

Stanford						
COMMUNICATIONS		TEAM SCORE				POINTS
		APPROACH	EQUALS	EXCEEDS	ECLIPSES	/100
CONTEST CRITERIA		0-60	61-80	81-90	91-100	
<b>A FINAL WEBSITE</b>						
1	Was the site submitted by the deadline?				X	
2	Is the design appealing (graphics, photos, colors, and typography)?		X			
3	Is the information architecture easy to use, consistent, and comprehensible? Does it present a logical hierarchy of information?		X			
4	Are graphical elements easy to use, consistent, and well integrated with content and design?		X			
5	Does the Web site meet minimum coding requirements?			X		
6	Is the Web site usable by people of all abilities?		X			
7	Does the team communicate its messages appropriately to online audiences?		X			
8	Does the team employ original and creative methods to capture users' interests and engage online visitors?		X			
9	Does the site comply with rules 10-2 and 10-3?				X	
<b>B. PUBLIC EXHIBIT MATERIALS</b>						
1	Do the on-site communications materials (signage and handout) comply with rules 10-2 and 10-3?				X	
2	Did the house pass all on-site inspections in time to be opened to the public during required public hours?				X	
3	Are messages communicated appropriately?		X			
4	Do materials use correct spelling and grammar?				X	
5	Do the handout and signage demonstrate originality?		X			
6	Do materials both educate and engage audiences?		X			
<b>C. PUBLIC EXHIBIT PRESENTATION</b>						

1	Does the team adequately offer two presentations for the jurors' evaluation: one that represents a comprehensive, personalized "tour" appropriate for times when visitors are few and another that represents a fast, yet informative, self-guided exhibit that accommodates large crowds and long lines?				X	
2	Are both on-site presentations for the public informative? Interesting? Accessible by people of all abilities?			X		
1	Has the team planned original and creative methods to control lines and wait times and to engage visitors waiting in line during public hours? Are these methods effective?		X			
2	Are the team messages appropriate for the public?				X	
<b>C. VIDEO WALKTHROUGH</b>						
1	Does the walkthrough provide viewers with interesting and informative video of the team's house?				X	
2	Does the walkthrough include an audio narrative that explains to viewers what they're seeing and describes the philosophy behind the design?				X	
3	Does the video walkthrough closely represent the as-built house on the competition site?				X	
4	Has the team followed formatting requirements?				X	
5	Has the team provided a verbatim transcript to meet Section 508 Accessibility standards?				X	
<b>Total</b>						86.0

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The Stanford team created a unique story about a car to make an analogy about the core of its house. This was accompanied by a high-production-value brochure reminiscent of new car brochures, that demonstrated excellent writing. This, accompanied with a video that included great renderings of the house as well as stock footage and animation, resulted in an overall high-quality communications effort.