

DMA 327 GRADING CRITERIA FOR PROJECT EVALUATION

The final grade for the documentary project will be based on a **detailed** analysis and evaluation of the following criteria. Each producer and co-producer must address each of the following criteria in his or her own Documentary Project Report under the section entitled #9 Production Role:

PROGRAM APPEAL - how well does this documentary attract the interest of and hold the attention of the average TV audience in comparison to other television programming.

1. Human Interest Appeal - does the program's topic and focus stimulate the curiosity of the average TV audience?
2. Visual Appeal - is there adequate visual stimulation (*action, movement, color, spectacle*) to support the topic?

WRITING QUALITY - how well does the program communicate its points and point of view to the average TV audience?

1. Specific Focus - script has a clearly defined theme that the audience can identify after viewing.
2. Specific Points - script makes salient, understandable points that the audience retains after viewing.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

1. Extent of Research - does the program reflect an extensive data base, expertise, and closure on the subject?
2. Credible/Appropriate Interviews - did program use the best people possible to support the program in interviews?
3. Cut Away Video - is pertinent, logical, active and illustrative in supporting the narration and interview soundbytes.

VIDEO QUALITY

1. Picture Quality - lighting, exposure, and color balance make the program's images look like "real TV".
2. Shot Composition and Staging - framing and design of shots reflect *professional expertise and aesthetic taste*.
3. Variety of Shots - use of different camera angles (overhead, low, reverse angle) and shots (XCU, CU, MS, LS, OS).
4. Steady/Fluid Camera Work - use of zooms, pans, tilts, and rack focusing that *move and look like real TV*.

AUDIO QUALITY

1. Professional Narration - narrator's voice, tonal quality, and delivery definitely enhanced the documentary.
2. Clean, clear, high quality audio throughout the program. (*No hum or hiss*).
3. Maintenance of consistent and optimum audio levels throughout the program. (*No pegs or dips*).
4. Balanced mix between audio tracks. (*One channel doesn't overpower or mask the other channel*).
5. Seamless transitions in audio track intros and exits. (*No abrupt jolts or voids*).
6. Appropriate music enhanced the program and supported the intended mood or tone. (*Cognitive Rationalization*).

EDITING QUALITY

1. Pace of editing prevents boredom or negative adaptation. (*Interspersed with no long, uninterrupted segments*).
2. Multi-angle video sequences look natural and have no continuity problems. (*Good continuity - no jump cuts!*).
3. Seamless, fluid, staggered "split edit" transitions. (*No abrupt jolts or voids*).
4. Consistent proc amp levels (*luminance, pedestal, tint, chroma*) were at the proper settings. (*NTSC Standards*).

GRAPHICS/TITLING QUALITY

1. Aesthetically designed, placed, and balanced Chyron titles that enhance the program's message and video.
2. Legibility of font, character color saturation, and edge type holds up on 3rd generation VHS tape playback.
3. Readability - the information in the title can be easily read within the time span that it appears on the screen.

PRODUCTION EFFICIENCY - ratio between the time, money, and facilities expended and the quality of the final product.

1. Number of location shoots needed to gather the supporting video footage and interview soundbytes. (*The more location shoots [ie. equipment checkouts], the better the overall coverage of the topic should be*).
2. Hours of editing time booked to complete the on-line editing of the project. (*The more editing time scheduled, the better the editing [ie. pace, interspersing, seamless transitions] should be*).
3. Overall time span needed to complete the project from pre-production and production all the way through post production. (*The longer the time span [ie. months, semesters, years], the better the finished product should be*).

PROFESSIONALISM - based on this project, would the executive producer or co-producer want to work with you again?

1. Characteristic attitude and behavior displayed during script consultation, footage review, and edit screening review sessions. (*Based on executive producer's [ie. instructor] evaluation of student producer's attitude and behavior*).
2. Ability to work cooperatively and effectively with co-producer. (*Based on co-producer's evaluation of student*).
3. Number of cancelled or late equipment pick up or returns. (*Based on TV Production Manager's evaluation*).
4. Equipment damage, loss, or breakdown due to operator error, neglect or misuse. (*TV Production Manager's report*).