

## VIDEO RUBRIC FOR THE D. B. REINHART ETHICS COMPETITION

Video Title:

Student Names:

Evaluation Criteria	Strong (4 points)	Effective (3 points)	Emerging (2 points)	Incomplete (0-1 point)	SCORE
<b>Video Content</b>	+Video clearly identifies a social injustice in the City of La Crosse/ La Crosse county and explains what makes it an injustice + Video explores some of the history/causes behind the injustice (providing data/statistics/ relevant demographic information) +Video articulates why the issue identified should be a top priority for the city/county of La Crosse. +Video provides concrete and feasible recommendations that help address some aspect of the problem and documents the efforts of the students to engage stake-holders impacted by the problem.	+Video identifies problem but its impact on La Crosse County/City needs more emphasis. +More definitions/ explanation of social injustice needed. +Relevant data is provided but could be explained more. +Recommendations are provided but could use more explanation +Student engagement documented	+Video identifies general problem that has no clear connection with region. +No definitions of justice/injustice or other moral principles mentioned. +Little relevant data is provided. +Recommendations lack specificity +Student engagement is documented but it is unclear how it relates to the problem	+No connection made to La Crosse County or City. +No data is provided. +No moral principles of evaluation used. +Lack of any clear recommendations +Little if any of the video documents the students community engagement	
<b>Video Format</b>	+Video is no longer than 5 minutes. +All people directly appearing in the film are identified. +Credits are listed at the end of the video that indicate who was involved and lists/states what resources were utilized. +If criticisms are provided, no individuals are personally identified (although institutions, laws and policies can be).	+Video is either too short (less than 3 min) or slightly too long (over 5 min.) +Some people featured in video need better identification. +Sources and data used need clearer references.	+Video is too long (more than 6 min.) +Few people who appear in the video are properly identified. +List of sources/data is incomplete.	+Video is over 8 min. or under 2 min. +No one appearing in video is identified. +No indication provided of where sources/data or definitions come from.	
<b>Video Aesthetics</b>	+Video is easy to hear and may include additional audio like music to enhance it. +Video is composed well (subject placement heightens dramatic effect), and easy to follow and understand. +Video is edited well (transitions are clear, pacing enhances narrative) and any additional graphics/title are smoothly integrated into the video +Lighting used effectively for maximum impact.	+Video is easy to hear but some of the dialogue could be clearer at times. +Some transitions in video detract from its message/clarity +Some individuals or locations in the video are hard to see. +Some messages need repeating or more focus-attention	+Video is hard to hear or follow at times. +Timing and transitions detract from the message. +Lighting needs to be used more effectively +Some individuals and messages receive too little attention +Overall video composition and organization do not enhance the message of the video.	+Video cannot be heard. +Editing is disjointed and follows no clear organizing strategy. +Much of what is filmed is hard to make out or otherwise unclear. +Composition of video makes it very difficult to understand the content of the video.	