
Errors are distracting to the reader.	Errors are minimally distracting to the reader.		
Entry does not cite or indicate any sources.	Entry has sources but of questionable quality or origin.	Entry uses at least a few high quality sources.	Entry uses several (4 or more) high quality sources.
Sources are not properly documented. Material was used without permission from a source that required permission.	<i>Does not apply for this category.</i>		Fair Use Guidelines followed with clear and accurate citations for <u>all</u> sources.
			No material is included from sources that state that permission is required unless permission has been obtained.

\* Get more information on fair use guidelines, read, “The Educator's Guide to Copyright and Fair Use”, here:  
[http://www.educationworld.com/a\\_curr/curr280.shtml](http://www.educationworld.com/a_curr/curr280.shtml)

Columbia University Library / Information Services developed a helpful Fair Use Checklist, here:  
<http://copyright.columbia.edu/copyright/files/2009/10/fairusechecklist.pdf>



What on Earth is in your stuff?  
WHERE on Earth does it come from?

Presented by: [www.miningmatter.ca](http://www.miningmatter.ca)

This rubric is meant to be used as a guide for the development of an effective and winning entry. Entries scoring below 25 are ineligible for consideration as regional and/or national prizes.

36 – 31 points	30 – 25 points	< 24 points
<p>Entries are exceptionally well researched with a novel or innovative design.</p> <p>Entries make an attempt to persuade their audience about the importance of Earth's resources in everyday life.</p> <p>Fair use guidelines are followed with clear and accurate citations for almost or all sources. No material is included from sources that state that permission is required unless permission has been obtained.</p>	<p>Entries are highly creative or well researched but may not be strong in both categories OR are moderate in each category.</p> <p>Entries make an attempt to persuade their audience about the importance of Earth's resources in everyday life.</p> <p>Fair use guidelines are followed with clear and accurate citations for almost or all sources. No material is included from sources that state that permission is required unless permission has been obtained.</p>	<p>Entries are limited in research, accuracy, and/or creativity.</p> <p>Fair use guidelines may or may not be followed and citations may or may not be included for all sources</p>