CDM Scoring Rubric

Text Discussion

1	Poor	-Forecast is inaccurate beyond reasonable expectations -Discussion cannot be understood by intended audience -Weather concepts and relevant weather information such as Warnings or climatological data are missing -Text is either illegible or contains frequent spelling/grammar/syntax issues
2	Substandard	-Forecast is incorrectly or incompletely explained -Weather concepts and relevant weather information such as Warnings or climatological data are not quickly apparent -Some spelling/grammar/syntax issues are present
3	Fair	-Forecast is adequately explained and reasonably accurate -Important information such as Warnings and/or climatological data is included if relevant -No major spelling/grammar/syntax issues are present
4	Very Good	-Forecast is well explained and actionably accurate -Discussion is helpful for the intended audience and puts the relevant weather information, such as Warnings and climatological information, into proper context -No major spelling/grammar/syntax issues are present
5	Excellent	-Forecast is well explained, accurate, and actionable for its intended audience -Discussion has a compelling narrative that is easy to follow and includes relevant weather information, such as Warnings and climatological information, into proper context -No spelling/grammar/syntax mistakes are present

Video Discussion

1	Poor	-Forecast is inaccurate beyond reasonable expectations -Discussion cannot be understood by intended audience -Weather concepts and relevant weather information such as Warnings or climatological data are missing -Weather graphics are irrelevant to the current forecast and/or the geographical region in the forecast area
2	Substandard	-Forecast is incorrectly or incompletely explained -Weather concepts and relevant weather information such as Warnings or climatological data are not quickly apparent -Weather graphics do not properly illustrate the narrative due to being out of order. Illustrations are unnecessary or inadequate to tell the full weather story
3	Fair	-Forecast is adequately explained and reasonably accurate -Important information such as Warnings and/or climatological data is included if relevant -Weather graphics adequately illustrate the weather story; all important aspects of the forecast are addressed
4	Very Good	-Forecast is well explained and actionably accurate -Discussion is helpful for the intended audience and puts the relevant weather information, such as Warnings and climatological information, into proper context -Weather graphics do a good job of illustrating the weather story, moving the narrative along and including all important aspects of the forecast without superfluous information
5	Excellent	-Forecast is well explained, accurate, and actionable for its intended audience -Discussion has a compelling narrative that is easy to follow and includes relevant weather information, such as Warnings and climatological information, into proper context -Weather graphics are an excellent, indispensable companion to the weather story, covering all important aspects of the forecast and enhancing the audience's understanding of the video and their ability to take proper action

Journalism Story

1	Poor	-Story has no theme -Sources are missing and/or quotes are not correctly cited -Data/statistics are not properly cited -Opinions are offered in place of sources, data, or statistics -Plagiarism is discovered
2	Substandard	-Story does not have a discernible narrative, with a lede, beginning, body, and closing -Opinion-slanting language is used inappropriately (universally-shared opinions like “miserable 110° heat” are acceptable) -Story fails to include outside expertise when appropriate
3	Fair	-Story has a discernible narrative, with a lede, beginning, body, and closing -Weather graphics adequately illustrate the weather story; all important aspects of the forecast are addressed - Story includes outside expertise, though the source is not directly quoted or paraphrased (ie. using an explanation off a state climatologist website rather than asking the state climatologist directly)
4	Very Good	-Story has an interesting narrative with a clearly understandable theme -Writing is concise and clearly understandable for intended audience -Story has sourcing from experts if relevant, and they are properly quoted/cited -Story has a nut graf, lede, beginning, body, and closing
5	Excellent	-Story has a clear, compelling narrative with a relevant and/or timely theme -Story addresses an issue important to their audience, is unique, or puts an interesting spin on a topic -At least two sources are quoted or cited, if relevant to the story -Story has a nut graf, lede, beginning, body, and closing

Data or Explainer Story (Video, Audio, or Text)

1	Poor	-Story has no focus, order, or theme -Explainer is factually inaccurate -Data is impossible to understand and/or explainer is unreadable
2	Substandard	-Story does not have a discernible narrative, with a lede, beginning, body, and closing -Key sources are not provided, detracting from the credibility of the explanation or data -Story is hard to understand, may contain grammatical errors
3	Fair	-Story has a discernible narrative, with a lede, beginning, body, and closing -Sources are utilized and cited where appropriate -Data and/or sources are relevant to the topic
4	Very Good	-Story has an interesting narrative with a clearly understandable theme -Subject matter is relevant and timely for its intended audience -Spelling or grammatical errors, if any, do not detract from the message
5	Excellent	-Story has a clear, compelling narrative -A unique or interesting conclusion is drawn, which the intended audience might not find elsewhere -No spelling or grammatical errors

Weather Graphics

1	Poor	-Incorrect information is presented -Key information is missing (e.g. time and date when relevant) -Graphic is impossible to read
2	Substandard	-A small factual error or inconsistency is noted -Graphic is hard to read due to inconsistent fonts, too much or too little information, etc.
3	Fair	-Information is correct, but not presented in a broader context -Graphic is readable, but attention to detail is lacking
4	Very Good	-Information is correct and presented in proper context for the intended audience -Graphic is easy to read and professionally assembled, with useful variables and/or legends included where appropriate
5	Excellent	-Information is factually correct, interesting, and beneficial/educational to the intended audience -Weather event or forecast is explained well enough for a general audience to understand and enjoy -Graphic is easy to read, with a polished, appealing, and professional look

Social Media Posts: scoring guidance for other types of submissions may be useful, dependent on the nature of the social post's content (e.g. a video tweet, a text tweet thread, a Facebook post with graphic)

1	Poor	-Forecast is grossly inaccurate -Important information, such as a watch or warning, is missing -Opinions are offered in place of sources, data, or statistics
2	Substandard	-Forecast fails to capture the full forecast, e.g. the range of possibilities -Important information, such as a watch or warning, is not presented in proper context -Opinion-slanting language is used inappropriately (but universally-shared opinions like "miserable 110° heat" are acceptable)
3	Fair	-Forecast is accurate and understandable at a basic level -Information is properly presented, but does not add further value for the audience
4	Very Good	-Forecast is accurate and actionable

		-Information is clear and easy to read, while adding value for the audience by putting the information into proper context
5	Excellent	-Forecast is accurate and provides unique value to the intended audience -Information is presented in a compelling and memorable way