

Title of Work: \_\_\_\_\_

Artist: \_\_\_\_\_

Medium: \_\_\_\_\_

	5	4	3	2
<b>Prompt: <i>Gen Z Democracy: Shaping the Future</i></b>	The prompt has been imaginatively reframed to enable a compelling and powerful statement.	Novel approaches/moves/ directions/ideas/ perspectives were used to good effect in addressing the prompt.	Familiar approaches/moves/ directions/ideas/ perspectives were used in addressing the prompt.	The work offers little in the way of new approaches/moves/ directions/ideas/ perspectives when addressing the prompt.
<b>Ideas/Vision/ Technique</b>	Methods/approaches/techniques /perspectives are used to great effect, without overkill “less is more” here: there is an elegant simplicity of emphasis and coherence. The work is vivid through careful attention to telling details and deft engaging touches.	Novel methods/approaches/ techniques/perspectives were used to good effect. There is an effective blend of personal style and technical knowledge.	Novel methods/approaches/ techniques/perspectives may be present, but they seem stuck on, excessive, out of place and/or not integrated effectively in the work.	There are places where methods/approaches/techniques /perspectives are borrowed whole and lack vision. The work is timid and lacking in vivid feelings and ideas.
<b>Voice/Risk</b>	Rules or conventions may have been broken to create a powerful new statement. The work reveals a willingness to take risks in order to strengthen the message.	There are imaginative and personal touches scattered throughout the work and some risk is taken.	Time-tested recipes and clichés are used, even where there is a personal voice. The work takes some risks in methods/style/ content but presents as pretty “safe.”	There is little sign of personal voice, touch, or style. The creator may have confused great care and precision with creativity – the work is more polished than imaginative or revealing.
<b>Materials/Medium</b>	Common and uncommon materials/ideas/perspectives have been combined in revealing and clever ways.	Familiar materials and ideas have been combined in new and imaginative ways.	The work is a mish-mash of interesting and familiar materials, approaches, and/or effects, but with no coherence OR the work is technically very competent and coherent, without much spark or insight.	There is excessive and/or incoherent use of different materials, mediums, techniques, ideas.
<b>Audience</b>	The audience is highly responsive to (perhaps disturbed by) the work. The work evokes a deeply emotional response.	The work evokes a lively audience response.	While the work is effective in communicating its message, it evokes little emotional response from the audience.	The work is more polished than imaginative or revealing or so abstract that it has little to say to an audience.

**Title of Work:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Artist:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Medium:** \_\_\_\_\_

### Overall Descriptors

**A Score of 5:** The work is unusually or highly creative. The ideas/materials/methods used are novel, imaginative, striking, and highly effective. Important ideas/feelings are illuminated or highlighted in sophisticated ways. The creation shows great imagination, insight, style, and daring. There is attention to detail. A clear and confident voice and style are present. The creator takes risks in form, style, and/or content. The work has an elegant power that derives from clarity and adherence to the prompt and evokes a deeply emotional audience response.

**A Score of 4:** The work is creative. The ideas/materials/methods used are effective and addresses the prompt well. A voice and style are present and scattered throughout the work effectively blending personal style with technical knowledge. Materials, ideas, and techniques have been combined in imaginative ways that results in a lively audience response.

**A Score of 3:** The work is somewhat creative. The ideas/materials/methods used show signs of imagination and personal style but lack coherence and/or insight. Creativity may have been sacrificed for safety and as a result evokes little emotional response from the audience.

**A Score of 2:** The work offers little in the way of new approaches, moves, directions, ideas, or perspectives. The work lacks vision and shows little sign of personal voice or imagination, and as a result, has little to say to the audience.