ART 341 – DIGITAL ANIMATION

Rubric - Kinetic Typography (Adobe Animate)

HOW THIS RUBRIC WORKS

This rubric rewards visible timing decisions, typographic clarity, and animation craft—not last-minute effects. Scores are based on both the final video and the evidence you provide of how you built it.

• Each category lists evidence expectations. If evidence is missing, the score in that category is capped—even if the final video looks polished.

• Legibility and pacing are non-negotiable: motion must support reading, not obscure it.

• Audio edits must be intentional and clean. Abrupt cuts must be justified by the concept (and still sound controlled).

• If AI tools are used, disclosure must be complete and the work must still show your authorship and decision-making.

CONCEPT + TYPOGRAPHIC SYSTEM (15 PTS)

What is assessed:

• Clear message intent and concept that is expressed through type, timing, and hierarchy (not decoration).

• Intentional typographic system (type choice, scale, weights, spacing rules) that stays consistent.

• Readable hierarchy: viewers can tell what matters first/second/third without pausing the video.

Evidence expected:

• Storyboard/thumbnails showing major beats and emphasis decisions.

• A short system note (typeface(s), basic scale, color plan, and any rules you followed).

Exemplary (13–15: Concept is specific and cohesive; typographic system is intentional; hierarchy reads

instantly and stays consistent throughout.)

Proficient (10–12: Concept and system are clear; minor inconsistencies in hierarchy or typographic discipline.)

Developing (6–9: Concept is generic or underdeveloped; system/hierarchy is inconsistent or occasionally unclear.)

Insufficient (0–5: Message and hierarchy are confusing; typography choices feel random or undermine readability.)

TIMING + SYNC TO AUDIO (20 PTS)

What is assessed:

• Rhythm and pacing match the structure of the audio (beats, phrases, transitions).

• Text entrances/exits feel motivated; scene changes land cleanly on musical or narrative moments.

• Timing supports comprehension (enough dwell time to read; emphasis aligns to meaning).

Evidence expected:

• Edited audio file (or export) demonstrating the final duration (60–90 seconds).

• Timing sheet or annotated waveform with timestamps that map to major text events.

• A short note explaining one timing problem you solved (before/after).

Exemplary (18–20: Sync is precise; pacing feels professional; transitions land cleanly; readability is protected even at faster moments.)

Proficient (14–17: Timing is solid with minor drift, rushed sections, or a few awkward transitions.)

Developing (8–13: Sync is inconsistent; pacing is uneven; multiple sections feel rushed or disconnected from audio structure.)

Insufficient (0–7: Poor alignment to audio; transitions feel random; text is frequently unreadable due to pacing.)

ANIMATION CRAFT (25 PTS)

What is assessed:

• Use of motion principles (easing, arcs, anticipation/follow-through where appropriate) to create believable movement.

• Motion supports meaning: scale, position, rotation, and spacing changes are purposeful.

• Transitions are controlled (not default effects); motion tweens and keyframes are used intentionally.

Evidence expected:

• Adobe Animate file shows clear keyframes/tweens and sensible layer organization.

• At least three checkpoint exports (block/mid/near-final) showing refinement over time.

• Examples of easing decisions (notes or screenshots) where you refined motion to improve clarity.

Exemplary (23–25: Motion feels intentional and refined; easing is controlled; transitions are original and readable; animation choices amplify meaning.)

Proficient (19–22: Strong craft with a few rough edges (stiff motion, occasional overuse of effects, minor spacing/timing issues).)

Developing (12–18: Basic animation present but motion often feels generic, abrupt, or effect-driven; readability suffers in places.)

Insufficient (0–11: Motion feels random or unresolved; heavy reliance on effects; poor spacing/easing; frequent readability failures.)

TECHNICAL EXECUTION IN ADOBE ANIMATE (15 PTS)

What is assessed:

• Clean file structure: symbols, layers, naming, and grouping support iteration and revision.

• Efficient production choices: reusable elements, organized timelines, and manageable complexity.

• Visual quality is controlled (aliasing issues minimized, consistent resolution, no accidental distortions).

Evidence expected:

• Organized .fla file with labeled layers and grouped sequences.

• Brief production notes: how you structured scenes, reused elements, and managed complexity.

Exemplary (13–15: File is clean, efficient, and professional; structure clearly supports iteration and future edits.)

Proficient (10–12: File is mostly organized; minor clutter or inefficiencies but still manageable.)

Developing (6–9: Organization is inconsistent; file structure makes iteration difficult; avoidable technical issues appear.)

Insufficient (0–5: Disorganized file; technical problems substantially harm output or prevent revisions.)

AUDIO EDITING + EXPORT QUALITY (10 PTS)

What is assessed:

• Audio is edited cleanly to match 60–90 seconds and supports the pacing of the typography.

• Export settings are correct (H.264 MP4, consistent resolution, stable playback, acceptable audio levels).

• No missing audio, clipping, or obvious compression artifacts that undermine professionalism.

Evidence expected:

• Final MP4 export meeting duration and format requirements.

• Proof of audio edit (timeline screenshot, edit notes, or exported waveform).

Exemplary (9–10: Audio edit is seamless and intentional; export is clean and platform-ready with strong technical choices.)

Proficient (7–8: Audio and export are solid; minor level/transition issues or small technical inconsistencies.)

Developing (4–6: Audio edit is rough or distracting; export has quality issues but is still viewable.)

Insufficient (0–3: Audio/edit/export problems significantly degrade the piece or fail basic requirements.)

PROCESS EVIDENCE + ITERATION (10 PTS)

What is assessed:

• Visible progression from plan to block to refined animation (not a single last-minute render).

• Decision trail explains what changed and why (legibility, timing, hierarchy, motion improvements).

• Reflection shows learning: identifies at least one mistake and how it was corrected.

Evidence expected:

• Checkpoint exports (block/mid/near-final) OR dated screenshots showing evolution.

• 1-page reflection addressing timing, hierarchy, and animation revisions.

Exemplary (9–10: Clear iteration trail with specific improvements and strong self-critique; process demonstrates real learning.)

Proficient (7–8: Iteration evidence is present; reflection is credible but less specific or less insightful.)

Developing (4–6: Minimal iteration evidence; reflection is vague; changes appear superficial.)

Insufficient (0–3: Little/no evidence of process; unclear authorship; reflection missing or non-credible.)

AI COMPLIANCE + AUTHORSHIP (5 PTS)

What is assessed:

• AI use stays within allowed scope (idea support, phrasing options, proofreading—not generating finished animation).

• Disclosure is complete (tool, purpose, representative prompt/input, and what you changed).

• You can explain your own decisions and reproduce key steps if asked.

Evidence expected:

• AI Use Note attached with submission (or "No AI used" statement).

• Prompts/inputs included if AI was used.

Exemplary (5: Full compliance and transparent disclosure; authorship is clear and defensible.)

Proficient (4: Mostly compliant; small gaps in disclosure or clarity but no integrity concerns.)

Developing (2–3: Disclosure incomplete or AI use blurs authorship; requires clarification.)

Insufficient (0–1: Undisclosed or out-of-scope AI use; authorship concerns; category earns minimal credit.)

NON-NEGOTIABLES + INTEGRITY NOTES

• Duration outside 60–90 seconds cannot earn above Developing in Audio Editing + Export Quality.

• Missing planning artifacts or checkpoint evidence caps Process Evidence + Iteration at Developing.

• If the type is frequently unreadable due to pacing/contrast/scale, Timing + Sync and Animation Craft are capped at Developing.

• Fabricated process evidence, fake timestamps, or undisclosed AI use results in a zero for the affected category and requires resubmission.

GRADING GRID

Category	Pts Possible	Student Score
Concept + Typographic System (message, hierarchy, consistency)	15	
Timing + Sync to Audio (beats, pacing, transitions)	20	
Animation Craft (easing, motion principles, readability)	25	
Technical Execution in Animate (organization, symbols, tweens)	15	
Audio Editing + Export Quality (duration, levels, codecs)	10	
Process Evidence + Iteration (checkpoints, decision trail)	10	
AI Compliance + Authorship (policy + disclosure)	5	
TOTAL	100	