

AGRONOMY FEEDS THE WORLD VIDEO CONTEST

Eligible contestants: Submitter must be an ASA undergraduate student member – all videography, photography, and editing must be done by undergraduate students, but other members/agronomists can be interviewed.

Video content requirements

Videos should target the following messages:

1. How are we going to feed a growing world population?
2. How do we grow food sustainably? To protect the environment?
3. What does the public need to know about growing organic crops and vegetables and/or why is there a price discrepancy between food grown organically vs large scale?"
4. How is food quality determined? Example: Nutritious food vs empty food – many people do not know that one tomato/corn/edamame might have different nutritional values based on soil health?

Other requirements:

1. At the beginning of the video: student name/s, that they are an agronomy student, and school, which state school is in. Example: "Hi, I'm FirstName LastName, a student at X university/collegestudying X. Today I'm going to explain (list item above 1-4)..." Or if multiple students, "we are students at X".
2. Within the video, it must be stated by someone in the video: "agronomy feeds the world" at least twice. Example: after their intro – "I'm going to explain X and how agronomy feeds the world." And then at the end, "thanks for listening about how agronomy feeds the world".

Video length: 90 seconds or less

Prize Selection Format: See rubric below.

Prizes: One winner for each message will win \$500
Honorable mentions for each message will receive \$100.

Restrictions: Must be original material created by undergraduate members with only one video entry per member. A team may submit a video and those on the team will not be eligible to submit another video. Videos must not be previously submitted elsewhere. Music used in the submission must be original and/or not require additional clearances. Profane language, violence, sex or personal attacks on people or organizations should be avoided. Submitters shall not violate copyright laws and/or using brand names or logos other than the ASA, and/or SASES logos. Release forms for each person featured in your video should be obtained as these forms and the original video file will be required if you win. Videos that are submitted without an entry form or after the deadline will not be judged. By entering the contest, the applicant grants ASA, CSSA and SSSA a perpetual, royalty-free license to use your video and also grant permission for ASA, CSSA and SSSA to edit, modify, format, or adapt your video. Finalists further grant the organizations the right to display video entries on third party sites for promotional purposes.

How to enter: To enter, the applicant will visit: <https://www.agronomy.org/students/contests/feed-the-world> and follow the onscreen submission process which will require the full name of the student member, valid email address, daytime telephone number and the college or university official SASES club name (if applicable).

Deadline: November 1, 2016

Judging Rubric for ASA Agronomy Feeds the World Student Video Contest 2016

Length of Video (90 second maximum): _____

Integration with ASA message (list message): _____

10%—Organization and Framing: Does the video follow a clear and logical path for the audience?

| 5 | 4 | 3 Points | 2 Points | 1 Point |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Organization is explicit, skillful, and unique. It enhances the content delivery. On time. | Organization is clearly observable, making the talk cohesive. On time. | Organization is intermittently observable within the talk. On time. | Organization is barely observable within the talk. Runs slightly over time. | Organization is NOT observable within the talk. Runs over time. |

30%—Message Content and Ideas: How memorably does the video present the specific ASA message

| 5 Points | 4 | 3 Points | 2 Points | 1 Point |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ideas and content are focused and extremely compelling. Holds attention. Vibrant and accurate. | Ideas and content are focused and interesting. Holds attention through most of the video. Accurate and provoking. | Ideas and content are relevant but not compelling. Hold sufficient attention. Factual. | Ideas and content are loosely connected. Holds mild attention. Generates little thought. Some factual errors. | Ideas and content are irrelevant to monthly theme. Not compelling or memorable. Lack of accuracy. |

30%—Delivery: Does the video utilize good visuals and sound quality that contribute to a compelling message?

| 5 | 4 | 3 Points | 2 Points | 1 |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Delivery techniques make talk compelling. | Delivery techniques make talk interesting and engaging. | Delivery techniques make talk understandable.. | Delivery techniques are distracting | Delivery techniques make talk hard to follow. |

30%—Production Quality and Visuals: What is the overall production quality of the video?

| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 Points | 1 Point |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Video has smooth transitions and edits. Sound is easy to hear. All elements (visuals, music, lighting, background, etc.) add to the video's message. | Video is well- planned with competent edits. Sound is easy to hear. Most elements blend with the talk's message. Visuals complement talk. | Transitions and edits are competent. Sound is mostly easy to hear. Minor distractions from other elements exist. | Transitions and edits are rudimentary. Sound is reasonably balanced. Some elements are distracting. | Transitions are choppy and have distracting edits. Sound is of poor quality. Many elements distract from the talk's message. |