



<b>Pedagogical Innovation (Weight = 35%)</b>	<b>Innovation</b>	The work is a minimal collection or rehash of other people's ideas, products, images, and inventions. There is no evidence of new thought.	The work is an extensive collection and rehash of other people's ideas, products, images, and inventions. There is little evidence of new thought or inventiveness.	The project shows some evidence of originality and inventiveness. While based on an extensive collection of other people's ideas, products, images, and inventions, the work extends beyond that collection to offer new insights.	The project shows significant evidence of originality and inventiveness. The majority of the content and many of the ideas are fresh, original, and inventive.		9%
	<b>Curricular Alignment</b>	No evidence of connection to the target curriculum. Users are not likely to learn from this project.	Some evidence of connection to the target curriculum. Users may learn from this project.	Adequate evidence of connection to the target curriculum. Users are likely to learn from this project.	Clear evidence of connection to the target curriculum. Frequent and clear references are made to facts, concepts, and cited resources. Users will learn from this project.		9%
	<b>Clarity of Learning Objectives</b>	Learning objectives are not discussed.	Learning objectives are discussed but not linked to the project.	Some evidence that learning objectives are addressed with the project.	Clear evidence that the stated learning objectives will be met by this project.		10%
	<b>Dissemination of the Project and its Pedagogy</b>	There is no effort to share or disseminate the project.	The project is shared in a limited way such as presentation(s) within the department.	Project is shared via presentation(s) within the university.	Project is shared via presentation(s) or publication(s) outside the university.		7%

<b>High-Quality Design (Weight = 25%)</b>	<b>Design</b>	Screens are either barren and stark or confusing and cluttered. Exaggerated emphasis on graphics and special effects weakens the message and interferes with the communication of content and ideas.	Multimedia elements accompany content but there is little sign of mutual reinforcement. There is no attention to visual design criteria such as balance, proportion, harmony, and restraint. There is some tendency toward random use of graphical elements that do not reinforce the message.	Multimedia elements and content combine to adequately deliver a high impact message with the elements and words reinforcing each other	The combination of multimedia elements and content takes communication to a superior level. There is clear attention give to balance, proportion, harmony, and restraint. The synergy reaches the intended audience with style and pizzazz.		11%
	<b>Navigation &amp; Logic</b>	Buttons or navigational tools are absent or confusing. No buttons and navigational tools work.	Some difficult experience while navigating through project.	Few difficulties experience while navigating through project.	Users can progress intuitively throughout the entire project in a logical path to find information. All buttons and navigational tools work.		7%
	<b>Organization</b>	The sequence of information is not logical. Menus and paths to information are not evident.	The sequence of information is somewhat logical. Menus and paths are confusing and flawed.	The sequence of information is logical. Menus and paths to most information are clear and direct.	The sequence of information is logical and intuitive. menus and paths to all information are clear and direct.		7%

							<b>TOTAL:</b>
							(max = 100)