



JUDGING CRITERIA

OUTSTANDING PRODUCTION

- a) Best Production
- b) Best Two-hander Production
- c) Best Spoken Word Production
- d) Best Stand-Up Comedy Production
- e) Best Story-telling Production
- f) Best Children's Play
- g) Best Musical theatre production
- h) Best Swahili Production
- i) Best Kikwetu production (Vernacular shows)
- j) Best Producer

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA:	SCORE (Range of 1 – 10, 10 being the highest score)
1. Most effectively delivers the production as a unified whole.	
2. Effectively integrates the elements of good theatre-making and good theatre production practice	
3. Demonstrates genuine audience engagement and impact	
4. Incorporates ingenuity, innovation, and creativity	
5. Rates highly across all other relevant Award sub-categories	

CRITERION 1: DELIVERY OF THE PRODUCTION AS A UNIFIED WHOLE

What jurors are assessing:

- Overall cohesion
- Clarity of artistic identity
- Whether all elements feel intentionally connected

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- The production feels fully unified and seamless
- Every element (performance, direction, design, music, technical execution) clearly belongs to the same artistic vision
- No part feels accidental, disconnected, or unnecessary
- The production has a strong, recognisable identity from beginning to end

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Production is clearly cohesive with a strong sense of unity
- Minor inconsistencies exist but do not undermine the overall experience
- Artistic intent is evident and largely realised

5–6 (Competent)

- General unity is present but inconsistently maintained
- Some elements feel stronger or more developed than others
- Transitions, pacing, or stylistic consistency may fluctuate

3–4 (Developing)

- Production feels fragmented or uneven
- Elements appear loosely connected or insufficiently coordinated
- The overall vision is unclear or inconsistently communicated

1–2 (Weak)

- Production lacks cohesion
- Elements feel disconnected or contradictory
- No clear sense of a unified artistic whole

CRITERION 2: INTEGRATION OF THEATRE-MAKING & PRODUCTION PRACTICE

What jurors are assessing:

- Professional discipline
- Balance between artistic ambition and execution
- Evidence of sound rehearsal and planning

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- High level of professional theatre-making discipline
- Strong rehearsal evident in performance confidence, timing, and transitions
- Technical elements are well rehearsed and precisely executed
- Artistic choices are matched by strong production management

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Production practice is strong and reliable
- Minor technical or organisational lapses may occur but are well managed
- Rehearsal and planning are clearly evident

5–6 (Competent)

- Basic production practices are in place
- Execution is uneven in places (e.g. pacing, cues, transitions)
- Some elements feel under-rehearsed or rushed

3–4 (Developing)

- Inconsistent production discipline
- Technical or organisational weaknesses disrupt flow
- Limited evidence of sufficient rehearsal or coordination

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor production practice
- Frequent breakdowns in timing, transitions, or technical execution
- Lack of preparation significantly affects the performance

CRITERION 3: AUDIENCE ENGAGEMENT & IMPACT

What jurors are assessing:

- Emotional, intellectual, or entertainment value
- Audience connection and sustained interest
- Clarity of storytelling or comedic impact

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Strong, sustained audience engagement throughout
- Production elicits clear emotional, intellectual, or entertainment response
- Audience is fully invested and responsive
- Impact remains strong beyond the performance

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Audience engagement is consistent and effective
- Clear moments of strong connection or impact
- Minor dips in energy or focus

5–6 (Competent)

- Audience engagement is intermittent
- Some moments resonate strongly while others fall flat
- Overall impact is moderate

3–4 (Developing)

- Limited audience engagement
- Energy, clarity, or pacing issues reduce impact
- Audience connection is inconsistent

1–2 (Weak)

- Minimal audience engagement
- Production fails to connect or hold attention

CRITERION 4: INGENUITY, INNOVATION & CREATIVITY

What jurors are assessing:

- Originality of concept or execution
- Creative problem-solving
- Freshness of approach within genre

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Production demonstrates highly original thinking
- Creative risks are taken and successfully realised
- Innovation enhances storytelling or audience experience
- Production stands out strongly within its category

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Clear creative ideas and thoughtful innovation
- Some originality in approach or execution
- Creativity supports the overall vision

5–6 (Competent)

- Production is competently executed but largely conventional
- Creativity is present but limited or familiar
- Few risks taken

3–4 (Developing)

- Limited creativity or imagination
- Reliance on predictable or underdeveloped ideas

1–2 (Weak)

- Little to no evidence of creative or innovative thinking

CRITERION 5: PERFORMANCE ACROSS RELEVANT SUB-CATEGORIES

(Direction, Performance, Design, Music, Choreography, Technical Execution)

What jurors are assessing:

- Overall quality across departments
- Balance and consistency
- No single element severely undermining the whole

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Production scores highly across multiple artistic and technical areas
- No significant weaknesses
- Strength is well distributed across departments

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Strong performance across most sub-categories
- Minor weaknesses exist but do not dominate

5–6 (Competent)

- Mixed quality across departments
- Some strong elements alongside noticeable weaknesses

3–4 (Developing)

- One or more weak areas significantly affect the production
- Imbalance between departments

1–2 (Weak)

- Multiple weak elements undermine the production as a whole

SPECIAL GUIDANCE FOR SPECIFIC SUB-CATEGORIES

Best Two-Hander

- Balance and chemistry between performers
- Sustained energy with limited cast
- Clear narrative progression

Spoken Word / Storytelling

- Clarity of narrative voice
- Vocal control and rhythm - emotional tone scale, pitch, tone, audibility, pronunciation and enunciation, diction and articulation, pacing.
- Emotional or thematic resonance

Stand-Up Comedy

- Originality of material
- Timing, pacing, and audience rapport
- Sustained comedic impact

Children's Play

- Age-appropriate storytelling - Production for children
- Engagement, clarity, and pacing
- Visual and imaginative appeal

Musical Theatre Production

- Integration of music, performance, and narrative
- Ensemble cohesion
- Balance between vocals, acting, and staging

Kikwetu / Vernacular Production

- Authentic cultural expression
- Clarity of storytelling regardless of language
- Cultural integrity and audience connection

Best Producer

- Scale and ambition matched with execution
- Resource management and coordination
- Overall delivery quality and consistency

RECOMMENDED JUROR SCORING NOTE

Jurors should score based solely on what is presented in performance, considering both artistic merit and execution. Scores should reflect the overall impact and quality of the production within its category.

OUTSTANDING DIRECTION

a) Best Director

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA:	SCORE (Range of 1 – 10, 10 being the highest score)
1. Unifies the production with an overarching vision or interpretation that engages the audience and makes a “world” for us to experience	
2. Integrates all aspects of the production such as interpretation, acting choices and style, performances, design, technical elements, music and choreography	
3. Creates an effective physical and/or emotional and/or intellectual relationship or “dynamic” between the actors and audience	
4. Shows sensitivity to the meanings of the work and, through the production, offers insights into some of the themes of the work	
5. Informs or enriches the work through background research and/or through interpretation	
6. Demonstrates an understanding of the text, subtext and context of the work	
7. Casts effectively, enabling actors to convincingly portray their roles	
8. Delivers effective characterizations and authentic relationships between characters 9. Uses appropriate variation in pace, rhythm, style, pitch of performance and other dynamic	

performance elements to enrich meaning, enliven the work, and maintain audience engagement	
10. Makes effective use of the performance space, and of the actors and elements within the space, to enhance meaning and create visual variety	
11. Shows evidence of sufficient and effective rehearsal	
12. Employs effective solutions to any special demands of the production (e.g. extensive scene or costume changes, large cast, significant technical challenges)	

CRITERION 1: OVERARCHING DIRECTORIAL VISION & WORLD-BUILDING

What jurors are assessing:

- Clarity and originality of vision
- Whether the production creates a coherent theatrical “world”
- Audience immersion and engagement

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Director presents a **clear, confident, and compelling vision**
- The production creates a fully realised theatrical world with its own logic, tone, and rules
- Audience is strongly immersed from beginning to end
- Vision elevates the material and feels intentional, distinctive, and memorable

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Vision is clear and engaging
- The world of the production is well established
- Minor inconsistencies, but overall immersion is strong

5–6 (Competent)

- Vision is present but inconsistently realised
- The world of the play is partially formed or uneven
- Audience engagement fluctuates

3–4 (Developing)

- Vision lacks clarity or coherence
- Production feels conceptually uncertain or unfocused

1–2 (Weak)

- No discernible directorial vision
- Production lacks identity or coherence

CRITERION 2: INTEGRATION OF ALL PRODUCTION ELEMENTS

(Performance, Design, Technical Elements, Music, Choreography)

What jurors are assessing:

- Director's ability to unify departments
- Balance between artistic elements
- Coherence of interpretation

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- All elements are **seamlessly integrated**
- Acting, design, music, choreography, and technical choices clearly serve the same vision
- No element feels dominant or disconnected

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Strong integration across departments
- Minor mismatches do not undermine overall cohesion

5–6 (Competent)

- Some elements integrate well; others feel uneven
- Inconsistencies in style or emphasis are noticeable

3–4 (Developing)

- Elements feel compartmentalised

- Limited coordination between departments

1–2 (Weak)

- Production elements work against each other
- Lack of integration significantly affects impact

CRITERION 3: ACTOR–AUDIENCE DYNAMIC

What jurors are assessing:

- How the director shapes audience engagement
- Emotional, intellectual, or physical connection
- Awareness of audience positioning and response

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Director establishes a **strong, intentional relationship** between performers and audience
- Audience is actively engaged emotionally and/or intellectually
- Staging and pacing enhance connection

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Effective and sustained audience engagement
- Clear moments of strong connection

5–6 (Competent)

- Audience engagement is inconsistent
- Some scenes connect strongly; others do not

3–4 (Developing)

- Limited awareness of audience dynamics
- Engagement feels accidental rather than intentional

1–2 (Weak)

- Audience remains disconnected or disengaged

CRITERION 4: INTERPRETATION OF THEMES & MEANING

What jurors are assessing:

- Depth of thematic exploration
- Insight offered through direction
- Sensitivity to the work's ideas

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Direction reveals **new insight or depth** in the material
- Themes are clearly articulated through staging, performance, and imagery
- Interpretation feels thoughtful and purposeful

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Themes are clearly communicated
- Interpretation supports the text effectively

5–6 (Competent)

- Themes are present but superficially explored
- Interpretation lacks depth or clarity

3–4 (Developing)

- Themes are unclear or inconsistently communicated

1–2 (Weak)

- Little to no engagement with thematic meaning

CRITERION 5: USE OF RESEARCH, CONTEXT & INTERPRETATION

What jurors are assessing:

- Evidence of research (historical, cultural, stylistic)
- Informed interpretive choices

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Direction is clearly informed by research and context
- Interpretive choices deepen authenticity and meaning

- Research enhances rather than restricts creativity

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Evidence of research informs key decisions
- Context is respected and effectively communicated

5–6 (Competent)

- Limited or uneven evidence of research
- Context is acknowledged but not fully explored

3–4 (Developing)

- Contextual understanding is shallow or unclear

1–2 (Weak)

- No evident engagement with context or research

CRITERION 6: UNDERSTANDING OF TEXT, SUBTEXT & CONTEXT

What jurors are assessing:

- Director's command of narrative and subtext
- Clarity of intention across scenes

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Direction demonstrates deep understanding of text and subtext
- Character motivations and narrative stakes are clear
- Subtext is actively communicated through staging and performance

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Clear understanding of text and relationships
- Subtext is mostly evident

5–6 (Competent)

- Basic narrative clarity
- Subtext is inconsistently communicated

3–4 (Developing)

- Scenes lack clear intention
- Subtext is largely absent

1-2 (Weak)

- Poor understanding of the material is evident

CRITERION 7: CASTING & CHARACTER REALISATION

What jurors are assessing:

- Appropriateness of casting choices
- Actor suitability and balance
- Relationship dynamics

Descriptor Bands:

9-10 (Exceptional)

- Casting is highly effective and purposeful
- Actors are well suited to roles
- Relationships feel authentic and balanced

7-8 (Very Strong)

- Casting supports the production well
- Minor imbalances may exist

5-6 (Competent)

- Casting is generally suitable but uneven

3-4 (Developing)

- Miscasting affects credibility

1-2 (Weak)

- Poor casting significantly undermines the production

CRITERION 8: PACING, RHYTHM & PERFORMANCE DYNAMICS

What jurors are assessing:

- Control of tempo, rhythm, and energy

- Variation and audience engagement

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Pacing is dynamic and purposeful
- Effective variation sustains audience interest
- Transitions are smooth and intentional

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mostly effective pacing with minor lapses

5–6 (Competent)

- Pacing is uneven or repetitive

3–4 (Developing)

- Poor rhythm or sluggish momentum

1–2 (Weak)

- Pacing consistently undermines engagement

CRITERION 9: USE OF SPACE & STAGING

What jurors are assessing:

- Spatial composition
- Visual storytelling
- Stage picture variety

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Space is used creatively and meaningfully
- Strong visual composition enhances storytelling
- Staging supports clarity and focus

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Effective use of space with minor limitations

5–6 (Competent)

- Functional staging with limited creativity

3–4 (Developing)

- Awkward or unclear staging

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor spatial use undermines the production

CRITERION 10: REHEARSAL PROCESS & PERFORMANCE PREPAREDNESS

What jurors are assessing:

- Evidence of rehearsal depth
- Precision and confidence in performance

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Performances show strong rehearsal discipline
- Cues, transitions, and blocking are precise
- Actors appear confident and fully prepared

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Good preparation with minor lapses

5–6 (Competent)

- Adequate rehearsal evident, but uneven

3–4 (Developing)

- Insufficient rehearsal affects clarity

1–2 (Weak)

- Lack of preparation is clearly evident

CRITERION 11: HANDLING OF SPECIAL PRODUCTION DEMANDS

(Large cast, complex transitions, technical challenges, space limitations)

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Challenges are handled creatively and effectively
- Solutions enhance rather than limit the production

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Challenges are managed competently

5–6 (Competent)

- Challenges are addressed but limit impact

3–4 (Developing)

- Challenges disrupt flow or clarity

1–2 (Weak)

- Challenges are poorly managed

JUROR SCORING NOTE

Jurors should assess the director's leadership, interpretive clarity, and integration of all production elements. Scores should reflect overall artistic control and impact, not isolated moments of excellence.

For Musicals: *Jurors should evaluate musical direction based on clarity, control, expressiveness, and integration with storytelling. Scores should reflect musical leadership rather than scale or volume.*

OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

- a) Best Breakthrough Male Performer
- b) Best Breakthrough Female Performer
- c) Best Performance by a Young Male Actor
- d) Best Performance by a Young Female Actor
- e) Best Performance by a Female Actor in a Supporting Role (Play)
- f) Best Performance by a Male Actor in a Supporting Role (Play)

- g) Best Performance by a Female Actor in a Supporting Role (Musical)
- h) Best Performance by a Male Actor in a Supporting Role (Musical)
- i) Best Performance by a Female Actor in a Lead Role (Play)
- j) Best Performance by a Male Actor in a Lead Role (Play)
- k) Best Performance in a Solo Production: Male/Female
- l) Best Performance by a Female Actor in a Lead Role (Musical)
- m) Best Performance by a Male Actor in a Lead Role (Musical)

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA:	SCORE (Range of 1 – 10, 10 being the highest score)
1. Creates a believable character that embodies the nature of the role	
2. Demonstrates understanding of the text, subtext and context of the work	
3. Supports characterization through physical movement, posture and effective technique including projection, articulation, pacing, intonation and accents	
4. Communicates with and reacts to other actors	
5. Effectively uses space and positioning in relation to other actors and the audience	
6. Sustains a role through the entire performance, maintaining momentum, mood and focus	
7. Works as a team player	
Additional criteria for Musical Theatre category:	
8. Suitable vocal quality and range for the role	
9. Demonstrates accuracy, evenness across vocal range and musicality, including attention to dynamics and phrasing.	

10. "Sells" a song through characterization and understanding of the context	
--	--

CRITERION 1: BELIEVABLE CHARACTERISATION

What jurors are assessing:

- Depth and authenticity of character
- Psychological and emotional truth
- Convincing embodiment of the role

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Actor fully **inhabits the character** with complete credibility
- Character feels psychologically real and emotionally truthful
- Performance transcends technique and feels lived-in
- Actor's presence remains compelling even in silence

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Character is convincing and clearly defined
- Strong emotional truth with minor lapses
- Actor remains mostly consistent in character

5–6 (Competent)

- Character is understandable but somewhat surface-level
- Emotional depth is inconsistent
- Some moments feel acted rather than embodied

3–4 (Developing)

- Characterisation lacks clarity or consistency
- Emotional responses feel forced or unclear

1–2 (Weak)

- Character is unconvincing or unclear
- Performance lacks emotional truth

CRITERION 2: UNDERSTANDING OF TEXT, SUBTEXT & CONTEXT

What jurors are assessing:

- Actor's comprehension of the material
- Ability to communicate meaning beyond spoken words
- Awareness of historical, cultural, or narrative context

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Actor demonstrates deep understanding of text and subtext
- Meaning is conveyed clearly through intention and delivery
- Performance reflects strong awareness of context and stakes

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Clear understanding of text and relationships
- Subtext is evident but not always fully explored

5–6 (Competent)

- Basic comprehension of lines and scenes
- Limited engagement with deeper subtext

3–4 (Developing)

- Lines are delivered without clear intention
- Subtext and context are poorly communicated

1–2 (Weak)

- Lack of understanding of the material is evident

CRITERION 3: PHYSICAL & VOCAL TECHNIQUE

What jurors are assessing:

- Control of voice and body
- Technical skill supporting character
- Clarity and effectiveness of delivery

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Excellent control of voice and body
- Movement, posture, and gesture are purposeful and character-driven
- Vocal delivery is clear, expressive, and dynamic
- Accents and physicality are consistent and appropriate

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Strong technique with minor inconsistencies
- Physical and vocal choices largely support character

5–6 (Competent)

- Adequate technique but limited range or precision
- Some technical habits or weaknesses evident

3–4 (Developing)

- Weak vocal projection or unclear articulation
- Physicality feels unfocused or repetitive

1–2 (Weak)

- Technical shortcomings significantly affect performance

CRITERION 4: INTERACTION & RESPONSIVENESS

What jurors are assessing:

- Listening skills
- Responsiveness to fellow performers
- Relationship-building on stage

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Actor listens actively and responds truthfully
- Relationships feel authentic and dynamic
- Performance is clearly shaped by interaction, not isolation

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Strong engagement with scene partners
- Relationships are believable with minor lapses

5–6 (Competent)

- Interaction is present but inconsistent
- Actor occasionally retreats into solo delivery

3–4 (Developing)

- Limited responsiveness to others
- Relationships feel underdeveloped

1–2 (Weak)

- Actor appears disconnected from fellow performers

CRITERION 5: USE OF SPACE & STAGE AWARENESS

What jurors are assessing:

- Spatial intelligence
- Awareness of audience and fellow actors
- Purposeful positioning and movement

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Actor uses space with confidence and intention
- Positioning enhances meaning and focus
- Strong awareness of audience sightlines and dynamics

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Effective use of space with minor lapses
- Good spatial awareness overall

5–6 (Competent)

- Basic spatial awareness
- Movement sometimes feels habitual or unmotivated

3–4 (Developing)

- Awkward or unclear use of space

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor spatial awareness undermines performance

CRITERION 6: SUSTAINING THE ROLE

What jurors are assessing:

- Consistency, stamina, and focus
- Ability to maintain character throughout

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Performance remains focused and truthful throughout
- Energy, intention, and emotional arc are sustained
- No noticeable drop in quality

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Strong consistency with minor dips

5–6 (Competent)

- Performance quality fluctuates

3–4 (Developing)

- Focus and energy drop significantly

1–2 (Weak)

- Actor frequently breaks character or focus

CRITERION 7: ENSEMBLE CONTRIBUTION / TEAMWORK

What jurors are assessing:

- Professionalism
- Support of overall production
- Respect for shared storytelling

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Actor enhances the ensemble and overall production
- Supports fellow performers and shared rhythm
- Demonstrates generosity and professionalism

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Works well within the ensemble
- Minor moments of imbalance

5–6 (Competent)

- Generally cooperative but inconsistently supportive

3–4 (Developing)

- Self-focused performance limits ensemble cohesion

1–2 (Weak)

- Performance disrupts ensemble balance

ADDITIONAL CRITERIA – MUSICAL THEATRE PERFORMANCES

Criterion 8: VOCAL SUITABILITY & RANGE

9–10 Vocal quality, range, and stamina perfectly suit the role

7–8 Voice suits role with minor limitations

5–6 Vocal range or tone is adequate but strained

3–4 Vocal suitability is inconsistent

1–2 Vocal limitations undermine performance

Criterion 9: MUSICALITY & TECHNICAL ACCURACY

9–10 Excellent pitch accuracy, phrasing, dynamics, and rhythm

7–8 Mostly accurate with minor technical lapses

5–6 Noticeable pitch or rhythm issues

3–4 Frequent inaccuracies

1–2 Poor musical control

Criterion 10: STORYTELLING THROUGH SONG

- 9–10** Song is fully “acted” and emotionally truthful
Music and character are seamlessly integrated
- 7–8** Clear storytelling with minor emotional gaps
- 5–6** Song is sung well but emotionally flat
- 3–4** Limited connection between song and character
- 1–2** Song lacks narrative or emotional purpose

SPECIAL GUIDANCE FOR SPECIFIC AWARD TYPES

Young Actor

- 18 Years Old and below
- Age-appropriate excellence

Breakthrough Performer

- Evidence of strong potential
- Confidence, presence, and risk-taking
- Impact relative to experience level

Supporting Role

- Clarity and precision - must appear upto 45% of the production running time
- Ability to elevate scenes without dominating
- Strong contribution to story and leads

Lead Role

- Narrative responsibility
- Emotional stamina and depth
- Command of stage and audience attention

Solo Performance

- Sustained engagement without support of other actors
- Strong internal rhythm and variation
- Clear narrative arc and focus

JUROR SCORING NOTE

Jurors should score the performance observed, not the performer's reputation or prior work. Impact, consistency, and truthfulness should guide scoring decisions.

OUTSTANDING CHOREOGRAPHY AND ARRANGEMENT

a) Best Original Choreography in a Musical/Play

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA:	SCORE (Range of 1 – 10, 10 being the highest score)
1. Demonstrates originality and creativity that complements and supports the director's vision for the production	
2. Suits the style of the story, music, genre and/or period	
3. Incorporates variety across musical numbers and within routines (e.g. through the use of different groupings, rhythms, spacing, intensity and climaxes) 4. Draws upon the lyrics and musical texture to support the narrative or emotional content of the music	
5. Creatively uses the performance space, set and/or props	
6. Suits the abilities of the performers and caters effectively for different skill levels	
7. Demonstrates precision within ensemble work	
8. Ensures that solo dance work is consistent with the characterization and nature of the role	
9. Shows evidence of sufficient and effective rehearsal	

10. Employs effective solutions to any special challenges (e.g. stage/space limitations, costumes, cast size)	
---	--

CRITERION 1: ORIGINALITY & CREATIVE VISION

What jurors are assessing:

- Freshness of movement language
- Inventiveness of ideas
- Alignment with the director's vision

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Choreography demonstrates **highly original and imaginative movement language**
- Clear creative identity that enhances the director's vision
- Movement feels intentional, distinctive, and memorable

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Clear originality with thoughtful creative choices
- Some familiar vocabulary used effectively

5–6 (Competent)

- Functional choreography with limited originality
- Relies on familiar or safe movement patterns

3–4 (Developing)

- Limited creativity or unclear choreographic intent

1–2 (Weak)

- Little to no original choreographic thinking

CRITERION 2: SUITABILITY TO STYLE, GENRE & PERIOD

What jurors are assessing:

- Stylistic accuracy
- Appropriateness of movement choices

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Movement style perfectly suits the story, music, genre, and/or period
- Stylistic choices deepen authenticity and meaning

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Style is appropriate with minor inconsistencies

5–6 (Competent)

- Style is generally suitable but lacks refinement

3–4 (Developing)

- Stylistic choices feel mismatched or unclear

1–2 (Weak)

- Movement style undermines the production

CRITERION 3: VARIETY & STRUCTURAL INTEREST

What jurors are assessing:

- Dynamic contrast
- Structural composition of routines
- Use of musical climaxes and transitions

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Choreography shows **clear variety and dynamic contrast**
- Effective use of groupings, spacing, rhythm, and intensity
- Routines build toward clear climaxes and transitions

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Good variety with minor repetition

5–6 (Competent)

- Some variation but routines feel predictable

3–4 (Developing)

- Repetitive or structurally flat choreography

1–2 (Weak)

- Little to no variation; movement feels monotonous

CRITERION 4: MUSICAL & LYRIC INTERPRETATION

What jurors are assessing:

- Responsiveness to music and lyrics
- Narrative and emotional support through movement

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Choreography is deeply responsive to **lyrics, rhythm, phrasing, and musical texture**
- Movement actively supports storytelling and emotional content

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Strong musical responsiveness with minor missed opportunities

5–6 (Competent)

- Movement follows the music but lacks expressive depth

3–4 (Developing)

- Limited connection between movement and music

1–2 (Weak)

- Movement feels disconnected from the music

CRITERION 5: USE OF SPACE, SET & PROPS

What jurors are assessing:

- Spatial intelligence
- Visual composition
- Integration with stage environment

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Creative and purposeful use of performance space
- Set and props are integrated seamlessly into choreography
- Strong visual variety and clarity

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Effective use of space with minor limitations

5–6 (Competent)

- Functional spatial use with limited imagination

3–4 (Developing)

- Awkward or unclear spatial patterns

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor spatial awareness undermines choreography

CRITERION 6: SUITABILITY TO PERFORMER ABILITIES

What jurors are assessing:

- Appropriateness of difficulty level
- Inclusivity and adaptability

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Choreography is expertly tailored to performers' abilities
- Differing skill levels are accommodated creatively
- All performers appear confident and effective

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mostly well matched to performer abilities

5–6 (Competent)

- Some performers appear stretched or underused

3–4 (Developing)

- Movement does not suit performers' skill levels

1–2 (Weak)

- Choreography sets performers up to fail

CRITERION 7: ENSEMBLE PRECISION & COHESION

What jurors are assessing:

- Timing, alignment, and group unity

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Ensemble work is **precise, cohesive, and confident**
- Strong timing, spacing, and unison

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Minor timing or spacing issues

5–6 (Competent)

- Ensemble precision is inconsistent

3–4 (Developing)

- Frequent coordination issues

1–2 (Weak)

- Lack of ensemble cohesion

CRITERION 8: SOLO DANCE & CHARACTER CONSISTENCY

What jurors are assessing:

- Character-driven movement
- Alignment between solo choreography and role

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Solo choreography strongly reflects character and narrative
- Movement choices deepen characterization

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Solo work is appropriate with minor inconsistencies

5–6 (Competent)

- Solo movement is generic or character-neutral

3–4 (Developing)

- Solo choreography contradicts characterization

1–2 (Weak)

- Solo work undermines character or story

CRITERION 9: REHEARSAL DEPTH & PERFORMANCE READINESS

What jurors are assessing:

- Evidence of rehearsal
- Confidence and polish

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Strong rehearsal discipline evident
- Performers execute movement with confidence and clarity

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Well rehearsed with minor lapses

5–6 (Competent)

- Adequate preparation but uneven execution

3–4 (Developing)

- Insufficient rehearsal affects precision

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor preparation is clearly evident

CRITERION 10: HANDLING OF SPECIAL CHALLENGES

(Space limitations, costumes, large cast, scene changes)

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Challenges are handled **creatively and effectively**
- Solutions enhance rather than limit choreography

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Challenges are managed competently

5–6 (Competent)

- Challenges limit choreographic impact

3–4 (Developing)

- Challenges disrupt clarity or flow

1–2 (Weak)

- Challenges are poorly managed

JUROR SCORING NOTE

Jurors should score choreography based on storytelling, clarity, originality, and execution — not speed, complexity, or athleticism alone.

OUTSTANDING DESIGN – COSTUME

a) Best Costume

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA:	SCORE (Range of 1 – 10, 10 being the highest score)
1. Supports the key characteristics of specific roles and performers' characterizations	
2. Accounts for different relationships between characters and changes in character development	
3. Through purposeful design, creatively complements and supports the director's vision for the production	
4. Reinforces the style, tone, mood, atmosphere or themes of the production	
5. Demonstrates excellence and innovation in design	
6. If necessary, shows evidence of background research that has informed the design (e.g. in relation to the period, culture or style)	
7. Effectively uses colour, shape and texture, having regard to contrast and balance	
8. Demonstrates stylistic consistency and connection	
9. Considers the practical needs of the actors and/or the production	

CRITERION 1: CHARACTER SUPPORT & CLARITY

What jurors are assessing:

- How costume reveals character
- Alignment between costume and performance
- Clarity of role identity

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Costumes **clearly and powerfully define each character**
- Design choices deepen understanding of personality, status, psychology, or journey
- Costume enhances and supports the performer's characterisation at all times

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Costumes clearly support character with minor inconsistencies
- Most characters are well defined visually

5–6 (Competent)

- Costumes generally suit characters but lack specificity or depth
- Some characters feel visually underdeveloped

3–4 (Developing)

- Costumes do not clearly support characterisation
- Visual choices feel generic or confusing

1–2 (Weak)

- Costumes actively undermine or confuse character identity

CRITERION 2: RELATIONSHIPS & CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT

What jurors are assessing:

- Visual storytelling across relationships
- Costume progression or transformation

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Costumes clearly reflect **relationships between characters**

- Changes in costume meaningfully track character development or transformation
- Visual contrasts and connections are intentional and readable

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Relationships and development are mostly clear
- Some transitions could be more defined

5–6 (Competent)

- Limited use of costume to indicate relationships or growth

3–4 (Developing)

- Character development is not visually supported

1–2 (Weak)

- Costume choices contradict or obscure character progression

CRITERION 3: ALIGNMENT WITH DIRECTOR'S VISION

What jurors are assessing:

- Cohesion between costume and overall concept
- Responsiveness to directorial interpretation

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Costume design **seamlessly supports and enhances the director's vision**
- Design choices feel intentional, integrated, and conceptually aligned

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Strong alignment with the production's vision
- Minor stylistic mismatches

5–6 (Competent)

- Costume design supports the production generally but without strong conceptual unity

3–4 (Developing)

- Costume design feels disconnected from the directorial approach

1–2 (Weak)

- Costume design actively conflicts with the director's vision

CRITERION 4: STYLE, TONE, MOOD & THEMATIC SUPPORT

What jurors are assessing:

- Contribution to atmosphere and meaning
- Consistency of visual tone

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Costumes strongly reinforce the **style, tone, mood, and themes** of the production
- Visual language is clear, expressive, and evocative

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Costumes effectively support mood and theme with minor inconsistencies

5–6 (Competent)

- Costumes are appropriate but not particularly expressive

3–4 (Developing)

- Costume choices do not clearly support tone or theme

1–2 (Weak)

- Costumes undermine atmosphere or thematic clarity

CRITERION 5: DESIGN EXCELLENCE, INNOVATION & CREATIVITY

What jurors are assessing:

- Originality of design
- Creative problem-solving

- Artistic confidence

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Costume design demonstrates **exceptional creativity and innovation**
- Original ideas elevate the production
- Design stands out as distinctive and memorable

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Creative and thoughtful design with some originality

5–6 (Competent)

- Functional design with limited innovation

3–4 (Developing)

- Safe or unimaginative design choices

1–2 (Weak)

- Poorly conceived or unoriginal design

CRITERION 6: RESEARCH, CONTEXT & AUTHENTICITY

What jurors are assessing:

- Historical, cultural, or stylistic accuracy
- Informed design decisions

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Strong evidence of research informs costume choices
- Period, culture, or style is convincingly realised
- Research enhances authenticity without limiting creativity

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Clear research influence with minor inaccuracies

5–6 (Competent)

- Basic awareness of context but limited depth

3–4 (Developing)

- Contextual inaccuracies or unclear research basis

1–2 (Weak)

- No evident research or inappropriate context

CRITERION 7: USE OF COLOUR, SHAPE & TEXTURE

What jurors are assessing:

- Visual composition
- Balance, contrast, and cohesion

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Sophisticated use of colour, silhouette, and texture
- Strong contrast and visual balance across the stage
- Costumes read clearly under stage lighting

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Effective visual choices with minor imbalance

5–6 (Competent)

- Colour and texture choices are serviceable but unremarkable

3–4 (Developing)

- Poor contrast or visually confusing choices

1–2 (Weak)

- Visual choices undermine clarity or aesthetics

CRITERION 8: STYLISTIC CONSISTENCY & COHESION

What jurors are assessing:

- Unity of costume design across the production
- Consistency of visual language

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Costume design demonstrates **strong stylistic unity**
- Clear connection across characters and scenes

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mostly consistent with minor deviations

5–6 (Competent)

- Some stylistic inconsistency

3–4 (Developing)

- Disjointed or unclear stylistic approach

1–2 (Weak)

- Lack of cohesion across costume design

CRITERION 9: PRACTICALITY & FUNCTIONALITY

What jurors are assessing:

- Wearability and movement
- Suitability for performance conditions

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Costumes fully support movement, quick changes, and performance demands
- Actors appear comfortable and unrestricted

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mostly practical with minor limitations

5–6 (Competent)

- Some functional issues affect performance

3–4 (Developing)

- Practical issues noticeably hinder performers

1–2 (Weak)

- Costumes significantly obstruct performance

JUROR SCORING NOTE

Jurors should assess costume design as an integral element of storytelling, considering character, concept, execution, and functionality rather than cost or scale.

OUTSTANDING DESIGN – SET

a) Best Set design

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA:	SCORE (Range of 1 – 10, 10 being the highest score)
1. Effectively suggests the location(s) of scenes	
2. Employs effective solutions to any special challenges arising from the venue (e.g. small stage, lack of wing space, low ceiling, problems with sight lines)	
3. Through purposeful design, creatively complements and supports the director's vision for the production	

4. Reinforces the style, tone, mood, atmosphere or themes of the production	
5. Demonstrates excellence and innovation in design	
6. If necessary, shows evidence of background research that has informed the design (e.g. in relation to the period, culture or style)	
7. Effectively uses colour, shape and texture, having regard to contrast and balance	
8. Demonstrates stylistic consistency and connection	
9. Considers the practical needs of the actors and/or the production	

CRITERION 1: SUGGESTION OF LOCATION(S) & PLACE

KKKKWhat jurors are assessing:

- Clarity of place and environment
- Readability of locations and transitions
- Spatial storytelling

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Set **clearly and evocatively establishes location(s)**
- Audience immediately understands where scenes take place
- Transitions between locations are clear, imaginative, and theatrically effective

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Locations are clearly suggested with minor ambiguities
- Scene changes are mostly smooth and understandable

5–6 (Competent)

- Location is generally identifiable but lacks specificity or atmosphere
- Some transitions feel unclear or repetitive

3–4 (Developing)

- Locations are confusing or inconsistently communicated

1–2 (Weak)

- Set fails to establish place or actively confuses the audience

CRITERION 2: RESPONSE TO VENUE & SPATIAL CONSTRAINTS

(Stage size, sightlines, ceiling height, wing space, audience configuration)

What jurors are assessing:

- Problem-solving and adaptability
- Intelligent use of available space

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Set design shows **creative and effective solutions** to venue challenges
- Spatial limitations are transformed into strengths
- Sightlines and performer movement are well considered

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Venue constraints are handled competently with minor compromises

5–6 (Competent)

- Practical solutions are in place but limit visual impact

3–4 (Developing)

- Venue challenges negatively affect visibility or movement

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor response to venue significantly undermines performance

CRITERION 3: ALIGNMENT WITH DIRECTOR'S VISION

What jurors are assessing:

- Conceptual coherence
- Integration with the overall production idea

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Set design **seamlessly supports and enhances the director's vision**
- Design choices feel intentional, meaningful, and integrated

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Strong conceptual alignment with minor inconsistencies

5–6 (Competent)

- Set generally supports the production but lacks conceptual clarity

3–4 (Developing)

- Set feels disconnected from the director's interpretation

1–2 (Weak)

- Set actively contradicts or undermines the director's vision

CRITERION 4: STYLE, TONE, MOOD & THEMATIC SUPPORT

What jurors are assessing:

- Contribution to atmosphere
- Visual reinforcement of themes

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Set powerfully reinforces **style, tone, mood, and themes**
- Visual language is clear, expressive, and evocative

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mood and tone are well supported with minor lapses

5–6 (Competent)

- Set is appropriate but emotionally neutral

3–4 (Developing)

- Set does not clearly support mood or theme

1–2 (Weak)

- Set undermines atmosphere or thematic clarity

CRITERION 5: DESIGN EXCELLENCE, INNOVATION & CREATIVITY

What jurors are assessing:

- Originality and imagination
- Artistic confidence and ambition

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Set design demonstrates **exceptional creativity and innovation**
- Original concepts elevate storytelling
- Design is distinctive and memorable

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Creative and thoughtful design with some originality

5–6 (Competent)

- Functional design with limited innovation

3–4 (Developing)

- Safe or unimaginative design choices

1–2 (Weak)

- Poorly conceived or derivative design

CRITERION 6: RESEARCH, CONTEXT & AUTHENTICITY

What jurors are assessing:

- Informed design decisions
- Accuracy and credibility where relevant

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Strong evidence of research informs the design
- Period, culture, or stylistic context is convincingly realised
- Research enhances authenticity without limiting creativity

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Clear research influence with minor inaccuracies

5–6 (Competent)

- Basic awareness of context with limited depth

3–4 (Developing)

- Contextual inaccuracies or unclear research basis

1–2 (Weak)

- No evident research or inappropriate contextual choices

CRITERION 7: USE OF COLOUR, SHAPE & TEXTURE

What jurors are assessing:

- Visual composition
- Balance, contrast, and readability

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Sophisticated use of colour, form, and texture
- Strong visual balance and contrast across the stage
- Set reads clearly under performance lighting

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Effective visual choices with minor imbalance

5–6 (Competent)

- Serviceable but unremarkable visual design

3–4 (Developing)

- Poor contrast or visually confusing choices

1–2 (Weak)

- Visual design undermines clarity or aesthetics

CRITERION 8: STYLISTIC CONSISTENCY & COHESION

What jurors are assessing:

- Unity of design language
- Continuity across scenes

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Set design demonstrates **strong stylistic unity** throughout
- Visual language is consistent and intentional

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mostly consistent with minor deviations

5–6 (Competent)

- Some stylistic inconsistency

3–4 (Developing)

- Disjointed or unclear stylistic approach

1–2 (Weak)

- Lack of cohesion across the design

CRITERION 9: PRACTICALITY, FUNCTIONALITY & SAFETY

What jurors are assessing:

- Usability for performers
- Support for blocking and action
- Safety and efficiency

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Set fully supports movement, blocking, and scene changes
- Design is safe, stable, and performer-friendly

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mostly practical with minor limitations

5–6 (Competent)

- Functional but occasionally restrictive

3–4 (Developing)

- Practical issues hinder performance flow

1–2 (Weak)

- Set significantly obstructs performance or poses safety concerns

JUROR SCORING NOTE

Jurors should evaluate set design as a storytelling and spatial tool, considering clarity, creativity, integration, and functionality rather than size or cost.

OUTSTANDING DESIGN – LIGHTING

a) Best lighting design

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA:	SCORE (Range of 1 – 10, 10 being the highest score)
1. Through purposeful design, creatively complements and supports the director's vision for the production	

2. Reinforces the style, tone, mood, atmosphere or themes of the production	
3. Integrates well with other aspects of the production such as set and costume design, music and choreography	
4. Executed with precision and evidence of sufficient and effective rehearsal	
5. Supports the actors in delivering their performances	
6. Employs effective solutions to any special demands of the production (e.g. extensive scene or costume changes, stage or space limitations, position of audience)	
Additional criteria for Lighting:	
7. Provides focus for the action and/or even stage coverage with appropriate colour balance	
8. Suggests different locations and times of day	
9. Provides a realistic representation of on-stage light sources (e.g. lamps, fireplaces, windows)	
10. Effectively uses special lighting effects	
Additional criteria for Video/Film	
11. Shows appropriate skill in the use of film/video techniques	
12. Is effectively integrated into the production as a whole	
13. Adds value	

CRITERION 1: ALIGNMENT WITH DIRECTOR'S VISION

What jurors are assessing:

- Conceptual coherence
- Responsiveness to directorial interpretation
- Intentionality of lighting choices

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Lighting design seamlessly complements and enhances the director's vision
- Lighting choices are clearly intentional and conceptually aligned
- Design actively shapes the audience's understanding of the production

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Strong alignment with the director's vision
- Minor conceptual inconsistencies

5–6 (Competent)

- Lighting supports the production generally but lacks strong conceptual clarity

3–4 (Developing)

- Lighting feels disconnected from the director's interpretation

1–2 (Weak)

- Lighting actively undermines or contradicts the director's vision

CRITERION 2: STYLE, TONE, MOOD & THEMATIC SUPPORT

What jurors are assessing:

- Emotional and atmospheric contribution
- Visual reinforcement of themes

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Lighting powerfully reinforces style, tone, mood, and thematic intent

- Changes in lighting deepen emotional impact and narrative clarity

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mood and tone are effectively supported with minor lapses

5–6 (Competent)

- Lighting is appropriate but emotionally neutral

3–4 (Developing)

- Lighting inconsistently supports mood or theme

1–2 (Weak)

- Lighting choices confuse or undermine atmosphere

CRITERION 3: INTEGRATION WITH OTHER DESIGN & PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS

(Set, Costume, Music, Choreography, Blocking)

What jurors are assessing:

- Cohesion across departments
- Visual balance and harmony

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Lighting integrates seamlessly with set, costume, music, and movement
- Colours, intensities, and cues complement other design elements
- No element competes unnecessarily for focus

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Good integration with minor mismatches

5–6 (Competent)

- Lighting functions independently but lacks cohesion

3–4 (Developing)

- Lighting clashes with other design elements

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor integration significantly disrupts the production

CRITERION 4: TECHNICAL PRECISION & REHEARSAL DEPTH

What jurors are assessing:

- Cue accuracy and timing
- Consistency and polish
- Evidence of rehearsal

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Lighting cues are precise, smooth, and well-timed
- Clear evidence of thorough rehearsal
- Transitions enhance rather than interrupt performance

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mostly accurate cueing with minor lapses

5–6 (Competent)

- Adequate cueing but inconsistent precision

3–4 (Developing)

- Mistimed or abrupt cues disrupt flow

1–2 (Weak)

- Frequent technical errors undermine performance

CRITERION 5: SUPPORT OF PERFORMERS & STORYTELLING

What jurors are assessing:

- Visibility and focus
- Enhancement of actor performance

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Lighting consistently supports performers' visibility and focus
- Lighting enhances emotional beats and dramatic emphasis
- Actors are never lost, obscured, or unintentionally overshadowed

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Performers are generally well supported with minor issues

5–6 (Competent)

- Visibility is adequate but inconsistent

3–4 (Developing)

- Lighting frequently distracts from or obscures performers

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor lighting severely limits performance effectiveness

CRITERION 6: RESPONSE TO SPECIAL PRODUCTION DEMANDS

(Scene changes, audience configuration, venue constraints, costume changes)

What jurors are assessing:

- Adaptability and problem-solving
- Flexibility of lighting design

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Lighting design demonstrates creative and effective solutions to production challenges
- Constraints are handled smoothly and intelligently

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Challenges are managed competently

5–6 (Competent)

- Challenges are addressed but limit impact

3–4 (Developing)

- Lighting struggles to accommodate production demands

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor handling of challenges disrupts the performance

ADDITIONAL LIGHTING-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

CRITERION 7: FOCUS, COVERAGE & COLOUR BALANCE

What jurors are assessing:

- **Visual clarity**
- **Balance and readability**

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Lighting provides clear focus for action
- Stage coverage is even and intentional
- Colour balance enhances visibility and mood

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mostly effective focus and coverage

5–6 (Competent)

- Uneven coverage or inconsistent colour balance

3–4 (Developing)

- Poor focus or distracting colour choices

1–2 (Weak)

- Lighting obscures action or confuses focus

CRITERION 8: INDICATION OF TIME, PLACE & LIGHT SOURCES

What jurors are assessing:

- Realism and clarity
- Visual storytelling through light

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Lighting clearly suggests time of day, location, and environment
- On-stage light sources are represented convincingly

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Time and place are mostly clear

5–6 (Competent)

- Limited clarity in time/place transitions

3–4 (Developing)

- Time and place are confusing

1–2 (Weak)

- Lighting fails to establish time or location

CRITERION 9: USE OF SPECIAL LIGHTING EFFECTS

What jurors are assessing:

- Purposeful use of effects
- Enhancement of storytelling

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Effects are used creatively and purposefully
- Effects enhance narrative, mood, or spectacle

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Effective effects with minor overuse or underuse

5–6 (Competent)

- Effects are present but not fully integrated

3–4 (Developing)

- Effects feel distracting or poorly timed

1–2 (Weak)

- Effects undermine clarity or storytelling

ADDITIONAL CRITERIA – VIDEO / FILM INTEGRATION (Where Applicable)

CRITERION 10: TECHNICAL SKILL IN VIDEO / FILM USE

9–10

- Video/film elements demonstrate strong technical and artistic control

7–8

- Effective use with minor technical limitations

5–6

- Basic competence with limited impact

3–4

- Technical weaknesses are evident

1–2

- Poor execution undermines production

CRITERION 11: INTEGRATION & VALUE ADDITION (VIDEO / FILM)

9–10

- Video/film is seamlessly integrated and significantly enhances storytelling

7–8

- Adds value with minor integration issues

5-6

- Neutral impact

3-4

- Feels unnecessary or distracting

1-2

- Detracts from the production

JUROR SCORING NOTE

Jurors should evaluate lighting design as an active storytelling tool, considering clarity, integration, precision, and emotional impact rather than brightness or equipment complexity.

OUTSTANDING DESIGN – SOUND

a) Best sound design

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA:	SCORE (Range of 1 – 10, 10 being the highest score)
1. Demonstrates technical skill in the manipulation of sound effects and/or music to enhance the production.	
2. Through purposeful design, creatively complements and supports the director's vision for the production.	
3. Reinforces the style, tone, mood, atmosphere or themes of the production.	
4. Integrates well with other aspects of the production such as lighting design, set and costume design, music and choreography.	
5. Executed with precision and evidence of sufficient and effective rehearsal.	
6. Supports the actors in delivering their performances.	
7. Employs effective solutions to any special demands of the production (e.g. extensive scene or costume changes, stage or space limitations, position of audience).	

8. Where the production involves the sound mixing of amplified voices and musical accompaniment, achieves good balance within the instrumental accompaniment and vocal sections, and between vocalists and accompaniment.	
---	--

CRITERION 1: TECHNICAL SKILL & SOUND MANIPULATION

What jurors are assessing:

- Quality and control of sound effects, music, and playback
- Precision in cueing and layering

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Sound effects and/or music are manipulated with **high technical skill**
- Transitions, fades, and layering are smooth and intentional
- Sound enhances narrative clarity and emotional impact

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Strong technical control with minor inconsistencies

5–6 (Competent)

- Basic technical competence with occasional flaws

3–4 (Developing)

- Technical weaknesses affect clarity or consistency

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor sound manipulation undermines the production

CRITERION 2: ALIGNMENT WITH DIRECTOR'S VISION

What jurors are assessing:

- Conceptual coherence
- Artistic intention behind sound choices

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Sound design **clearly and purposefully supports the director's vision**
- Choices feel intentional, integrated, and dramaturgically informed

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Strong alignment with minor conceptual gaps

5–6 (Competent)

- Sound generally supports the production without a strong conceptual identity

3–4 (Developing)

- Sound feels disconnected from the director's interpretation

1–2 (Weak)

- Sound actively undermines or contradicts the director's vision

CRITERION 3: STYLE, TONE, MOOD & THEMATIC SUPPORT

What jurors are assessing:

- Emotional and atmospheric contribution
- Reinforcement of themes

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Sound design powerfully reinforces **style, tone, mood, and themes**
- Audio choices deepen emotional resonance and narrative clarity

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Effective atmospheric support with minor lapses

5–6 (Competent)

- Appropriate but emotionally neutral sound design

3–4 (Developing)

- Sound inconsistently supports the mood or theme

1–2 (Weak)

- Sound choices confuse or undermine the atmosphere

CRITERION 4: INTEGRATION WITH OTHER DESIGN ELEMENTS

(Lighting, Set, Costume, Music, Choreography, Blocking)

What jurors are assessing:

- Cohesion across departments
- Balance and timing

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Sound integrates **seamlessly** with lighting, set, costume, music, and movement
- Cueing complements visual and physical storytelling

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Good integration with minor timing or balance issues

5–6 (Competent)

- Sound functions independently but lacks cohesion

3–4 (Developing)

- Sound clashes with other design elements

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor integration disrupts the production

CRITERION 5: PRECISION, CUEING & REHEARSAL DEPTH

What jurors are assessing:

- Timing accuracy
- Smooth execution
- Evidence of rehearsal

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Sound cues are **precise, well-timed, and consistently accurate**
- Clear evidence of thorough rehearsal and technical preparedness

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mostly accurate cueing with minor lapses

5–6 (Competent)

- Cueing is serviceable but occasionally late or abrupt

3–4 (Developing)

- Mistimed cues disrupt flow

1–2 (Weak)

- Frequent errors undermine performance

CRITERION 6: SUPPORT OF PERFORMERS & CLARITY OF DELIVERY

What jurors are assessing:

- Audibility and intelligibility
- Performer comfort and confidence

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Sound design consistently supports the **clear audibility of performers**
- Dialogue, vocals, and effects are well-balanced
- Sound enhances, rather than competes with, performance

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mostly clear with minor balance issues

5–6 (Competent)

- Audibility is inconsistent

3–4 (Developing)

- Performers are frequently overpowered or unclear

1–2 (Weak)

- Sound severely limits performer effectiveness

CRITERION 7: RESPONSE TO SPECIAL PRODUCTION DEMANDS

(Scene changes, venue acoustics, audience placement, space limitations)

What jurors are assessing:

- Adaptability and problem-solving
- Venue awareness

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Sound design demonstrates **creative and effective solutions** to production challenges
- Venue acoustics and spatial demands are expertly managed

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Challenges are handled competently

5–6 (Competent)

- Challenges are addressed but limit impact

3–4 (Developing)

- Acoustic or logistical issues disrupt performance

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor handling of challenges undermines production

ADDITIONAL SOUND-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

CRITERION 8: MIXING OF AMPLIFIED VOICES & MUSIC (WHERE APPLICABLE)

What jurors are assessing:

- Balance and blend
- Clarity across vocal and instrumental elements

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Excellent balance between vocals and accompaniment
- All elements are clear, blended, and controlled

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mostly balanced with minor inconsistencies

5–6 (Competent)

- Balance issues occasionally affect clarity

3–4 (Developing)

- Frequent imbalance between vocals and music

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor mixing significantly undermines performance

JUROR SCORING NOTE

Jurors should evaluate sound design based on clarity, integration, storytelling impact, and technical execution — not volume, equipment quality, or scale alone.

OUTSTANDING ENSEMBLE

- a) Best Learning Institution(Schools, Tertiary Institutions)
- b) Best Theatre company of the year

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA:	SCORE (Range of 1 – 10, 10 being the highest score)
1. Works together as a team to deliver the production as a whole	
2. Demonstrates effective communication and engagement between team members and with the audience	
3. Shows evidence of mutual trust and support between team members and commitment to a shared purpose	
4. Achieves consistency and cohesiveness of performance across the entire team	

CRITERION 1: TEAMWORK & COLLECTIVE DELIVERY

What jurors are assessing:

- How the group functions as a unit
- Shared responsibility for storytelling
- Balance between individuals and the collective

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Ensemble operates as a **seamless, unified unit**
- No single performer dominates unnecessarily
- Collective storytelling is strong, confident, and coherent
- Group functions with high awareness and responsiveness

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Strong teamwork with minor imbalances
- Most performers contribute effectively to the whole

5–6 (Competent)

- General teamwork is evident but inconsistent
- Some performers stand out while others fade

3–4 (Developing)

- Ensemble feels fragmented or uneven
- Limited sense of shared responsibility

1–2 (Weak)

- Little evidence of teamwork
- Performers function in isolation rather than as a group

CRITERION 2: COMMUNICATION & ENGAGEMENT

What jurors are assessing:

- Internal communication between performers
- External communication with the audience
- Responsiveness and listening

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Ensemble demonstrates **clear, active communication** at all times
- Performers listen, respond, and adapt to one another
- Strong, intentional engagement with the audience

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Effective communication with minor lapses
- Audience engagement is sustained

5–6 (Competent)

- Communication is present but inconsistent
- Audience engagement fluctuates

3–4 (Developing)

- Limited interaction or responsiveness
- Weak audience connection

1-2 (Weak)

- Poor communication undermines clarity and engagement

CRITERION 3: TRUST, SUPPORT & SHARED PURPOSE

What jurors are assessing:

- Mutual reliance and confidence
- Evidence of ensemble discipline
- Commitment to a shared artistic goal

Descriptor Bands:

9-10 (Exceptional)

- Strong evidence of **mutual trust, support, and shared purpose**
- Performers clearly rely on and support one another
- Ensemble discipline enhances performance quality

7-8 (Very Strong)

- Clear sense of trust and collective intention
- Minor inconsistencies in support or focus

5-6 (Competent)

- Some sense of shared purpose, but unevenly realised

3-4 (Developing)

- Weak trust or uneven commitment among members

1-2 (Weak)

- Lack of trust or cohesion is evident

CRITERION 4: CONSISTENCY & COHESIVENESS ACROSS THE ENSEMBLE

What jurors are assessing:

- Uniformity of performance quality
- Reliability and discipline across the group

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Performance quality is **consistently high across the entire ensemble**
- Energy, focus, and commitment are sustained throughout

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mostly consistent with minor performance dips

5–6 (Competent)

- Noticeable variation in quality between performers

3–4 (Developing)

- Inconsistent performance undermines cohesion

1–2 (Weak)

- Significant inconsistency across the ensemble

SPECIAL GUIDANCE FOR CATEGORY TYPES

Learning Institutions (Schools / Tertiary)

Jurors should consider:

- Age-appropriate discipline and ambition
- Training outcomes and ensemble development
- Growth, commitment, and collective learning evident in performance
- Consistency - quality over quantity

Theatre Company of the Year

Jurors should consider:

- Professional discipline and consistency - quality over quantity
- Company identity and artistic cohesion
- Ensemble culture demonstrated across productions

JUROR SCORING NOTE

Jurors should evaluate ensemble performance based on collective impact, unity, and consistency rather than individual excellence or star power.

OUTSTANDING WRITING

a) Best Playwright

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA:	SCORE (Ranges from 1-10, 10 being the highest)
1. A strong and clear use of an original and interesting theme	
2. A clear viewpoint that is integrated into the play in an interesting writing style	
3. The progression in character development throughout the play	
4. The active, vital and dramatic progression of the plot of the play	
5. How natural and credible the dialogue is in respect to the plot and setting of the play	
6. The appropriateness and relatability of the play to its audience	

CRITERION 1: ORIGINAL THEME & CENTRAL IDEA

What jurors are assessing:

- Originality of the concept - research and context
- Clarity of the central theme
- Dramatic significance of the idea

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Play presents a **clear, original, and compelling theme**
- Central idea is fresh, distinctive, and intellectually or emotionally engaging
- Theme resonates strongly and lingers beyond the performance

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Theme is clear and interesting
- Some originality, though familiar ideas may be present

5–6 (Competent)

- Theme is identifiable but predictable or underdeveloped

3–4 (Developing)

- Theme is unclear or inconsistently explored

1–2 (Weak)

- Theme is confused, derivative, or absent

CRITERION 2: VIEWPOINT & WRITER'S VOICE

What jurors are assessing:

- Strength of perspective
- Distinctiveness of writing style
- Integration of viewpoint into the narrative

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Play demonstrates a **strong, confident, and distinctive viewpoint**
- Writer's voice is clear and consistent throughout
- Perspective is embedded organically within the story

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Clear viewpoint with a recognisable voice
- Some stylistic inconsistencies

5–6 (Competent)

- Viewpoint is present but not strongly articulated

3–4 (Developing)

- Writing lacks a clear perspective or voice

1–2 (Weak)

- No discernible viewpoint or authorial intent

CRITERION 3: CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT & DRAMATIC ARCS

What jurors are assessing:

- Depth and evolution of characters
- Consistency and motivation
- Relationship between character and story

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Characters are **fully developed, complex, and dynamic**
- Clear progression and transformation across the play
- Characters drive the narrative meaningfully

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Characters are well developed with clear arcs
- Minor inconsistencies may exist

5–6 (Competent)

- Characters are functional but limited in depth

3–4 (Developing)

- Characters lack growth or clarity

1–2 (Weak)

- Characters are flat, inconsistent, or poorly defined

CRITERION 4: PLOT STRUCTURE & DRAMATIC PROGRESSION

What jurors are assessing:

- Narrative momentum

- Structural coherence
- Dramatic tension and pacing

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Plot demonstrates **strong dramatic momentum**
- Clear structure with purposeful progression
- Conflict, stakes, and resolution are effectively handled

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Plot is engaging with mostly effective pacing

5–6 (Competent)

- Plot is understandable but uneven or predictable

3–4 (Developing)

- Plot lacks drive or structural clarity

1–2 (Weak)

- Plot is confusing, stagnant, or poorly constructed

CRITERION 5: DIALOGUE – NATURALISM, PURPOSE & CREDIBILITY

What jurors are assessing:

- Authenticity of dialogue
- Relationship between speech and character
- Advancement of plot and theme through dialogue

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Dialogue is **natural, credible, and character-specific**
- Speech advances plot and deepens relationships
- Strong rhythm, subtext, and dramatic tension

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Dialogue is believable and effective with minor lapses

5–6 (Competent)

- Dialogue serves the plot but lacks vitality or nuance

3–4 (Developing)

- Dialogue feels forced, expositional, or repetitive

1–2 (Weak)

- Dialogue is unnatural or undermines credibility

CRITERION 6: AUDIENCE RELATABILITY & RELEVANCE

What jurors are assessing:

- Connection to intended audience
- Cultural, emotional, or social relevance
- Accessibility without oversimplification

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Play is **highly relevant and relatable** to its audience
- Themes, characters, and conflicts resonate strongly
- Writing balances specificity with universality

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Clear audience connection with strong moments of resonance

5–6 (Competent)

- Some relatable elements, but impact is uneven

3–4 (Developing)

- Limited relevance or unclear target audience

1–2 (Weak)

- Play fails to connect meaningfully with its audience

JUROR SCORING NOTE

Jurors should assess the written work independently of performance quality, production values, or popularity. Scores should reflect dramatic craft, originality, and narrative effectiveness.

OUTSTANDING WRITING

a) Best Adaptation

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA:	SCORE (Ranging from 1-10, 10 being the highest)
1. Transformation of source material. How effectively the original source (play, novel, oral narrative, film, historical text, etc.) is re-imagined for the stage, showing clear adaptation choices rather than direct replication.	
2. Artistic Interpretation and Adaptational Vision. A clear interpretive viewpoint that justifies why and how the work has been adapted, offering a fresh perspective.	
3. Dramatic and theatrical effectiveness. How well the adapted work functions as theatre.	
4. Respect for source material with creative independence.	

Adaptations must NOT be judged on originality of source material, but on the quality of adaptation choices.

CRITERION 1: TRANSFORMATION OF SOURCE MATERIAL

What jurors are assessing:

- Degree of transformation from source to stage

- Clarity of adaptational choices
- Theatrical re-imagining (not replication)

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Source material is **boldly and intelligently transformed** for the stage
- Adaptation demonstrates clear, purposeful choices in structure, form, and emphasis
- The work feels theatrically alive and newly authored, not transferred or copied

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Source material is effectively reworked for theatrical purposes
- Adaptational choices are clear, though some sections may remain close to the original

5–6 (Competent)

- Adaptation is functional but largely literal
- Limited transformation beyond condensation or reordering

3–4 (Developing)

- Adaptation shows minimal re-imagining
- Work feels overly dependent on the source

1–2 (Weak)

- Little to no adaptation evident
- Material feels directly transplanted rather than theatrically reworked

CRITERION 2: ADAPTATIONAL VISION & ARTISTIC INTERPRETATION

What jurors are assessing:

- Presence of a clear interpretive viewpoint
- Justification for adapting this work now and in this way
- Freshness of perspective

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Adaptation presents a **clear, confident, and compelling artistic vision**
- Interpretive choices offer new insight, relevance, or perspective
- The adaptation justifies its existence artistically and thematically

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Interpretive vision is clear and purposeful
- Some moments could push further in originality or depth

5–6 (Competent)

- Vision is present but cautious or underdeveloped

3–4 (Developing)

- Interpretive intent is unclear or inconsistent

1–2 (Weak)

- No discernible adaptational vision

CRITERION 3: DRAMATIC & THEATRICAL EFFECTIVENESS

What jurors are assessing:

- How well the adaptation functions as live theatre
- Dramatic momentum, structure, and stageworthiness

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Adapted work functions as **strong, confident theatre**
- Clear dramatic structure, momentum, and stage logic
- Scenes, characters, and action are theatrically purposeful

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Effective theatrical structure with minor pacing or clarity issues

5–6 (Competent)

- Theatrically serviceable but uneven or static in places

3–4 (Developing)

- Theatrical weaknesses undermine engagement

1–2 (Weak)

- Adaptation does not function effectively as theatre

CRITERION 4: BALANCE BETWEEN RESPECT & CREATIVE INDEPENDENCE

What jurors are assessing:

- Respect for the spirit (not necessarily the letter) of the source
- Willingness to make bold creative decisions

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Adaptation demonstrates **deep respect for the source material while asserting strong creative independence**
- Changes feel justified, thoughtful, and artistically necessary
- The adaptation stands confidently as its own work

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Good balance between fidelity and creativity
- Some areas lean too heavily toward one side

5–6 (Competent)

- Respectful but overly cautious
- Limited creative risk-taking

3–4 (Developing)

- Either too reverent (restrictive) or too detached from the source

1–2 (Weak)

- Adaptation either disrespects the source without purpose or copies it without creativity

OPTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR JURORS

(Not separately scored but useful in deliberation)

- How effectively non-theatrical sources (novels, oral narratives, historical texts, film) are translated into stage language
- Use of theatrical devices (structure, chorus, narration, symbolism, fragmentation, etc.)
- Cultural, historical, or contemporary relevance introduced through adaptation

JUROR SCORING NOTE

Jurors should assess the adaptation as an independent theatrical work, considering how imaginatively and effectively the source material has been transformed for the stage, rather than judging faithfulness alone.

OUTSTANDING MUSICAL SCORE

a) Best Original Musical score, arrangement or adaptation

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA:	SCORE (Ranging from 1-10, 10 being the highest)
1. The appropriateness and compatibility of music with the plot and theme of the play	
2. The originality, imagination and fresh musical ideas integrated into the play	
3. The incorporation of the score in developing the message of the play	
4. The relatability and appropriateness of the (music to the audience)	
5. The role the music plays in character development and portrayal	

CRITERION 1: COMPATIBILITY WITH PLOT & THEME

What jurors are assessing:

- Alignment between music and story
- Appropriateness of musical choices

- Narrative coherence

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Music is **perfectly aligned with the plot and themes** of the play
- Musical choices actively clarify, deepen, or heighten narrative meaning
- Score feels inseparable from the story being told

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Music supports plot and theme effectively
- Minor moments of mismatch or missed emphasis

5–6 (Competent)

- Music is generally appropriate but occasionally generic or under-integrated

3–4 (Developing)

- Music inconsistently supports the story or themes

1–2 (Weak)

- Music clashes with or undermines the plot and thematic intent

CRITERION 2: ORIGINALITY, IMAGINATION & MUSICAL INVENTIVENESS

What jurors are assessing:

- Freshness of musical ideas
- Creative risk-taking
- Distinctive compositional voice

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Score demonstrates **high originality and imaginative musical thinking**
- Musical ideas are fresh, distinctive, and memorable
- Composer/arranger shows strong creative identity

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Clear originality with thoughtful musical ideas
- Some familiar influences used creatively

5–6 (Competent)

- Functional but predictable musical language

3–4 (Developing)

- Limited originality or overreliance on familiar patterns

1–2 (Weak)

- Derivative or uninspired musical material

CRITERION 3: NARRATIVE & THEMATIC DEVELOPMENT THROUGH MUSIC

What jurors are assessing:

- How music advances the story
- Musical reinforcement of meaning
- Structural role of the score

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Music plays an **active role in developing the message and themes** of the play
- Musical motifs, reprises, or structural choices support narrative progression
- Score deepens emotional and intellectual engagement

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Music clearly supports thematic development
- Some missed opportunities for deeper integration

5–6 (Competent)

- Music accompanies the story but rarely drives it

3–4 (Developing)

- Music feels incidental rather than integral

1–2 (Weak)

- Music has little to no narrative function

CRITERION 4: AUDIENCE RELATABILITY & ACCESSIBILITY

What jurors are assessing:

- Audience connection
- Cultural, emotional, or stylistic accessibility
- Appropriateness to intended audience

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Music is **highly relatable and engaging** for the intended audience
- Score balances accessibility with artistic integrity
- Audience connection is strong and sustained

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Music resonates well with the audience
- Minor accessibility gaps

5–6 (Competent)

- Some engaging moments, but overall impact is moderate

3–4 (Developing)

- Limited audience connection

1–2 (Weak)

- Music fails to connect meaningfully with the audience

CRITERION 5: MUSIC AS A TOOL FOR CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT

What jurors are assessing:

- Use of music to define character
- Character-specific musical language
- Emotional and psychological depth

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Music plays a **clear and powerful role in character development and portrayal**
- Characters are given distinct musical identities or journeys
- Songs or motifs reveal inner states, growth, or conflict

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Music supports characterisation effectively
- Some characters are more musically defined than others

5–6 (Competent)

- Music supports character presence but lacks depth

3–4 (Developing)

- Limited use of music for character exploration

1–2 (Weak)

- Music does not support or actively confuses character portrayal

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR ARRANGEMENTS & ADAPTATIONS

Jurors should consider:

- Artistic justification for changes
- Respect for original material
- Added value of the adaptation

High scores should reflect adaptations that:

- Reimagine material creatively
- Serve the production's specific narrative needs
- Maintain musical integrity while offering fresh perspective

JUROR SCORING NOTE

Jurors should assess the musical score as a narrative and emotional engine of the production. Scores should reflect originality, integration, and storytelling impact rather than complexity, volume, or production scale.

OUTSTANDING DESIGN – HAIR & MAKE-UP

a) Best Hair and Make-up

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA:	SCORE (Ranging from 1-10, 10 being the highest)
1. How hair and make-up support character identity, age, status, personality, and role	
2. Use of hair and make-up to show progression, transformation, or continuity	
3. Conceptual coherence with the overall production	
4. Consistency and harmony across the cast and scenes	
5. Suitability for movement, lighting, heat, and performance length	
6. Originality, imagination, and technical skill	
7. Consistency across scenes and accuracy in execution	

CRITERION 1: CHARACTER IDENTITY, AGE, STATUS & PERSONALITY

What jurors are assessing:

- Clarity of character definition
- Visual storytelling through hair and make-up
- Alignment with role requirements

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Hair and make-up **immediately and clearly communicate character identity**

- Age, status, personality, and role are visually distinct and convincing
- Design choices enhance performance and deepen characterisation

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Characters are clearly defined with minor inconsistencies

5–6 (Competent)

- Designs are appropriate but lack specificity or depth

3–4 (Developing)

- Character identity is unclear or inconsistently communicated

1–2 (Weak)

- Hair and make-up confuse, flatten, or undermine character identity

CRITERION 2: PROGRESSION, TRANSFORMATION & CONTINUITY

What jurors are assessing:

- Use of hair and make-up to track narrative change
- Visual continuity across scenes

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Hair and make-up **actively show progression, transformation, or deterioration**
- Continuity is precise and intentional across scenes and time shifts

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Clear progression with minor continuity lapses

5–6 (Competent)

- Limited or subtle use of progression

3–4 (Developing)

- Inconsistent or unclear continuity

1-2 (Weak)

- No evidence of progression or continuity management

CRITERION 3: CONCEPTUAL COHERENCE WITH THE PRODUCTION

What jurors are assessing:

- Alignment with the director's vision
- Integration with costume, lighting, and overall aesthetic

Descriptor Bands:

9-10 (Exceptional)

- Hair and make-up design **seamlessly align with and enhance the production concept**
- Design choices feel intentional, integrated, and dramaturgically informed

7-8 (Very Strong)

- Strong conceptual alignment with minor inconsistencies

5-6 (Competent)

- General support of the production concept without strong identity

3-4 (Developing)

- Design feels disconnected from the production's vision

1-2 (Weak)

- Design contradicts or undermines the overall concept

CRITERION 4: CONSISTENCY & HARMONY ACROSS CAST & SCENES

What jurors are assessing:

- Visual cohesion
- Balance across principal and ensemble performers

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Hair and make-up demonstrate **strong visual harmony across the entire cast**
- No performer appears out of place stylistically

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mostly cohesive with minor inconsistencies

5–6 (Competent)

- Functional consistency with noticeable variations

3–4 (Developing)

- Uneven or distracting inconsistencies

1–2 (Weak)

- Lack of cohesion undermines believability

CRITERION 5: PERFORMANCE PRACTICALITY & DURABILITY

(Movement, lighting, heat, sweat, performance length)

What jurors are assessing:

- Suitability for live performance conditions
- Maintenance across scenes

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Designs are **fully performance-proof**
- Hair and make-up remain intact, readable, and effective throughout
- Quick changes and maintenance are seamless

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Mostly durable with minor breakdown issues

5–6 (Competent)

- Some visible wear or inconsistency during performance

3–4 (Developing)

- Practical issues distract from performance

1–2 (Weak)

- Designs fail under performance conditions

CRITERION 6: ORIGINALITY, IMAGINATION & TECHNICAL SKILL

What jurors are assessing:

- Creative thinking
- Technical execution and finish
- Problem-solving ability

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- Design demonstrates **high originality and technical mastery**
- Creative risks enhance storytelling and visual impact

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Strong technique with some originality

5–6 (Competent)

- Technically sound but creatively safe

3–4 (Developing)

- Limited creativity or inconsistent technique

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor execution or uninspired design

CRITERION 7: EXECUTION, DETAIL & SCENE-TO-SCENE ACCURACY

What jurors are assessing:

- Precision of application
- Attention to detail

- Continuity accuracy

Descriptor Bands:

9–10 (Exceptional)

- High level of precision and attention to detail
- Hair and make-up remain consistent and accurate across scenes and performances

7–8 (Very Strong)

- Minor execution or continuity lapses

5–6 (Competent)

- Noticeable inconsistencies

3–4 (Developing)

- Frequent execution errors

1–2 (Weak)

- Poor accuracy undermines credibility

JUROR SCORING NOTE

Jurors should assess hair and make-up as a narrative, visual, and practical design discipline. Scores should reflect storytelling impact, cohesion, durability, and technical execution rather than cosmetic beauty alone.