

Visual Resources Review Rubric

Guidelines for those submitting images.			
Questions to Consider	Acceptable	Need revision	Unacceptable
Format			
Format of the Legend – Are all sections included? 1. Authors , Affiliation, Email 2. Descriptive Title 3. Detailed Description 4. Method: 5. Relevance (Instructional Value) 6. Core Theme 7. Reference Section	All Sections included.	Some sections are not included.	The format of the legend does not follow the MicrobeLibrary format.
Image Detail:			
Scientific Accuracy and Completeness of the Image/Animation			
Does the image/animation include a labeled version, with relevant items clearly and accurately identified?	A labeled version is included. All items are appropriately and accurately labeled.	The labeled items are not clearly or appropriately labeled.	The image needs a labeled version and no labeled version is provided.
Quality, Clarity and Appeal of the Image/Animation			
Does the image/animation meet the visual standards of the collection?	The image/animation is crisp and clear and easy to visualize.	The image is a little bit unclear, but is definitely acceptable.	The image is very unfocused and I can't tell what I'm supposed to see..
Are all relevant items/structures in the image easily detected?	Every single item is easily detected.	Most of the items are easily detected.	It is difficult to differentiate or discern anything in this image.
Legend Detail			
Section 1: Authors			
Are all authors with complete affiliation and email included?	Authors with complete affiliation and email are included.	Aspects of the author and affiliation are missing.	Authors, affiliation and email are not included.
Section 2: Descriptive Title			
Does the title accurately reflect the submission?	The title describes the submission perfectly.	Other needed information is not included in the title.	The title does not describe the submission.
Section 3: Detailed Description			
Still Image: Are important features of the image explained or highlighted?	Important features of the image/animation are explained or highlighted.	Some important and relevant information about the image are not highlighted.	The legend does not provide important details needed for description of the image

Animation: Is the legend detailed and include a “voice over”?	For animations – each step is explained in a “voice over” style legend.	For animations: There are steps in the animation that are poorly explained.	For animations: The legend does not give the needed information to allow one to understand the steps of the animation.
Section 4: Method			
Is method of sample collection and preparation described? Are any needed references from peer-reviewed articles cited? For animation or artwork: is the program for the design of the animation indicated?	Sample source, collection and preparation are described in a clear and easy to understand manner. For Non-standard methods, references are cited. For non-standard, unpublished methods, details are provided. For animations/artwork: the program used for design is indicated	There is some mention of the methods used for sample collection or design of the image but this section is incomplete. Or references that are needed are not cited.	The information provided does not explain how the image/animation was prepared or how the sample was collected.
Section 5: Relevance/Instructional Value			
Is relevance of the submission indicated? Is information on ecological, clinical, industrial or research significance provided?	Ecological, clinical, industrial or research significance are clearly and concisely described.	Some relevance is indicated but more details are needed.	Relevance or importance of the submission is not included.
Section 6: Core Theme			
Does this image fit within a Core Theme of the collection?	The image directly deals with core theme content well. The appropriate Core Theme is indicated.	The core theme does not seem appropriate for the image	No core theme is indicated.
Section 7: References			
Are references needed? Are needed references provided in ASM format?	Any references that are necessitated by the description or method included and are provided in ASM format.	References are needed but not all that are needed are included. Citations are lacking important information.	References are needed but none are provided.
Legend- Scientific Accuracy, Clarity, Audience and length			
Is legend written so a student of biology with little background in microbiology could understand? Are all terms defined? Are there any spelling errors?	Yes, most students/faculty with a basic background in biology could easily understand the legend. Any difficult terms are explained. There are no typographical/spelling errors.	There are a few words that someone who is unfamiliar with microbiology may not know.	The legend is total jargon that only a trained specialist could understand.
Is the legend scientifically accurate?	The legend is absolutely accurate.	Most of the information seems correct (list changes below)	There is critical misinformation in this legend.

Is the legend concisely written?	The legend is of appropriate length for a legend. The legend does not appear to be a full report or curriculum submission.	More information than that required by the seven legends categories is included. The legend appears to be a curriculum resource or a short paper.	The legend grossly exceeds the length that would be reasonable for a detailed figure legend.
----------------------------------	--	---	--

Overall recommendation:

- o Accept
- o Needs modifications
- o Reject

revision August 2008