

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging/Scoring Guidance

## Category A: Soldier Communicator of the Year



### **6 +/- Superior**

National media-grade imagery and story-telling; mastery of video, photo and print techniques; viral potential of communication impact seamlessly nested with higher HQ objectives; Zero grammatical or style errors

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

Army-level imagery and story-telling; video, photo and print techniques far exceed fundamentals; potential for global reach aligned with Army objectives; limited grammatical or style errors

### **4 +/- Solid**

Quality imagery and story-telling; demonstrates good application of video, photo and print techniques; shows potential for service-wide communication impact; noticeable grammatical and style errors degrade submission

### **3 +/- Average**

Average imagery and story-telling; reflects acceptable application of video, photo and print techniques; localized communication impact; consistent grammatical and style errors degrade submission

### **2 +/- Marginal**

Marginal imagery and story-telling; reflects gaps in application of video, photo and print techniques; no communication impact; significant grammatical and style errors degrade submission

### **1**

### **Substandard**

Substandard imagery and story-telling; unacceptable application of video, photo and print techniques; negative communication impact; unpublishable grammatical and style errors degrade submission

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging/Scoring Guidance



## Category B: Civilian Communicator of the Year

### **6 +/- Superior**

National media-grade imagery and story-telling; mastery of video, photo and print techniques; viral potential of communication impact seamlessly nested with higher HQ objectives; Zero grammatical or style errors

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

Army-level imagery and story-telling; video, photo and print techniques far exceed fundamentals; potential for global reach aligned with Army objectives; limited grammatical or style errors

### **4 +/- Solid**

Quality imagery and story-telling; demonstrates good application of video, photo and print techniques; shows potential for service-wide communication impact; noticeable grammatical and style errors degrade submission

### **3 +/- Average**

Average imagery and story-telling; reflects acceptable application of video, photo and print techniques; localized communication impact; consistent grammatical and style errors degrade submission

### **2 +/- Marginal**

Marginal imagery and story-telling; reflects gaps in application of video, photo and print techniques; no communication impact; significant grammatical and style errors degrade submission

### **1**

### **Substandard**

Substandard imagery and story-telling; unacceptable application of video, photo and print techniques; negative communication impact; unpublishable grammatical and style errors degrade submission

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging/Scoring Guidance

## Category C: Civilian Graphic Designer of the Year



### **6 +/- Superior**

National media-grade graphics and communication impact; pushes envelope of form without sacrificing professional standards; highly original and varied content that contributes to higher HQ efforts

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

Army-level graphics and communication impact; techniques far exceed fundamentals; quality content applicable for service platforms

### **4 +/- Solid**

Quality graphics and some communication impact; above average techniques; appropriate for unit-level platforms

### **3 +/- Average**

Average graphics with limited impact; average techniques

### **2 +/- Marginal**

Marginal graphics with no impact; reflects significant gaps in technique

### **1**

### **Substandard**

Substandard graphics; unacceptable techniques; potential to degrade communication efforts

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging/Scoring Guidance

## Category D: Military Graphic Designer of the Year



### **6 +/- Superior**

National media-grade graphics and communication impact; pushes envelope of form without sacrificing professional standards; highly original and varied content that contributes to higher HQ efforts

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

Army-level graphics and communication impact; techniques far exceed fundamentals; quality content applicable for service platforms

### **4 +/- Solid**

Quality graphics and some communication impact; above average techniques; appropriate for unit-level platforms

### **3 +/- Average**

Average graphics with limited impact; average techniques

### **2 +/- Marginal**

Marginal graphics with no impact; reflects significant gaps in technique

### **1**

### **Substandard**

Substandard graphics; unacceptable techniques; potential to degrade communication efforts

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging/Scoring Guidance



## Category E: Civilian Photographer of the Year

### **6 +/- Superior**

National media-grade imagery and story-telling; mastery of photo techniques; viral potential of communication impact seamlessly nested with higher HQ objectives; Zero grammatical or style errors in captions

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

Army-level imagery and story-telling; photo techniques far exceed fundamentals; potential for global reach aligned with Army objectives; limited grammatical and style errors in captions

### **4 +/- Solid**

Quality imagery and story-telling; demonstrates good application of photo techniques; shows potential for service-wide communication impact; noticeable grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

### **3 +/- Average**

Average imagery and story-telling; reflects acceptable application of photo techniques; localized communication impact; consistent grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

### **2 +/- Marginal**

Marginal imagery and story-telling; reflects gaps in application of photo techniques; no communication impact; significant grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

### **1**

### **Substandard**

Substandard imagery and story-telling; unacceptable application of photo techniques; negative communication impact; unpublishable grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging/Scoring Guidance

## Category F: Spc. Hilda I. Clayton Military Photographer of the Year



### **6 +/- Superior**

National media-grade imagery and story-telling; mastery of photo techniques; viral potential of communication impact seamlessly nested with higher HQ objectives; Zero grammatical or style errors in captions

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

Army-level imagery and story-telling; photo techniques far exceed fundamentals; potential for global reach aligned with Army objectives; limited grammatical and style errors in captions

### **4 +/- Solid**

Quality imagery and story-telling; demonstrates good application of photo techniques; shows potential for service-wide communication impact; noticeable grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

### **3 +/- Average**

Average imagery and story-telling; reflects acceptable application of photo techniques; localized communication impact; consistent grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

### **2 +/- Marginal**

Marginal imagery and story-telling; reflects gaps in application of photo techniques; no communication impact; significant grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

### **1**

### **Substandard**

Substandard imagery and story-telling; unacceptable application of photo techniques; negative communication impact; unpublishable grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging/Scoring Guidance

## Category G: Clark Taylor Civilian Videographer of the Year



### **6 +/- Superior**

National media-grade imagery and story-telling; mastery of video techniques; viral potential of communication impact seamlessly nested with higher HQ objectives; Zero grammatical or style errors in captions

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

Army-level imagery and story-telling; video techniques far exceed fundamentals; potential for global reach aligned with Army objectives; limited grammatical and style errors in captions

### **4 +/- Solid**

Quality imagery and story-telling; demonstrates good application of video techniques; shows potential for service-wide communication impact; noticeable grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

### **3 +/- Average**

Average imagery and story-telling; reflects acceptable application of video techniques; localized communication impact; consistent grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

### **2 +/- Marginal**

Marginal imagery and story-telling; reflects gaps in application of video techniques; no communication impact; significant grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

### **1**

### **Substandard**

Substandard imagery and story-telling; unacceptable application of video techniques; negative communication impact; unpublishable grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging/Scoring Guidance

Category H: Master Sgt. John T. Anderson Military Videographer of the Year



## **6 +/- Superior**

National media-grade imagery and story-telling; mastery of video techniques; viral potential of communication impact seamlessly nested with higher HQ objectives; Zero grammatical or style errors in captions

## **5 +/- Outstanding**

Army-level imagery and story-telling; video techniques far exceed fundamentals; potential for global reach aligned with Army objectives; limited grammatical and style errors in captions

## **4 +/- Solid**

Quality imagery and story-telling; demonstrates good application of video techniques; shows potential for service-wide communication impact; noticeable grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

## **3 +/- Average**

Average imagery and story-telling; reflects acceptable application of video techniques; localized communication impact; consistent grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

## **2 +/- Marginal**

Marginal imagery and story-telling; reflects gaps in application of video techniques; no communication impact; significant grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission

**1**

## **Substandard**

Substandard imagery and story-telling; unacceptable application of video techniques; negative communication impact; unpublishable grammatical and style errors in captions degrade submission



# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging/Scoring Guidance



## Category I: Moss-Holland Civilian Writer of the Year

### **6 +/- Superior**

National media-grade writing and story-telling; mastery of print techniques; viral potential of communication impact seamlessly nested with higher HQ objectives; Zero grammatical or style errors

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

Army-level writing and story-telling; print techniques far exceed fundamentals; potential for global reach aligned with Army objectives; limited grammatical and style errors

### **4 +/- Solid**

Quality writing and story-telling; demonstrates good application of print techniques; shows potential for service-wide communication impact; noticeable grammatical and style errors degrade submission

### **3 +/- Average**

Average writing and story-telling; reflects acceptable application of print techniques; localized communication impact; consistent grammatical and style errors degrade submission

### **2 +/- Marginal**

Marginal writing and story-telling; reflects gaps in application of print techniques; no communication impact; significant grammatical and style errors degrade submission

### **1**

### **Substandard**

Substandard writing and story-telling; unacceptable application of print techniques; negative communication impact; unpublishable grammatical and style errors degrade submission

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging/Scoring Guidance

Category J: Staff Sgt. Paul D. Savanuck Writer of the Year



## **6 +/- Superior**

National media-grade writing and story-telling; mastery of print techniques; viral potential of communication impact seamlessly nested with higher HQ objectives; Zero grammatical or style errors

## **5 +/- Outstanding**

Army-level writing and story-telling; print techniques far exceed fundamentals; potential for global reach aligned with Army objectives; limited grammatical and style errors

## **4 +/- Solid**

Quality writing and story-telling; demonstrates good application of print techniques; shows potential for service-wide communication impact; noticeable grammatical and style errors degrade submission

## **3 +/- Average**

Average writing and story-telling; reflects acceptable application of print techniques; localized communication impact; consistent grammatical and style errors degrade submission

## **2 +/- Marginal**

Marginal writing and story-telling; reflects gaps in application of print techniques; no communication impact; significant grammatical and style errors degrade submission

**1**

## **Substandard**

Substandard writing and story-telling; unacceptable application of print techniques; negative communication impact; unpublishable grammatical and style errors degrade submission

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging/Guidance

## Category K: Staff Sgt. James P. Hunter Award for Outstanding New Military Writer



### **6 +/- Superior**

National media-grade writing and story-telling; mastery of print techniques; viral potential of communication impact seamlessly nested with higher HQ objectives; Zero grammatical or style errors; 450+ AFT score (540+ ACFT); Sharpshooter

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

Army-level writing and story-telling; print techniques far exceed fundamentals; potential for global reach aligned with Army objectives; limited grammatical and style errors; 430+ AFT score (520+ ACFT); Sharpshooter

### **4 +/- Solid**

Quality writing and story-telling; demonstrates good application of print techniques; shows potential for service-wide communication impact; noticeable grammatical and style errors degrade submission; 400+ AFT score (500+ ACFT); Marksman

### **3 +/- Average**

Average writing and story-telling; reflects acceptable application of print techniques; localized communication impact; consistent grammatical and style errors degrade submission; Passing AFT/ACFT score; Marksman

### **2 +/- Marginal**

Marginal writing and story-telling; reflects gaps in application of print techniques; no communication impact; significant grammatical and style errors degrade submission; Passing AFT/ACFT score/ Marksman

### **1**

### **Substandard**

Substandard writing and story-telling; unacceptable application of print techniques; negative communication impact; unpublishable grammatical and style errors degrade submission; Passing AFT/ACFT score; Marksman

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging/Scoring Guidance



## Category L: Public Affairs Liaison of the Year

### **6 +/- Superior**

Content creation skills are equal to Skill Level 30 (SSG) Public Affairs or Visual Information Soldier; every attempt should be made to send individual to DINFOS for re-classification to CMF46 MOS

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

Content creation skills are equal to Skill Level 20 (SGT) Public Affairs or Visual Information Soldier; ACOO will support command's efforts to send individual to DINFOS for re-classification to CMF46 MOS

### **4 +/- Solid**

Content creation skills are above entry level Public Affairs or Visual Information Soldier; considered a potential candidate for re-classification to CMF46 MOS

### **3 +/- Average**

Content creation skills equal to those of entry level Public Affairs or Visual Information Soldier; displays some beginner skills for content creation but needs more training

### **2 +/- Marginal**

Products submitted need much more attention from submitting command; may have interest in continuing in role of Public Affairs Liaison, but needs more training

### **1**

### **Substandard**

Multiple areas of submission should have been reviewed before upload to DVIDS; does not meet service standards

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging Guidance

## Category M: Public Affairs Officer “Rising Star” Award



### **6 +/- Superior**

Nomination/Letter of Recommendation reflect the highest confidence and trust from senior commanders/PAOs; all products demonstrate a strategic level mastery of communication techniques and tools; a future ASCC/ACOM PAO

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

Nomination/Letter of Recommendation reflect confidence and trust from senior commanders/PAOs; all products demonstrate an operational level mastery of communication techniques and tools; operates far above grade

### **4 +/- Solid**

Nomination/Letter of Recommendation reflect acceptable performance; all products demonstrate a standard application of communication techniques and tools; shows potential for growth in career field

### **3 +/- Average**

Nomination/Letter of Recommendation submitted; all products demonstrate a basic application of communication techniques and tools

### **2 +/- Marginal**

Products submitted require considerable improvement

### **1 Substandard**

Does not meet standards

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging Guidance

## Category O: Public Affairs Organization of the Year (Command Information)



### **6 +/- Superior Example**

PA Team performing at the highest level with global communication impact and national media-grade content quality in support of command or Army priorities; all products are error-free and reflect strong organizational development

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

PA Team performing at a high level with service-level communication impact and high quality content in support of command or Army priorities; products have very minor errors and reflect organizational development

### **4 +/- Solid**

PA Team performing at an acceptable level with some communication impact and some quality content in support of command priorities; products have several errors and display attempted organizational development

### **3 +/- Average**

PA Team performing at a basic level in support of command priorities; products have noticeable errors and display limited organizational development

### **2 +/- Marginal**

PA Team performing at an ineffective level; products have consistent errors

### **1**

### **Substandard**

Multiple areas of submission should have been reviewed; does not meet standards

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging Guidance

## Category P: Kathy Canham-Ross Organization of Distinction



### **6 +/- Superior Example**

PA Team performing at the highest level with global community engagement/outreach efforts and corporate-level planning and execution techniques; clear positive impact on Army objectives; strong organizational cohesion

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

PA Team performing at high level with regional community engagement/outreach efforts and quality planning and execution techniques; positive impact on Army objectives; organizational cohesion

### **4 +/- Solid**

PA Team performing at acceptable level with some community engagement/outreach efforts and attempted planning and execution techniques; limited impact on Army objectives

### **3 +/- Average**

PA Team performing at basic level with some community engagement/outreach efforts and planning and execution techniques; noticeable errors in products, potential clarity issues

### **2 +/- Marginal**

PA Team performing at an ineffective level; products have consistent errors

### **1**

### **Substandard**

Multiple areas of submission should have been reviewed; does not meet standards

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging Guidance

## Category Q: Digital Media Campaign of the Year



### **6 +/- Superior Example**

Campaign fully leverages corporate-level digital media strategies and techniques to achieve communication objectives; original and innovative strategy, production and analysis across all products; viral-level impact on Army messaging

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

Campaign leverages advanced digital media strategies and techniques to achieve communication objectives; creative strategy, production and analysis across most products; measurable impact on Army messaging

### **4 +/- Solid**

Campaign leverages quality digital media strategies and techniques to achieve communication objectives; attempted strategy and analysis; potential impact on Army messaging

### **3 +/- Average**

Campaign leverages basic digital media strategies and technique; limited strategy and analysis; low impact on Army messaging

### **2 +/- Marginal**

Submission is not competitive with other campaigns due to lack of planning, production and analysis

### **1 Substandard**

Does not meet standards; consistent errors and low production level



# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging Guidance

## Category R: Master Communicator of the Year



### **6 +/- Superior**

Letters of Recommendation reflect the highest confidence and trust from senior commanders/PAOs; EXSUM clearly reflects mastery of executive communication skills and ability to advise and plan strategically; future CPA/ACO SGM

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

Letters of Recommendation reflect confidence and trust from senior commanders/PAOs; EXSUM demonstrates high level of executive communication skills and ability to advise and plan strategically

### **4 +/- Solid**

Letters of Recommendation reflect acceptable performance; EXSUM demonstrates some executive communication skills and ability to advise and plan operationally

### **3 +/- Average**

Letters of Recommendation submitted; EXSUM demonstrates some limited communication skills

### **2 +/- Marginal**

Products submitted require considerable improvement

### **1 Substandard**

Does not meet standards

# MG Keith L. Ware Communication Awards – Judging Guidance



## Category S: Operator-Maintainer of the Year

### **6 +/- Superior**

Letter of Recommendation reflects the highest confidence and trust from supervisor; essay clearly communicates mastery of MOS skills, experience and understanding of impact to the mission and the Army; future 1SG

### **5 +/- Outstanding**

Letter of Recommendation reflects confidence and trust from supervisor; essay demonstrates high level of MOS skills and understanding of impact to the mission and the Army

### **4 +/- Solid**

Letter of Recommendation reflects good performance; essay demonstrates basic level of MOS skills and understanding of impact to the mission and the Army

### **3 +/- Average**

Letter of Recommendation submitted; essay demonstrates acceptable MOS skills

### **2 +/- Marginal**

Products submitted require considerable improvement

### **1 Substandard**

Does not meet standards