Images = 30 pts.
Composition – Are the graphics complete in their design and content? Could the graphics stand alone and still be understood? Are they designed for maximum understanding and efficiency? (5 pts.)
Framing/Perspective – Is there too much white space in the graphics’ frames? Is the size appropriate? Are the data presented in an interesting and engaging way? (5 pts.)
Symbols – Are all graphics understandable from the viewing distance? Do the chosen symbols match the data? (5 pts.)
Color – Does the use of color enhance understanding or detract from the presentation? Are the selected colors relevant to the message? (5 pts.)
Numbers – Do all numbers make sense? Is it evident exactly what the numbers represent? (5 pts.)
Labeling – Are all elements labeled and positioned to maximize understanding? Are all legends, titles, sources, dates, scale bars, etc., present, complete, and understandable? (5 pts.)

Argument = 30 pts.
Clarity – Is a planning question or an objective to the research posed at the outset? Does the development of the argument make sense? Do the graphics adequately support the argument? (10 pts.)
Relevance to planning – Does the argument capture a plausible and relevant planning issue? Do the researchers acknowledge the link to planning? Do the researchers present a general background statement about the planning issue? (10 pts.)
Sequencing – Is the argument presented as a logical series of statements (premises to conclusion) through images and text? Is the conclusion stated? Is the conclusion valid? (10 pts.)

Composition = 30 pts.
Arrangement of graphic content – Does the arrangement of graphics follow a logical sequence or storyline – from the statement of the issue or objective, through premises and supporting data, to conclusion? (10 pts.)
Text selection and positioning – Are the text statements concise, efficient and relevant to the position of graphics? Does the arrangement allow for easy flow of the argument or is it difficult to follow? (10 pts.)
Creativity – Is the story interesting and presented in an engaging way? Is the issue presented in an unusual way that made you think differently about it? (10 pts.)

Oral Presentation = 10 pts.
Organization – Was the presentation logical? Did the oral delivery match the graphics shown to the audience both in sequence and in content? (4 pts.)
Delivery – Did the presenters appear to have practiced; was the presentation smooth? Could you read everything on the screen? (4 pts.)
Length – Was the presentation within the time limit specified? Was the final document at the specified three page length? (2 pts.)