

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