

Entry may take the form of a drawing, illustration, painting, and/or poster

Sponsored by Teck

40% RESEARCH WEIGHT

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.

40% INNOVATION WEIGHT

4. *Originality*: How novel, original or unexpected is the entry as compared to past 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	The message and/or perspective are unclear. There is no evidence of original thought. Concept exactly the same as 2016 entry.	The message and/or perspective are clear but needs some explanation to understand. Idea not completely original, but concept is clear and well played out visually. Concept too closely mimics past projects.	Message and/or perspective are bold and clear. Message is obvious. The entry is original and designed from a unique idea, concept or skill.	Message and/or perspective are bold, clear and needs no explanation. Message is compelling. The entry is very original and designed from a unique idea, concept or skill.
5	Entry is lacking in artistic value. There are no basic design principles or art elements at work in this entry.	Entry is somewhat lacking in artistic value. Applied the principles of design while using one or more elements effectively; shows an awareness of filling the space adequately; adequate planning.	Entry has obvious artistic value. The artwork was carefully planned, shows an awareness of basic art elements and design principles; arrangement and composition is unique and space is used effectively.	Entry has outstanding artistic value. The artwork was carefully planned; excellent use of the elements and principles of art; chose color scheme carefully both aesthetically and symbolically; uses space effectively; emphasis is clear.
6	The artwork shows no craftsmanship and no attention to control, adaptation, selection and experimentation of medium/media.	The artwork shows minimal craftsmanship and little attention to control, adaptation, selection and experimentation of medium/media.	The artwork shows good craftsmanship, with some attention to control, adaptation, selection and experimentation of medium/media.	The entry shows outstanding craftsmanship, with clear attention to control, adaptation, selection and experimentation of medium/media.

* *Elements of design*: line, texture, colour/hue, shape/form, light, space

* *Design principles*: repetition/rhythm, balance/symmetry, emphasis, dominance, contrast, and unity

10% MECHANICS
WEIGHT

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 and presented in a reference page or bibliography? Has an attempt been made to organize the content e.g. use of headings indicating the type of information (Text, graphics, figures, diagrams, music, etc.)? Is the source credible? When was the material published (or the website updated)?

	(1 point)	(2 points)	(3 points)	(4 points)
7	<p>Poorly written. Obvious and numerous errors (5 or more unique) in spelling, punctuation or grammar.</p> <p>Poor sentence structure and/or flow.</p> <p>Errors are distracting to the reader.</p>	<p>Some errors (3 to 4 unique errors) in spelling, punctuation or grammar.</p> <p>Choppy sentence structure. Minor errors in sentence structure and/or flow.</p> <p>Errors are minimally distracting to the reader.</p>	<p>Well written. Good insights. Few errors (less than 3 unique errors) in spelling, punctuation, or grammar.</p> <p>Errors, if present, are not distracting to the reader.</p>	<p>Articulate and insightful. No errors in spelling, punctuation or grammar.</p> <p>Consistent use of effective sentence length and structure (fluidity).</p>
8	<p>No reference page is present. Nor are any sources cited.</p>	<p>Entry does not include a separate reference page / bibliography.</p> <p>Only website URLs are listed. Sources are not arranged in a clear manner.</p> <p>Five to seven sources included of which all were of questionable origins; e.g. personal website, blogs, Facebook posts etc.</p>	<p>Entry includes a separate reference page / bibliography.</p> <p>Sources listed but headings are not used to indicate what content is being attributed to the source.</p> <p>Minimum of 7 sources including some in which the origins are questionable; e.g. personal website, blogs, Facebook posts etc.</p>	<p>Entry includes a reference page / bibliography.</p> <p>Sources organised and listed by type using headings (e.g. Content, Photos, Graphics, etc.).</p> <p>Minimum of 7 high quality sources. All of the sources are credible (websites from credible institutions, websites ending in <i>.edu</i> or <i>.gov</i>, published textbooks, encyclopedia, etc.).</p>

10% FAIR USE | DEALINGS
WEIGHT

9. *Fair Use | Dealings*: Was material included from sources that require permission? Does the entry respect educational Fair Use|Dealings practices?

	(1 point)	(2 points)	(3 points)	(4 points)
9	<p>Sources are not properly documented.</p> <p>Most of the material presented in the entry was used without permission from a source that required permission.</p>	<p>Fair Use Guidelines followed with clear and accurate citations for a <u>few</u> of the sources.</p> <p>Some of the material presented in the entry was used without permission from a source that required permission.</p>	<p>Fair Use Guidelines followed with clear and accurate citations for <u>most</u> of the sources.</p> <p>No material is included from sources that state that permission is required unless permission has been obtained.</p>	<p>Fair Use Guidelines followed with clear and accurate citations for <u>all</u> sources.</p> <p>No material is included from sources that state that permission is required unless permission has been obtained.</p>

For more information on Fair Use | Dealings, have look at:

- "The Educator's Guide to Copyright and Fair Use" educationworld.com/a_curr/curr280.shtml
- Columbia University Library Information Services Fair Use Checklist, copyright.columbia.edu/copyright/files/2009/10/fairusechecklist.pdf

