



The Prix d'Excellence is CCAE's annual advancement awards program, recognizing outstanding achievements in Canadian advancement.

For questions, please contact the CCAE Office at <a href="mailto:prix@ccaecanada.org">prix@ccaecanada.org</a> or 613-531-9213.

## **New for 2025**

CCAE is developing a completely online submission site this year with a planned open date of January 27. Please note this date is tentative and will be confirmed shortly. The 2025 submission package, including details on entry guidleines, how to submit, and links to the online submission form will be shared soon.



## 2025 Prix d'Excellence Category Details

## Category 1: Best Alumni Event

Eligibility: This category includes individual alumni events such as social or networking activities, educational alumni events, and alumni receptions. Events may be annual or one-time, virtual or inperson. Events related to fundraising or development should be submitted in Category #4.

#### Additional Judging Criteria:

 Judges will look for interest, attendance, volunteerism, , uniqueness, and impact on the institution.

## Category 2: Best Alumni Initiative

Eligibility: Entries may include one-time activities or initiatives that take place over a period of time. Examples include alumni strategies, communications, programs, award activities, services, benefits programs, etc. Alumni events should be submitted in Category #1.

#### Additional Judging Criteria:

• Judges will look for participation, uniqueness, strategic outcomes, and impact on the institution.

## Category 3: Best Young Alumni and/or Student Initiative

Eligibility: Entries may include one-time activities or initiatives that take place over a period of time, including student and young alumni strategies, communications, programs, award activities, services, community relations, and benefits programs. Student and young alumni events should be submitted in Category #1.

#### Additional Judging Criteria:

Judges will look for evidence of effective planning that incorporates the views and preferences
of students / young alumni; innovative ideas; and conclusive evidence of success including
participation, uniqueness, strategic outcomes, and impact on the institution.

## Category 4: Best Fundraising Event

Eligibility: This category includes one-time events or a series of activities (virtual or in-person) relating to a fundraising program, such as donor recognition celebrations, gift announcements, campaign events (launches, milestones, closing events), annual fund events, and other related fundraising-focused events.

- Judges will look for interest, attendance, volunteerism, any media coverage, uniqueness, and impact on the institution.
- Judges will look for funds raised, participation, and impact on the institution.
- Judges will look for participation, uniqueness, strategic outcomes, and impact on the institution.





## Category 5: Best Fundraising Initiative

Eligibility: Entries may include one-time activities or initiatives that take place over a period of time, and can reflect fundraising at any target level, including major or planned giving fundraising. Examples include annual fund strategies, proposals, solicitation communications; acquisition, renewal and cultivation programs.

Fundraising events should be submitted in Category # 4; Fundraising materials should be submitted in Category #6. Annual Giving/Giving Day Initiatives should be submitted in Category #7. Audiences can be internal (staff, faculty, administration) or external (students, parents, community, donors) etc.

### Additional Judging Criteria:

• Judges will look for funds raised, participation, uniqueness, strategic outcomes, and impact on the institution.

## Category 6: Best Fundraising Campaign Materials (print or online)

Eligibility: This category recognizes excellence in fundraising materials designed to attract support for major institutional fundraising initiatives such as a capital, anniversary, endowments, or research campaign. This includes the design of materials connected to announcements, recognition, stewardship, etc.

### Additional Judging Criteria:

Judges will look for clarity in fundraising goals; the writing, design, structure and imagery of the
materials; and how these all combine to capture the unique qualities of the institution, raise funds
and/or build relationships with donors.

## Category 7: Best Annual Giving/Giving Day Initiative

Eligibility: Entries may include one-time activities or initiatives that take place over a period of time, including annual giving strategies, giving days, communications, programs, award activities, services, community relations, and benefits programs. Annual Giving Events should be submitted under Category #2.

- Judges will look for funds raised, participation, and impact on the institution.
- Judges will look for evidence of effective planning and fundraising strategy.
- The judges will also consider the amount raised, the percent of donors who gave (including new and renewed donors) and the impact of the initiative on the institution and its students.





## Category 8: Best Special Event

Eligibility: Included in this category are individual one-time (non-annual) special events (virtual or in-person) such as open houses, building dedications, and anniversary galas aimed at various constituencies. Audiences can include specific communities such as international, LGBTQ2SIA+, cultural, racial, disabled, and other external and internal communities (staff recognition, community awareness, community recognition). Alumni or development events, recurring open houses, and annual events should be submitted in either Category #1 or Category #2. Indigenous or Reconciliation Events should be submitted in Category #15.

### Additional Judging Criteria:

• Judges will look for interest, attendance, volunteerism, any media coverage, uniqueness, and impact on the institution.

## Category 9: Best Special Initiative

Eligibility: Entries can be one-time, programs or initiatives that take place over a period of time. This includes all initiatives related to ways institutions are moving forward in their EDIBAJ & LGBTQ2SIA+, accessibility, strategies & connections, both internally and externally. Audiences can include specific communities such as international, LGBTQ2SIA+, cultural, racial, disabled, and other external and internal communities (staff recognition, community awareness, community recognition). Indigenous or Reconciliation Initiatives should be submitted in Category #14.

#### Additional Judging Criteria:

- Judges will look at the ways institutions involved students & community
- Judges will look at the ways institutions involved diverse community members
- Judges will look for evidence of effective planning, innovative ideas, and conclusive evidence of success in reaching the intended audience.
- Judges will look for how the initiative emphasized a tie-in to advancement.
- Judges will look for a successful connection to the audience and LGBTQ+ or diverse community
  members, and how this mirrors your overall departmental or institutional strategic goals in relation
  to the indigenous community.

## Category 10: Best Donor Relations/Stewardship Initiative

Eligibility: Entries may be one-time activities or initiatives that take place over a period of time, including initiatives related to donor recognition, appreciation, and stewardship; donor/accountability reporting; customer service; or other donor-focused initiatives. Donor events should be entered into Category #4. Audiences can be internal (staff, faculty, administration) or external (students, parents, community, donors) etc.

- Where applicable, judges will look for funds raised, participation, and impact on the institution.
- Where applicable judges will look for how this initiative fits within the overall donor relations strategy.





## Category 11: Best Report to Donors

Eligibility: Entries in this category may be institutional or departmental and may include either digital or printed pieces. This award is based on excellence in concept, graphic design, layout and editorial content in communicating the institution's sense of accountability to its donors and other key constituents.

### Judging Criteria:

- Judges will look at the writing and editing within your entry form, and the alignment with best practices in donor communication and stewardship; and how these all combine to capture the unique qualities of the institution.
- Judges will look for information regarding all expenses related to design, printing, freelance photography and writing in the budget.
- Layout, design, and imagery will be judged based on your selected creative/visual component select this visual piece wisely, and review Appendix A for more information.

## Category 12: Best Advancement Services Initiative

Eligibility: Initiatives may include one-time activities or initiatives that take place over a period of time, such as best practice in gift/data entry, prospect research, donations processing, receipting, database management, performance management, and advancement service functions specific to the institution.

### Additional Judging Criteria:

• Judges will look for evidence of effective planning, innovative ideas, collaboration with other units/ departments, and conclusive evidence of success, including impact on the institution.

## Category 13: Best Community Outreach Initiative

Eligibility: This category includes initiatives that involve internal and/or external community members in the life and work of your institution, that enhance the relationship between your institution and the community within which it resides. Examples include service-learning outreach initiatives, local collaborative fundraising drives, community literacy programs, and student/community volunteer interactions.

- Judges will look for a notable, positive increase in the relationship between your institution and the community within which it resides.
- Judges will look for information on the community and its connection to the initiative.





## Category 14: Best Indigenous/Reconciliation Initiative

Eligibility: Entries can be one-time, programs or initiatives that take place over a period of time. This includes initiatives related to ways institutions are moving forward in their reconciliation journey.

### Additional Judging criteria:

- Judges will look at the ways institutions involved students & community
- Judges will look at the ways institutions involved local Indigenous community members
- Judges will look for evidence of effective planning, innovative ideas, and conclusive evidence of success in reaching the intended audience.
- Judges will look for how the initiative emphasized a tie-in to advancement.
- Judges will look for a successful connection to the audience and Indigenous community
  members, and how this mirrors your overall departmental or institutional strategic goals in relation
  to the indigenous community.

## Category 15: Best Indigenous/Reconciliation Event

Eligibility: Entries can be one-time events, that take place over a period of time. This includes all events related to ways institutions are moving forward in their reconciliation journey.

#### Additional Judging criteria:

- Judges will look at the ways institutions involved students & community
- Judges will look at the ways institutions involved local Indigenous community members
- Judges will look for evidence of effective planning, innovative ideas, and conclusive evidence of success in reaching the intended audience.
- Judges will look for how the event emphasized a tie-in to advancement.
- Judges will look for a successful connection to the audience and Indigenous community members, and how this mirrors your overall departmental or institutional strategic goals in relation to the indigenous community.

## Category 16: Best Creativity on a Shoestring

Eligibility: This category recognizes innovative solutions / new and imaginative ideas that are modest in cost relative to your departmental budget and make the work of professionals in alumni relations, development, communications or public affairs easier or more effective. For information on what determines a shoestring budget, review the definition of terms within <u>Appendix A</u>.

- Judges will look for innovative ideas with an emphasis on creativity and conclusive evidence of success.
- Judges will assess uniqueness and creativity in the program and implementation, and cost of the new idea
  relative to the departmental budget. Please review Appendix A for what is considered a shoestring budget.
  Include staff time in the budget breakdown to give a more accurate scope of the initiative.





## Category 17: Best Marketing / Communications Initiative

Eligibility: Initiatives include communications, marketing, media relations or public relations initiatives for internal or external audiences, whether one-time or recurring initiatives that demonstrate overall excellence or innovation in methods used to engage and influence external or internal constituencies.

### Additional Judging Criteria:

- Judges will look for evidence of effective planning, innovative ideas, and conclusive evidence of success in engaging and influencing target constituents
- Judges will look for a summary of any responses by target constituents and the impact on the institution.

## Category 18: Best Use of Social Media

Eligibility: This category recognizes how advancement professionals are using social media strategies and new technologies to build constituent relationships. Examples include effective use of (videos, posts, stories, reels) in publicly available platforms such as blogging, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram, Snapchat, LinkedIn, TikTok, etc.; and/or the use and development of independent strategies such as promoted posts, online community building, photo contests, or new implementations.

### Additional Judging Criteria:

- Judges will look for information regarding ownership/authorship of the account, and a short description why they used the selected platform based on its functionality and objectives.
- Judges will look for conclusive evidence of success, including measurable engagement of target audiences, evidence of user-generated content, integration across platforms and with other sites, and impact on the institution.
- Judges will look for project analytics as evidence of success and growth.

## Category 19: Best Podcast

Eligibility: This category recognizes how advancement professionals are using podcasts to build constituent relationships. Examples include effective use of podcasts in publicly available platforms such as itunes, spotify, YouTube, etc.;

- Judges will look for information regarding ownership/authorship of the account, and a short Judges will look for information regarding ownership/authorship of the account, and a short description why they used the selected platform based on its functionality and objectives.
- Judges will look for conclusive evidence of success, including measurable engagement of target audiences, evidence of user-generated content, integration across platforms and with other sites, and impact on the institution.
- Judges will look for project analytics as evidence of success and growth.





## Category 20: Best Website

Eligibility: This category recognizes excellence in the development of institutional websites, internal and external sites, apps & mobile sites, micro-sites, constituent-specific portals, and interactive web services. E-mail communications should be submitted to Category #24; social media in Category #18.

#### Judging Criteria:

- Judges will look at the efficacy and appropriateness of the website for the intended audience; design, creativity, and how these combine to capture the unique qualities of the institution and its brand identity.
- Judges will look for information within your entry form on how the website aligns with overall
  institutional branding, commitment to EDII and demonstration of ease of navigation and
  accessibility.
- Judges will assess the overall effectiveness in communicating information or a message; usability and navigation; mobile accessibility; innovation, interactivity, and design.
- Judges will also look for a description of the process used to develop the website.

## Category 21: Best Use Of Video/Film - Engagement

Eligibility: Eligible initiatives include one-time activities or initiatives that take place over a period of time. Entries may include videos and films of no more than 5 minutes in length produced under the theme of constituent engagement. Examples include alumni engagement, student engagement, jovial purposes of engaging community audiences, alumni reunions, and donor recognition.

Creative/Visual component requirement: In addition to including the key creative or visual component on page four of the entry form, entries in this category are required to include a URL to the video (or a secure location where judges can download the entry) to be used for scoring in the judging process. Please also note the ideal viewing platform for the entry. Only include the direct URL to the video, additional or companion videos should not be included and will not be judged.

- Judges will look for innovative ideas, content, script, videography, soundtrack, editing, and conclusive evidence of success based on viewer engagement and the impact on the intended audience.
- Judges will look for examples of collaboration amongst departments.
- Metrics both quantitative & qualitative should include a connection to the goal of engaging the intended constituents, the overall success of the video in relation to institutional strategies.





## Category 22: Best Use Of Video/Film - Information

Eligibility: Eligible initiatives include one-time activities or initiatives that take place over a period of time. Entries may include videos and films of no more than 5 minutes in length produced under the theme of information. Examples include president addresses, changes, safety, town halls.

Creative/Visual component requirement: In addition to including the key creative or visual component on page four of the entry form, entries in this category are required to include a URL to the video (or a secure location where judges can download the entry) to be used for scoring in the judging process. Please also note the ideal viewing platform for the entry. Only include the direct URL to the video, additional or companion videos should not be included and will not be judged.

### Judging Criteria:

- Judges will look for innovative ideas, content, script, videography, soundtrack, editing, and conclusive evidence of success based on viewer engagement and the impact on the intended audience.
- Judges will look for examples of collaboration amongst departments.
- Metrics both quantitative & qualitative should include a connection to the goal of the information shared to the intended constituents, the overall success of the video in relation to institutional strategies.

## Category 23: Best Use Video/Film - Announcements

Eligibility: Eligible initiatives include one-time activities or initiatives that take place over a period of time. Entries may include videos and films of no more than 5 minutes in length produced under the theme of announcements. Examples include campaigns announcements, branding announcements, new building announcements, public relations announcements, leadership announcements.

Creative/Visual component requirement: In addition to including the key creative or visual component on page four of the entry form, entries in this category are required to include a URL to the video (or a secure location where judges can download the entry) to be used for scoring in the judging process. Please also note the ideal viewing platform for the entry. Only include the direct URL to the video, additional or companion videos should not be included and will not be judged.

- Judges will look for innovative ideas, content, script, videography, soundtrack, editing, and conclusive evidence of success based on viewer engagement and the impact on the intended audience.
- Judges will look for examples of collaboration amongst departments.
- Metrics both quantitative & qualitative should include a connection to the goal of the announcement, the intended constituents and the overall success of the video in relation to institutional strategies.





## Category 24: Best Publication (print or online)

Eligibility: This category includes all online or print general and special interest e-communications, newsletters, magazines, or other publications sent to alumni or other external audiences e.g., research, fundraising, alumni, or university magazines. Reports to Donors should be entered in Category #11; and printed newsletters or flyers in Category #27.

### Judging Criteria:

- Judges will look for information within your entry form, on how the publication aligns to institutional branding, demonstration of connection to overall institution values, and an explanation of choices made for the article.
- Judges will look for the information within your entry form to connect the inspiration, goals & message of the publication, and the reasons you choose the selected medium.
- Judges will not consider advertising revenues in the budget.
- The publication will be judged based on your selected page for the creative/visual component (pg. 4 of the template) select this page wisely, and review Appendix A for more information. Based on what is included in pg. 4 of the template, judges may be able to consider writing style, organization and clarity; the complexity of the subject; and the ability of the publication to present the material in a creative and compelling manner. You can include a url to the publication itself, however judges are basing the merit of the entry on this 4 page report template.

## Category 25: Best Feature Writing - English

Eligibility: This category recognizes excellence in reporting and writing for articles published in English in the 2024 calendar year. Articles may be on any topic but must have appeared in institutional (print or online) magazines, newspapers, newsletters or other publications for internal or external audiences. This category includes feature stories, news, editorials or articles written to explain important initiatives, profile significant persons or programs, persuade or clarify complex issues.

- Judges will consider writing style, organization and clarity; the complexity of the subject; and the ability of the writer to present the material in a creative and compelling manner.
- If the author is a freelance contributor, judges will assess the impact on the departmental budget.
- The written article will be judged based on your selected page for the creative/visual component (pg. 4 of the template) select this page wisely, and review Appendix A for more information. Based on what is included in pg. 4 of the template, judges may be able to consider writing style, organization and clarity; the complexity of the subject; and the ability of the writer to present the material in a creative and compelling manner. You can include a url to the article itself, however judges are basing the merit of the entry on this 4 page report template.





## Category 26: Best Feature Writing - French

Eligibility: This category recognizes excellence in reporting and writing for articles published in French in the 2024 calendar year. Articles may be on any topic but must have appeared in (print or online) institutional magazines, newspapers, newsletters or other publications for internal or external audiences. This category includes feature stories, news, editorials or articles written to explain important initiatives, profile significant persons or programs, persuade or clarify complex issues.

#### Judging Criteria:

- Judges will consider writing style, organization and clarity; the complexity of the subject; and the ability of the writer to present the material in a creative and compelling manner.
- If the author is a freelance contributor, judges will assess the impact on the departmental budget.
- The written article will be judged based on your selected page for the creative/visual component (pg. 4 of the template) select this page wisely, and review Appendix A for more information. Based on what is included in pg. 4 of the template, judges may be able to consider writing style, organization and clarity; the complexity of the subject; and the ability of the writer to present the material in a creative and compelling manner. You can include a url to the article itself, however judges are basing the merit of the entry on this 4 page report template..

### Category 27: Best Print Brochure, Newsletter, or Flyer

Eligibility: This category is for brochures, flyers, or newsletters that are printed. Audiences for brochures, newsletters or flyers may be internal or external, and all documents should be designed to convey information in a brief, interesting and effective manner. Online editions of the above should be submitted in Category #24.

### Judging Criteria:

- Judges will look at the writing and editing within your entry form, and how these all combine to capture the unique qualities of the institution.
- Layout, design, and imagery will be judged based on your selected creative/visual component select this visual piece wisely, and review Appendix A for more information.

## Category 28: Best Advertisement or Poster (online & print)

Eligibility: This award is given for achievement and excellence in print & digital advertisements or posters. Submissions may be a single item, or a series of ads or posters promoting a specific event, program, or other institutional initiative such as student recruitment, a grand opening, lecture series, or institutional image campaign. Ads or posters must have appeared in the 2024 calendar year.

- Judges will consider appropriate use of graphics, imagery and text for the intended audience
- Judges will consider design and creativity of the end product.
- If the advertisement or poster is a freelance contributor, judges will assess the impact on the departmental budget.





## Category 29: Best Photograph

Eligibility: This award recognizes the best original photograph to appear in an institutional publication. Black-and-white or colour photography may be entered. Photos must have been shot in 2023 or 2024 and published in 2024. Judges will evaluate uniqueness, technical quality, and creativity. Please showcase how the selected image relates to institutional objectives & goals.

- Judges will evaluate composition, technical quality, appropriateness for stated goals, and creativity.
- If the photographer is a freelance contributor, judges will assess the impact on the departmental budget
- Judges require a clear demonstration of both qualitative & quantitative metrics to determine the success of the image in relation to the associated cost of the image (ex. Licensing, photographer fees, etc.) AND it's relation to your overall departmental or institutional strategic goals.





## Appendix A – Definitions

Further details on the scoring of the items below can be found in Appendix B.

#### **Creative / Visual components**

ALL categories now include a creative or visual component, that will be judged under the following criteria under a point allotment of 5pts:

- Visual design/content quality
- Design/content uniqueness and relation to the institutional brand
- Overall design/content effectiveness in communicating the message based on:
  - Usability and functionality
  - Accessibility
  - Innovation & interactivity

For categories that do not have a specific creative visual, for example:

An event/initiative category, photos from the event/initiative (including team photos), invitations, signage both print & digital, or other elements can be used.

Reports or Writing categories, images of the cover, internal article pages or graphics can be used. In all instances please include the most compelling visual that highlights the project from a creative standpoint.

The entrant is required to select the best visual component of the project/initiative/event or the most important visual item of the piece. Failure to include a visual component will result in a score of 0/5 for this area within the judging rubric.

#### **Quantitative metrics**

Using statistical metrics show the success of the project in relation to its goal. These are measured through varying forms dependent on the project. Examples: Attendance, dollars raised, dollars pledged, financial investment vs. gain, click through rates, views, social media engagement, etc.

#### **Qualitative metrics**

Describe the quality of the entry, in relation to its success in comparison to its goal and objectives. These are metrics that look at value beyond clear-cut numbers. Examples: Observations on satisfaction, audience happiness, engagement etc.

#### **Budget**

All categories require a budget to be included in the entry form. This includes all costs of staff hours both external and internal. Note that internal staff costs and hours are to be included but not necessarily accounted for in consideration of a successful entry by the judges. Note: Taxes do not need to be included; If exact amounts are unknown estimated figures for internal staff can be supplied; Judges need to be able to relate the cost to the return on investment for the project.

#### **Shoestring budget**

Budgets for Category 16 will be reviewed based on the cost of the project falling between 4-6% of your specific departmental unit budget. You need to include this information in any budget information entered in the entry form. In the shoestring category, budget may outweigh quality. This definition includes departments with limited access to excess funding, and resources, "where creativity and human innovation trumps all". A detailed demonstration of budget is vital to all applicable entries.





# Appendix A – Definitions (cont.)

#### **Community Outreach**

The regional or targeted community that the project's goal relates to. This can include internal staff, students, alumni, regional communities, and external communities.

#### Impact on the institution / departmental strategies

The demonstration both using qualitative and quantitative metrics to determine the value of investment in the project to its outcome based on its intended goals and objectives.

#### **Thought Leadership**

The expression of ideas that demonstrate expertise in a particular field, area, or topic. This aligns with areas of best practices, benchmarking, innovation and big picture thinking.

#### **Young Alumni**

Alumni is defined by your institution's definition. To be considered young alumni they must have graduated within the last 5 years.

#### Best use of video categories

Engagement: main goal of the medium is to connect and involve the audience.

Information: main goal is to communicate a specific message to the audience.

Announcement: main goal is to provide an official overview statement to the audience.





# Appendix B – Judging Rubric

#### Quality and Organization, Weight = 3 points

- Was the entry well written and easy to understand
- Did the entry flow well, responding to all category and entry requirements
- Were there errors (grammar, syntax, spelling) found in the document
- Did the entry paint a good picture of the initiative
- Was the overview 150 words or less

#### **Budget Information Weight = 4 points**

- Did the entry include a detailed budget for the initiative, INCLUDING staff time and costs?
- Did the entry demonstrate a return on investment by demonstrating cost per dollar raised, cost per view, etc.?
- If the services were outsourced, was the impact on the departmental budget demonstrated?
- If applicable, was the budget for paid social media content and media production included in the budget?
- If applicable, did the analytics of paid content demonstrate a relevant return on investment?

#### Content and Category Requirements, Weight = 9 points

- Were the initiative's goals clearly explained?
- Were the initiative's goals linked to institutional/departmental mission/strategy?
- Did the entry demonstrate how this initiative fits within the institutional/departmental mission/strategy?
- Did the entry provide conclusive evidence of success?
- Were metrics provided that demonstrated return on investment?
- Was there a clear demonstration of qualitative metrics to determine the initiative's success and overall impact?
- Was there a clear demonstration of quantitative metrics to determine the initiative's success and overall impact?
- Did the entry identify its target audiences/stakeholders?
- Was there a clear connection between the audiences/stakeholders and the initiative's strategic goals?
- Did the initiative demonstrate a notable positive increase in the relationship between the institution and the community within which it resides?
- Did the entry thoroughly demonstrate and evaluate the initiative's implementation process, success & challenges?
- If applicable, did the entry demonstrate funds raised, participation, and impact on the institution?
- If the initiative is executed annually, does the entry demonstrate how it has changed, improved and/or adapted year over year?

#### **Best Practices & Thought Leadership**, Weight = 9 points

- Did the initiative demonstrate expertise in a particular field, area, or topic?
- Did the initiative demonstrate areas of benchmarking, innovation and big picture thinking?
- Did the initiative capture unique qualities of the institution?
- Did the initiative demonstrate collaboration amongst departments?
- Did the initiative demonstrate alignment with best practices in its industry (i.e. social media, MARCOM, events/meetings)?
- Did the initiative present uniqueness and/or creativity in its concept and implementation?
- Did the initiative demonstrate high quality or innovation in methods used to engage and influence the intended audience of the initiative?
- Did the initiative have a positive impact on the institution?
- Is this initiative innovative for the Institution as outlined in their entry form?





# Appendix B – Judging Rubric (cont.)

- Did this initiative demonstrate forward thinking as it relates to existing or potential Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Initiatives?
- If applicable, did the initiative demonstrate innovative ideas, content, script, photography/videography, soundtrack and/or editing?

#### Creative / Visual component, Weight = 5 points

- Did the provided materials give a good sense of the initiative and its success/execution?
- Were the provided materials compelling and of high quality?
- Did the provided materials highlight the unique qualities of the institution?
- Did the overall selected medium prove effective in communicating information or a message; usability and navigation; mobile accessibility; innovation, interactivity, and design?
- If applicable, does the layout suit the medium and the message?
- If applicable, do the creative materials connect to the institution's brand and image?
- If applicable, did the initiative demonstrate innovative ideas, content, script, photography/videography, soundtrack and/or editing?



