

Video Evaluation Rubric

Eligibility:

- The video addresses a topic related to inequalities within the UN SDGs framework, and the competition guidelines are followed.
 - a. Is the topic discussed related to inequalities within the framework of the SDGs? (YES/NO)
 - b. Does the video state the SDG within the first 30 seconds? (YES/NO)
 - c. If the audio is not in English, are there clear English subtitles? (YES/NO)

Criterion 1: Importance and Creativity - The topic addressed is important and tackled in a creative, inclusive way.

Sub-criteria	Exemplary/Excellent (3)	Proficient/Good (2)	Developing/Satisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement/Insufficient (0)
a. Creativity and originality of research question	Highly creative and original research question that addresses a significant topic.	Research question is somewhat creative and relevant but not completely original.	Research question lacks creativity or originality; addresses a common or marginally relevant topic.	Research question is unoriginal, lacks creativity and is not relevant or engaging.
b. Interesting research purpose	Study investigates a compelling, thought-provoking, and meaningful question.	Study aims to answer an interesting and relevant but less innovative or profound question.	Study addresses a mildly relevant or engaging question, and its purpose may feel unclear or unengaging.	Study does not address an interesting or meaningful question; lacks clear relevance.
c. Creativity and originality of design	Thorough and highly creative design; demonstrates insightful and innovative approaches throughout the video.	Design shows some creativity or innovation yet lacks distinctive qualities.	Design demonstrates limited creativity or originality, with some redundancy or lack of thoughtfulness.	Design is unoriginal, overly basic, or not creative.

Criterion 2: Communication - The clarity of the video’s message and its effectiveness in appealing to a broad audience.

Sub-criteria	Exemplary/Excellent (3)	Proficient/Good (2)	Developing/Satisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement/Insufficient (0)
a. Audio and sound	Crystal clear, easy to understand, no distortion. Consistently high-quality sound and audio.	Mostly clear, but with occasional faults and distortion. Mostly high-quality sound and audio.	The video is hampered by inconsistent audio quality, which distracts the viewer from the storyline.	The audio and sound quality are consistently poor and degrade the video. The viewer is consistently distracted.
b. Video quality	Quality and resolution are consistently high, and the images are in focus and well composed.	Quality and resolution of the majority of video is high. Images are mostly in focus and well composed.	Quality and resolution of the video are consistently low. Images are often not in focus and ineffectively composed.	Quality and resolution of the video are inadequate for presentation. Images are mostly not in focus and poorly composed.
c. Link to UN SDG	Video clearly and explicitly connects to one or more UN SDGs in a meaningful, relevant, and evident way.	Video makes a connection to a UN SDG, but it could be more explicit or well-integrated.	Video’s link to a UN SDG is unclear or tenuous, impacting its overall coherence.	No evident connection to any UN SDG.
d. Problem definition	A problem is clearly specified, supported by statistics, examples or facts, communicated early, prominently, and concisely.	The problem is clear but may not be emphasised strongly enough in the video, or may not be clearly supported by statistics, examples, or facts.	The problem is insufficiently clear or not supported by statistics, examples or facts.	The problem is unclear, and the statistics, examples or facts are missing

Sub-criteria	Exemplary/Excellent (3)	Proficient/Good (2)	Developing/Satisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement/Insufficient (0)
e. Analysis and solution	Video provides a clear analysis or offers a solution to the problem, aligned with the data and the methods used for data collection.	Video contains analysis or proposes a solution to the problem but may not fully align with the data or the methods used for data collection.	Video contains analysis or proposes a solution to the problem that is not consistent with the data, or the methods used for data collection.	Video does not contain an analysis, neither proposes a solution to the problem.
f. Overall understandability	Video is highly clear and understandable without requiring additional information; accessible to all potential audiences.	Video is clear for the most part but occasionally relies on prior knowledge or external information.	Video requires significant outside information or explanation to be understood by a general audience.	Video is difficult to understand, unclear, or inaccessible without significant explanation or additional resources.
g. Use of graphs/tables/statistics	Graphs, tables, and statistics are expertly chosen, effective for storytelling, and appropriate for displaying and summarising the data.	Most graphs/tables/statistics are relevant and helpful but may lack visual or explanatory clarity.	Graphs/tables/statistics are present but inconsistently relevant, clear, or well-designed.	Graphs, tables, or statistics are absent, irrelevant, or unclear.
h. Variety of graphs/tables/statistics used	A wide variety of graphs/tables/statistics are used to clearly provide multiple perspectives on the data.	Some variety in graphs/tables/statistics presents good perspective, but more range would improve clarity.	Graphs/tables/statistics rely on limited forms of presentation, limiting insights into the data.	Little to no variety in graphs/tables/statistics presented, neglecting data from multiple perspectives.

Sub-criteria	Exemplary/Excellent (3)	Proficient/Good (2)	Developing/Satisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement/Insufficient (0)
i. Value and relevance of visuals and statistics	Each graph/table/statistic is clearly relevant and provides meaningful information that adds to the overall clarity of the video's message.	Most graphs/tables/statistics add to the video's purpose, with only a few being less valuable or superfluous.	Several graphs/tables/statistics don't add value, seem redundant, or are poorly contextualised in the video.	Graphs/tables/statistics are largely irrelevant, poorly presented, or distracting instead of supporting the video's purpose.
j. Explanation of visuals and statistics	All graphs/tables are clearly titled and accurately labelled. All statistical evidence is fully explained in the context of the video.	Most graphs/tables are titled, effectively labelled, and most statistical evidence is explained, with minor omissions.	Multiple graphs/tables/statistics are not well-labelled or explained, limiting audience comprehension.	Graphs/tables/statistics lack titles, labelling, or explanations, rendering them difficult to interpret.
k. Explanation of statistical tools	Choice of statistical tools is fully appropriate for analysis and clearly stated and explained in the video.	Statistical tools are mostly appropriate but somewhat unclear or insufficiently explained.	Statistical tools are either inappropriate for the data or inadequately explained.	Statistical tools are not clearly identified or explained, or are evidently misused.
l. Logical and overall accuracy	The video demonstrates clear, accurate, and logically sound ideas throughout the entire presentation.	The video is logical and accurate, with only occasional lapses in clarity or reasoning.	The video demonstrates inconsistent accuracy or logical coherence, confusing its message at times.	The video is largely unclear, contains significant inaccuracies, and lacks logical flow or coherence.

Criterion 3: Data and Statistical Literacy –

The selection and presentation of data and statistical methods to support the video’s central message.

Data Literacy

Sub-criteria	Exemplary/Excellent (3)	Proficient/Good (2)	Developing/Satisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement/Insufficient (0)
a. Appropriateness of data for research question	Data presented is highly relevant, fully supports the research question, with a clear discussion of limitations.	Data is relevant but could better address the research question and/or limitations are insufficiently discussed.	Data is only partially relevant to the research question with limited discussion of limitations.	Data is not relevant or the discussion of limitations is missing or unclear.
b. Clarity of data collection methods	Data collection methods are rigorous, clearly stated, and address accuracy, sample size, and reliability.	Data collection methods are clear but lack thorough details or fail to address one significant aspect (e.g., sample size).	Data collection methods are vaguely mentioned or poorly described.	Data collection methods are unclear, absent, or insufficiently examined.
c. Reference to data sources	All data sources are clearly cited and easy to identify, both in the video and related abstract where applicable.	Most data sources are clearly cited but may be inconsistent or incomplete.	Data sources are mentioned but are hard to locate or inconsistently cited.	No data sources are cited or identifiable.

Statistical Literacy

Sub-criteria	Exemplary/Excellent (3)	Proficient/Good (2)	Developing/Satisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement/Insufficient (0)
a. Consistency of analysis with research question	Analysis aligns strongly with the research question, demonstrating clear-purposeful methods.	Analysis mostly aligns with the research question but may lack clarity or focus.	Partial alignment between analysis and research question; relevance may be unclear.	Analysis is disconnected from the research question or unrelated.
b. Appropriateness of analysis	Statistical analysis methods are fully appropriate for the data and question being addressed.	Statistical methods are appropriate but could include further details or improvements.	Statistical methods are partially appropriate but have significant issues.	Statistical methods are inappropriate or misapplied.
c. Answering the research question	Research question is thoroughly addressed with clear, logical conclusions from the evidence.	Research question is mostly addressed, but some conclusions lack clarity or evidence.	Research question is not addressed clearly or lacks logical development.	Research question is not addressed, or conclusions are unsupported by the evidence.
d. Conclusions supported by data	Conclusions are completely supported and justified by the data presented in the analysis.	Conclusions are mostly supported by the data, with minor inconsistencies or omissions.	Conclusions are only partially supported, or some evidence is unconvincing.	Conclusions are unsupported, irrelevant, or contradictory to the data presented.