**Lesson Rubric: Loop Nature Themed Animated Video**

**Student: Date:**

**Grade: Teacher:** Cynthia Cousineau

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent**  5 Points | **Good**  4 Points | **Adequate**  3 Points | **Partial**  2 points | **Poor**  1 Point |
| **Effective use of knowledge related to eco art** | Eco artist was clearly understood and researched | Eco artist was mostly understood and researched | Eco artist was somewhat understood and researched | Eco artist was not clearly understood and researched | No understanding of eco art shown and no relation to inspirational source for conveying environmental message |
| **Organization of Elements** | Innovative use of space | Innovative use of some aspect of space | Presence of aspects of space | Presence of limited number of predictable aspects of space | Space was disregarded |
| **Authenticity of the artwork and idea**  (Final video, story board and landscape and idea) | Work and idea is extremely original | Work and idea is modestly original | Work and idea is somewhat original | Work and idea displays elements or originality but lacks creativity | Work and idea is a clear copy of another work and lacks original creativity |
| **Quality and Neatness of Artwork**  (Landscape drawing and Storyboard) | Student put great care towards their artwork so that it is neat | Student artwork shows care and is neat | Artwork is clean but could use more care | Artwork is somewhat unclean and lacks some care | Artwork is sloppy and shows little care |
| **Representation of environmental message or theme** | Environmental message or theme is clearly represented and recognizable | Environmental message or theme is mostly represented and recognizable | Environmental message or theme is represented but could use more elements to help recognize it | Environmental message or theme is difficult to recognize | Environmental message or theme is not at all recognizable |
| **Good manipulation of images in photo editing software: Photoshop**  (Final video and storyboard) | Very good use of photo editing techniques (cropping, saturation, negative, contrasting, etc.). | Good use of photo editing techniques (cropping, saturation, negative, contrasting, etc.). | Adequate use of photo editing techniques (cropping, saturation, negative, contrasting, etc.). | Poor use of photo editing techniques (cropping, saturation, negative, contrasting, etc.). | Very poor or no of photo editing techniques (cropping, saturation, negative, contrasting, etc.). |
| **Good manipulation of images in video editing software** | Images were very well cropped, trimmed, adjusted to the time frame and the final video product flows nicely | Images were well cropped, trimmed, adjusted to the time frame and the final video product flows nicely | Images were somewhat well cropped, trimmed, adjusted to the time frame but the final video product could use some improvement | The video lacks use of video editing techniques and doesn’t flow nicely or fit the time frame | The video demonstrates a poor use of video editing techniques |
| **Presentation of Project to class** | Student clearly conveys the environmental idea and his or her experience creating the project | Student mostly conveys the environmental idea and his or her experience creating the project | Student somewhat conveys the environmental idea and his or her experience creating the project | Student poorly conveys the environmental idea and his or her experience creating the project | Student does not conveys the environmental idea and his or her experience creating the project |