

# Yukon WHERE Challenge Judging Rubric

## Research: 40% 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 Yukon 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 Yukon or Canadian examples provided.	Scientific background contains common inaccuracies. Some of the examples stating where the resources are found are from Yukon or Canada.	Scientific background is mostly accurate. Most of the examples stating where the resources are found are from Yukon or Canada.	Scientific background is accurate. All of the examples stating where the resources are from Yukon or Canada.
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: 40% weight

### Consider the following:

**1. Originality:** How novel, original or unexpected is the entry?

**2. 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?

**3. 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)
1	Entry is neither creative nor original in its design.	Entry is creative but is not original in its design.	Entry is both creative and original in its design. Refreshing but familiar.	Entry is extremely creative and original in its design. Completely novel.
2	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.	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 frames/scenes with no unifying main idea.	Information in the entry is presented as a connected theme with supporting information that contributes to understanding the project's main idea.	A rich variety of supporting information in the entry contributes to the understanding of the project's main idea.

## Mechanics: 20% weight

### Consider the following:

**1. 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?

**2. Citation:** Is the origin of the ideas, facts and content clearly identified and presented in a reference page or bibliography?

	(1 point)	(2 points)	(3 points)	(4 points)
<b>1</b>	<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>
<b>2</b>	<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 organized 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 .edu or .gov, published textbooks, encyclopedia, etc.).</p>