

# Multimedia Storytelling

Shortcode	Description
Appearance: Strong	Visitors to your page expect attractive and contemporary design, especially given that they are likely teenagers who spend lots of time online and on social media. Your design looks up-to-date and clean, meeting your audience and their preferences. Nice work in making typography, layout and color choices that entice your intended readers.
Appearance: Weak	Consider how your page's design might not appeal to a teenage audience that spends much of its day visiting sites more contemporary than this design. How could you design more to the taste of your audience? What fonts and colors do they see in their daily lives online? What style of design would match their tastes? A masterfully told story still needs to appear attractive to your audience.
Convergence: Strong	Great work of combining all of this coverage to create a unified and interesting overall story. Journalists call this "convergence," and your team has done well here. Congratulations on each creating compelling storytelling, but also working together to produce rich storytelling. This is the most complicated portion of this contest, and you have done it very well indeed.
Convergence: Mediocre	There is evidence that you and your team considered how these coverage pieces would fit together. The reader can see how the pieces connect. And this takes teamwork. Nice job. However, more could be done to coordinate coverage so that the reader can move from coverage to coverage and learn from the interconnections. How could the coverage be more unified, without simply repeating the same information? This consideration in online journalism is called "convergence."
Convergence: Weak	While you have created solid work on individual pieces of the coverage here, there could be more coordination between the component parts. Consider if your reader will be learning the same content from multiple pieces of the coverage. Or, perhaps the coverage elements are so different in their focuses that they have trouble being unified. Be sure to coordinate these elements so the reader can move smoothly from one piece of coverage to another. This practice is called "convergence" in online journalism and could use improvement here.
Editing: Strong	Nice work as a team of editing your work -- from the writing in your story to the words accompanying the visuals. Your editing showed attention to detailed language, journalistic writing, smart organization and clear explanation of your reporting. Good editing seldom happens when you are in a rush, so congratulations to your team on planning and working ahead.
Editing: Needs Improvement	More attention to editing throughout your reporting here would help the reader hear your message more clearly. Consider how you could perhaps have complied more closely to AP style, journalistic reporting and writing with clarity. This could be true in both the words of your written story and the words accompanying your visuals and "other" coverage. Working ahead of deadline will leave more time for editing.
Navigation: Weak	Consider how your navigation could be more intuitive and simple for the visitor. The typical online audience hopes to view a page that requires a minimum of clicks to enjoy all of the content -- and the clicks that are required should be natural and obvious. Are there "extra" steps that you are requiring of your visitor that could be avoided with embedding or other navigational aids? Perhaps you could ask a "sample" visitor to view the page and watch their clicks and steps needed to see all of the coverage. That might reveal how to make navigation more simple.
Other Coverage: Excellent	In addition to writing and visuals, your team achieved complex and interesting coverage with other media. Nice work of telling the story with this additional coverage. This coverage does well to inform and not simply decorate the story. Nice work.
Research: Strong	The visitor to this site enjoys a richly researched package of coverage with trustworthy and authoritative research. This journalism is much more than a surface reporting of the story: the audience learns about subtleties and complications from sources who know best. Strong research indeed.
Research: Weak	Consider what sources would help to inform the reader on this topic in a more trustworthy and authoritative way. Has your coverage provided original news that has not previously been reported? What sources would have better explained the nuances or details of the story? How would research from those sources have been displayed to the reader? More work on deep and complicated research would help here.
Topic: Strong	The specific focus of this multimedia storytelling package is smartly chosen. You are revealing news to your readers by explaining, exposing or describing something they didn't already know. This kind of interesting coverage is born of planning but also hard work in reporting. Nice job.
Topic: Mediocre	Your storytelling team here has done well in selecting a topic that is newsworthy. However, consider how you could focus the story more narrowly or locally to inform your reader of something that is compelling and unknown.
Topic: Weak	The story topic could be selected more carefully here. Generally, we should strive for local, narrow and timely topics. We should strive to tell stories about the community immediately around us. And in telling those local stories we should narrow down to specific issues and people that have not yet been covered. Finally, the story should be a story that we can only tell now, because it is so timely. Fulfilling all three of those criteria is a tall order, but it should remain an online journalist's goal.
Visuals: Excellent	Visuals are typically the first thing that a reader considers on an online page -- an entry point to considering the coverage more closely, including reading the story. The visual coverage of this story is well done. Congratulations to members of your team who worked on this portion.

## Multimedia Storytelling

Shortcode	Description
Visuals: Mediocre	You clearly understand that visuals can help tell the story here. Nice work of having them connect with the overall focus of the story. However, more could be done to appeal to your audience by using more dynamic, engaging or aesthetically pleasing visuals. Solid work, but consider how you could improve your entry in this specific way for your audience.
Visuals: Weak	Consider how your visuals could have been more appealing to the reader. At first glance, readers often make their decision visually about how interested they are in the story and how much of the story they intend to read. Whether through graphics, photography or videography, this submission could be improved.
Written Story: Excellent	The written story here is well done. Still the bedrock of journalism -- even in an online journalism age -- is the ability to tell a story through the written word. Good work by your team of concentrating on this foundational element of the coverage.
Written Story: Mediocre	Consider what work could be done here to strengthen the written story. While other media are here to assist in telling the story, your team could strengthen the overall package with a strong written story, which is still the foundational component of online journalism.
Written Story: Weak	People rely on journalists for strong written coverage of current events. Your audience might enjoy visuals, social media and other coverage, but they are still hungry for journalistic writing. Consider how your writing could be stronger here.