



TECHNICAL THEATRE SCORING HANDBOOK

OFFICIAL CATEGORY SCORING GUIDE
FOR CAPPIES CRITICS
GREATER CINCINNATI CHAPTER

WWW.CINCICAP.COM

EVIDENCE BASED SCORING

Critics should score all technical categories based on the evidence they see in the room and what they observe in the show. Critics should refer to the individual category rubrics when scoring technical categories.

All technical categories listed in this handbook require the following evidence to be submitted by the student or group of students in charge:

1. Cover Sheet (role, responsibilities, 150–250 word reflection)
2. Required role verification documents (2–3 artifacts)
3. Supporting portfolio (maximum 10 pages / 5 double-sided of additional evidence or photos)

Evidence must be presented in a binder or on a posterboard. Digital presentations (i.e. slideshows) are excluded due to limited usability in pre-show and post-show discussions.

IF NO EVIDENCE IS PROVIDED 60 MINUTES BEFORE THE SHOW

The school is ineligible for that category.

IF JUST THE COVER SHEET IS SUBMITTED

The school is ineligible for that category.

IF THE COVER SHEET AND EVIDENCE ARE SUBMITTED BUT REQUIRED DOCUMENTS ARE MISSING

The highest score the school can earn in that category is a 5.

IF COVER SHEET AND REQUIRED EVIDENCE IS SUBMITTED, BUT ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE IS MISSING

The school may be scored fully in this category, but critics should use good and fair judgment when evaluating.

IF COMPLETE EVIDENCE IS SUBMITTED

The category should be scored fully according to the rubric.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS BY CATEGORY

Each category requires two specific documents as part of the evidence portfolio. These are the minimum required artifacts. Submitted evidence **MUST** be created by students. Falsifying evidence created by adults will result in a school's show being ineligible for all awards per the advisor/mentor agreement.

CATEGORY	REQUIRED DOCUMENT #1	REQUIRED DOCUMENT #2
Stage Management	Cue Documentation Calling script pages, cue script pages	Production Report Rehearsal report or performance report
Sets	Ground Plan Hand-drawn or digital ground plan	Rendering or Model Documentation Rendering, model photos
Lighting	Lighting Plot Hand-drawn or digital lighting plot	Cue Sheet Cue list, magic sheet
Sound	Sound Cue List Cue sheet, QLab cue list	Microphone Plot (if mics used) or Sound System Documentation (if not) Mic plot, speaker plot
Costumes	Costume Plot Character costume tracking chart	Costume Renderings Costume sketches, costume collage
Hair & Makeup	Hair & Makeup Design Template Face chart, hairstyle template	Look Book Completed design photos showing character looks
Props	Master Props List Props tracking list	Build/Buy/Borrow List Acquisition and construction documentation
Marketing & Publicity	Marketing Plan Campaign calendar, publicity timeline	Marketing Materials Posters, social media graphics
Special Effects & Technology	Effect/System Plan Projection plan, effect diagram	Effect Cue Documentation Cue sheet, operator checklist
Choreography	Formation Charts Formation maps, staging diagrams	Choreography Notes Rehearsal notes and teaching notes

MARKETING & PUBLICITY

EVALUATION GUIDE

WHAT IS THIS CATEGORY?

Recognizes the student(s) responsible for promoting the production through advertising, branding, social media, public relations, and audience outreach. Evaluate the student's strategy, materials, branding, and execution—not ticket sales, school size, or professional contributions.

POST-SHOW QUESTIONS

- What specific marketing responsibilities did the student have?
- What promotional materials did the student create?
- How did the student develop and execute the campaign?
- What evidence of planning, branding, or strategy can they provide?

EVIDENCE DISCLOSURE

Any marketing asset not created by the student must be disclosed and credited. This includes professional photography, adult-created graphics or video, and outside marketing services. Failure to disclose may impact evaluation.

WHAT TO LOOK FOR

- Clear, consistent visual identity
- Materials effectively communicate themes and appeal
- Creative, engaging, audience-appropriate campaign
- Evidence of planning and strategic thinking
- Coordinated campaign across multiple platforms
- Evidence of campaign development and execution

IMPORTANT

A well-attended show is not evidence of excellent marketing. Evaluate the student's work, not enrollment or budget. Professional photos or video may be used in a campaign but must be disclosed. Evaluate how photos and video are used, not photo and video quality. Students seeking top scores must show both an outstanding campaign and professional planning.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

Marketing Plan (campaign calendar, publicity timeline) • Marketing Materials (posters, social media graphics)

OPTIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Content Calendars • Brand Guides • Social Media Campaigns • Promotional Graphics • Digital Ads • Video Trailers • Press Releases • Email Campaigns • Website Content

MARKETING & PUBLICITY

SCORING GUIDE

PRESENTATION (1–10)

How polished, professional, and visually cohesive are the marketing materials?

9–10: Materials are exceptionally polished with consistent branding, professional-quality design, and flawless execution across all platforms.

7–8: Materials are well-designed with strong visual identity and minimal inconsistencies.

5–6: Materials are competent but lack refinement or have noticeable inconsistencies in branding or quality.

3–4: Materials appear rushed or unfinished with weak visual identity.

1–2: Materials are sloppy, inconsistent, or unprofessional.

ORIGINALITY (1–10)

How creative, inventive, or unique is the campaign concept and execution?

9–10: Campaign demonstrates exceptional creativity with a distinctive concept that sets it apart from conventional approaches.

7–8: Campaign shows strong creative thinking with fresh ideas in concept or execution.

5–6: Campaign is functional but relies on familiar or expected approaches.

3–4: Campaign shows little creative thought or borrows heavily from templates.

1–2: No evidence of original thinking; generic or copied materials.

RANGE (1–10)

How broad and varied is the campaign across platforms, formats, and audiences?

9–10: Campaign spans multiple platforms with varied formats (print, digital, video, social) and targets diverse audiences with tailored messaging.

7–8: Campaign uses several platforms effectively with some variety in format and audience targeting.

5–6: Campaign covers basic platforms but lacks variety in format or audience approach.

3–4: Campaign is limited to one or two platforms with minimal variation.

1–2: Campaign exists on a single platform with no variation in approach.

DIFFICULTY (1–10)

How ambitious and challenging was the campaign in scope, strategy, and execution?

9–10: Campaign required sophisticated strategic planning, complex coordination, and advanced skills (video production, multi-phase rollouts, data-driven targeting).

7–8: Campaign involved significant planning and coordination with some advanced techniques.

5–6: Campaign required moderate effort and basic planning skills.

3–4: Campaign involved minimal planning or coordination.

1–2: Campaign required little effort or skill to execute.

REMEMBER

Evaluate the student's work, not ticket sales, school size, or professional contributions. Score each area independently based on the evidence provided.

If required documents are missing, the highest score a category can receive is a 5.

SPECIAL EFFECTS & TECHNOLOGY

EVALUATION GUIDE

WHAT IS THIS CATEGORY?

Recognizes the student(s) responsible for creating, programming, integrating, operating, or managing technological and special effects elements that enhance storytelling. Evaluate the student's design, planning, programming, integration, and execution—not simply the presence of technology.

MAY INCLUDE

Projection Design • Video Content • Automation • Practical Effects • Atmospheric Effects • Interactive Technologies • Show Control Systems • Digital Media • Emerging Theatre Technologies

POST-SHOW QUESTIONS

- What specific effects or technologies were the student's responsibility?
- What planning, programming, design, or technical work did the student complete?
- What evidence of the student's process can be provided?
- How did the technology support storytelling and production goals?

EVIDENCE DISCLOSURE

Any technology, programming, content, or effect created primarily by adults, vendors, or non-student contributors must be disclosed and credited. This includes professionally created projection content, vendor-programmed systems, adult-programmed show control, and outside contractors. Failure to disclose may impact evaluation.

WHAT TO LOOK FOR

- Technology supports the story and production concept
- Effectively integrated into the production
- Student demonstrated technical skill and problem-solving
- Evidence of planning, programming, design, or system development
- Technology operated reliably and consistently
- Used intentionally, not simply for novelty

IMPORTANT

Evaluate based on the student's contribution, not the school's budget or equipment inventory. Complex equipment alone is not evidence of outstanding achievement. Students seeking top scores must show both exceptional execution and professional planning/programming/design process.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

Effect/System Plan (projection plan, effect diagram) • Effect Cue Documentation (cue sheet, operator checklist)

OPTIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

System Diagrams • Programming Documentation • Signal Flow Charts • Content Design Files • Testing Logs • Integration Plans • Operator Checklists • Maintenance Records

SPECIAL EFFECTS & TECHNOLOGY

SCORING GUIDE

PRESENTATION (1–10)

How polished, reliable, and seamlessly integrated are the effects into the production?

9–10: Effects execute flawlessly with precise timing, seamless integration, and professional-level reliability.

7–8: Effects are well-executed and consistent with only minor timing or integration issues.

5–6: Effects function adequately but have noticeable timing, reliability, or integration weaknesses.

3–4: Effects are inconsistent, poorly timed, or disruptive to the production flow.

1–2: Effects fail frequently, distract the audience, or appear unfinished.

ORIGINALITY (1–10)

How creative or inventive is the approach to solving production challenges through technology?

9–10: Student devised innovative solutions, repurposed technology in unexpected ways, or created original effects not typically seen in student productions.

7–8: Student showed creative problem-solving and applied technology in fresh or thoughtful ways.

5–6: Student used standard approaches and pre-existing solutions without significant adaptation.

3–4: Student relied entirely on out-of-the-box setups with no creative input.

1–2: No evidence of creative thinking; effects are generic or copied without understanding.

RANGE (1–10)

How varied are the types of technology, systems, or effects the student managed?

9–10: Student managed multiple distinct systems (projections, automation, practicals, atmospherics, show control) demonstrating breadth across disciplines.

7–8: Student worked across several different effect types or technical systems with competence.

5–6: Student focused on one or two systems with limited variety in technical scope.

3–4: Student operated a single system with no variation in responsibility.

1–2: Student's involvement was limited to a single, simple task.

DIFFICULTY (1–10)

How technically complex and challenging were the effects to design, program, build, or operate?

9–10: Effects required advanced programming, custom fabrication, complex system integration, or sophisticated problem-solving well beyond standard student work.

7–8: Effects involved significant technical skill, multi-step programming, or complex coordination.

5–6: Effects required moderate technical knowledge and standard operational skills.

3–4: Effects were simple to set up and operate with minimal technical demand.

1–2: Effects required virtually no technical skill or knowledge.

REMEMBER

Evaluate the student's contribution, not the school's budget or equipment inventory. Complex equipment alone is not evidence of outstanding achievement. Score each area independently.

If required documents are missing, the highest score a category can receive is a 5.

HAIR & MAKEUP

EVALUATION GUIDE

WHAT IS THIS CATEGORY?

Recognizes the student(s) responsible for designing, planning, coordinating, and executing hairstyles, wigs, facial hair, makeup, and character appearance. Evaluate both artistic design and technical execution, rewarding research, character storytelling, craftsmanship, consistency, and execution.

POST-SHOW QUESTIONS

- What specific responsibilities did the student have?
- Did the student design, apply, style, supervise, or coordinate elements?
- What design, research, or planning materials did the student create?

EVIDENCE DISCLOSURE

Any hair, wig, makeup, prosthetic, or styling work completed primarily by adults, professional stylists, or non-student contributors must be disclosed. This includes professional wig styling, adult-applied prosthetics, professional makeup design, and outside consultations. Failure to disclose may impact evaluation.

WHAT TO LOOK FOR

- Hair and makeup support character development and storytelling
- Design choices appropriate to style, period, and concept
- Consistency across performers and performances
- Evidence of research and design planning
- Work executed cleanly, effectively, and professionally
- Student demonstrated problem-solving and organizational skills

IMPORTANT

Evaluate based on the student's contribution, not the school's budget or access to professional resources. Professional wigs or specialty materials are not automatically evidence of outstanding achievement. Students seeking top scores must show both exceptional execution and a professional design process.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

Hair & Makeup Design Template (face chart, hairstyle template) • Look Book (completed design photos showing character looks)

OPTIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Character Makeup Charts • Makeup Renderings • Hair/Wig Plots • Research Boards • Design Packets • Character Tracking Sheets • Product Lists • Application Process Documentation • Before-and-After References

HAIR & MAKEUP

SCORING GUIDE

PRESENTATION (1–10)

How polished, consistent, and professionally executed are the hair and makeup looks?

9–10: Looks are flawlessly applied with exceptional craftsmanship, consistency across performers and performances, and professional-level finish.

7–8: Looks are well-executed with strong consistency and only minor application issues.

5–6: Looks are competent but have noticeable inconsistencies, uneven application, or lack of polish.

3–4: Looks are poorly applied, inconsistent between performers, or visibly unfinished.

1–2: Looks are distracting, sloppy, or undermine the production.

ORIGINALITY (1–10)

How creative and distinctive are the design choices in supporting character and story?

9–10: Designs show exceptional artistic vision with inventive choices that elevate character storytelling beyond conventional approaches.

7–8: Designs demonstrate strong creative thinking with thoughtful, character-specific choices.

5–6: Designs are appropriate but rely on expected or standard approaches for the genre/period.

3–4: Designs show little creative thought or are generic across characters.

1–2: No evidence of intentional design; looks appear arbitrary or unconsidered.

RANGE (1–10)

How varied are the techniques, styles, and character looks the student designed or executed?

9–10: Student demonstrated mastery across multiple techniques (aging, period styling, character makeup, wigs, prosthetics) with distinct looks for each character.

7–8: Student worked across several techniques or styles with clear differentiation between characters.

5–6: Student used a limited set of techniques with some variation between characters.

3–4: Student applied similar looks across most characters with minimal differentiation.

1–2: All characters look essentially the same; no variety in technique or style.

DIFFICULTY (1–10)

How technically demanding were the looks to design, plan, and execute?

9–10: Looks required advanced skills such as prosthetic application, wig construction, aging techniques, period-accurate styling, or complex quick-changes.

7–8: Looks involved significant skill including specialty techniques, detailed character work, or challenging coordination.

5–6: Looks required moderate skill and standard application techniques.

3–4: Looks were simple and required only basic application skills.

1–2: Looks required virtually no skill or planning.

REMEMBER

Evaluate the student's contribution, not the school's budget or access to professional resources. Professional wigs or expensive products alone are not evidence of outstanding achievement. Score each area independently.

If required documents are missing, the highest score a category can receive is a 5.

SOUND

EVALUATION GUIDE

WHAT IS THIS CATEGORY?

Recognizes the student(s) responsible for designing, programming, engineering, mixing, operating, or managing the audio elements of a production. This may include: Sound Design, Sound Engineering, Microphone Management, Audio Programming, Sound Effect Creation, Sound Mixing, Playback Operation, System Configuration, and Sound Reinforcement. Evaluate the student's planning, design, engineering, mixing, operation, and execution—not simply the quality of equipment.

POST-SHOW QUESTIONS

- What specific sound responsibilities did the student have?
- Did the student design, program, engineer, mix, or operate the sound system?
- Did the student actively mix the production during performances?
- What planning, programming, or design documents did the student create?
- What evidence of the student's process can be provided?

EVIDENCE DISCLOSURE

Any sound design, programming, mixing, engineering, or equipment configuration completed primarily by adults, professional engineers, consultants, or non-student contributors must be disclosed. This includes adult-created sound designs, professional audio programming, adult-built playback systems, consultant-created microphone plots, and outside sound engineering services. Failure to disclose may impact evaluation.

WHAT TO LOOK FOR

- Could performers be heard clearly and consistently?
- Did sound support storytelling and audience engagement?
- Were sound effects, music, and reinforcement used intentionally and effectively?
- Did the student demonstrate planning and technical skill?
- Was there evidence of programming, system design, or engineering?
- Was the sound operation reliable and consistent?
- Did sound enhance rather than distract from the performance?

IMPORTANT

Good sound is often unnoticed by the audience. Evaluate the student's contribution, not equipment cost or school resources. An expensive sound system is not automatically evidence of outstanding achievement. Students who actively mix during performances should generally be evaluated more favorably than those limited to passive playback operation. Students seeking top scores must demonstrate both exceptional execution and evidence of a professional sound process.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

Sound Cue List (cue sheet, QLab cue list) • Microphone Plot or Sound System Documentation (mic plot, speaker plot)

OPTIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Channel Lists • Speaker/System Layouts • Programming Files • System Diagrams • Sound Effect Documentation • Mixing Documentation

SOUND

SCORING GUIDE

PRESENTATION (1–10)

How clean, balanced, and professionally mixed is the sound throughout the production?

9–10: Sound is flawlessly mixed with crystal-clear dialogue, perfectly balanced levels, seamless transitions, and professional-quality output throughout.

7–8: Sound is well-mixed with strong clarity and balance; only minor level or timing issues.

5–6: Sound is functional but has noticeable balance issues, inconsistent levels, or occasional feedback/distortion.

3–4: Sound is poorly mixed with frequent clarity issues, missed cues, or distracting imbalances.

1–2: Sound is inaudible, distorted, or actively hinders the audience's experience.

ORIGINALITY (1–10)

How creative and inventive is the sound design in supporting mood, story, and world-building?

9–10: Sound design demonstrates exceptional creativity with original compositions, inventive soundscapes, or innovative use of audio to enhance storytelling beyond conventional approaches.

7–8: Sound design shows strong creative choices with thoughtful cue selection and effective atmospheric work.

5–6: Sound design is appropriate but relies on stock effects or expected musical choices without creative adaptation.

3–4: Sound design shows little creative thought; generic or obvious choices throughout.

1–2: No evidence of intentional sound design; audio choices appear arbitrary.

RANGE (1–10)

How varied are the sound responsibilities, systems, and techniques the student managed?

9–10: Student managed multiple disciplines (live mixing, sound effects design, music editing, system engineering, mic management) demonstrating breadth across the full sound department.

7–8: Student worked across several sound responsibilities with competence in both creative and technical areas.

5–6: Student focused on one or two areas (e.g., playback only) with limited variety in scope.

3–4: Student operated a single system with no variation in responsibility.

1–2: Student's involvement was limited to pressing play or a single repetitive task.

DIFFICULTY (1–10)

How technically demanding was the sound work to design, program, engineer, or operate?

9–10: Work required advanced skills such as live mixing a large cast, complex system programming, multi-channel routing, original sound design, or real-time problem-solving under pressure.

7–8: Work involved significant technical skill including multi-mic management, detailed cue programming, or system configuration.

5–6: Work required moderate technical knowledge and standard operational skills.

3–4: Work was simple playback operation with minimal technical demand.

1–2: Work required virtually no technical skill or knowledge.

REMEMBER

Evaluate the student's contribution, not the school's equipment or venue acoustics. Expensive gear or wireless mics alone are not evidence of outstanding achievement. Score each area independently.

If required documents are missing, the highest score a category can receive is a 5.

PROPS

EVALUATION GUIDE

WHAT IS THIS CATEGORY?

Recognizes the student(s) responsible for researching, designing, sourcing, creating, organizing, maintaining, and managing the hand props, set dressing, furniture, consumables, and specialty items used throughout a production. Evaluate the student's planning, organization, craftsmanship, problem-solving, and execution—not simply the number of props used.

POST-SHOW QUESTIONS

- What specific prop responsibilities did the student have?
- Did the student design, build, modify, source, organize, track, repair, or manage props?
- What planning, tracking, or design documents did the student create?
- What evidence of the student's process can be provided?

EVIDENCE DISCLOSURE

Any prop design, fabrication, acquisition, or management completed primarily by adults, professional artisans, parents, or non-student contributors must be disclosed. Examples: professionally fabricated props, adult-built specialty props, parent-created pieces, professional furniture restoration, outside artisan work. Failure to disclose may impact evaluation.

WHAT TO LOOK FOR

- Did props support storytelling, character development, and period/style requirements?
- Were props appropriate, functional, and believable?
- Did the student demonstrate organization and attention to detail?
- Was there evidence of research, planning, fabrication, or management?
- Were props consistently available and correctly used throughout?
- Did the student solve challenges creatively and effectively?
- Did props enhance rather than distract from the production?

IMPORTANT

A large number of props is not automatically evidence of outstanding achievement. Expensive props are not automatically evidence of outstanding achievement. Evaluate the student's contribution, not the budget or access to resources. Students seeking the highest scores should demonstrate both exceptional execution and evidence of a professional props process.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

Master Props List (props tracking list) • Build/Buy/Borrow List (acquisition and construction documentation)

OPTIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Tracking Sheets • Preset Sheets • Research Boards • Build Plans • Fabrication Documentation • Budget/Purchasing Records • Prop Acquisition Logs • Maintenance Records • Organizational Systems Documentation

PROPS

SCORING GUIDE

PRESENTATION (1–10)

How polished, appropriate, and professionally executed are the props in the production?

9–10: Props are flawlessly crafted, period-appropriate, and seamlessly integrated into the production with exceptional attention to detail and consistency.

7–8: Props are well-made and appropriate with strong attention to detail; only minor issues in finish or consistency.

5–6: Props are functional and generally appropriate but lack refinement, have inconsistent quality, or show visible shortcuts.

3–4: Props are poorly made, visibly inappropriate, or inconsistent in quality and style.

1–2: Props are distracting, broken, or undermine the production.

ORIGINALITY (1–10)

How creative and resourceful is the approach to sourcing, building, or adapting props?

9–10: Student demonstrated exceptional creativity through inventive fabrication, clever repurposing, or original design solutions that elevated the storytelling.

7–8: Student showed strong creative problem-solving in building, adapting, or sourcing props in thoughtful ways.

5–6: Student used standard approaches (purchasing or borrowing) without significant creative adaptation.

3–4: Student showed little creative input; props are generic or unmodified purchases.

1–2: No evidence of creative thinking in prop selection or creation.

RANGE (1–10)

How varied are the types of props and responsibilities the student managed?

9–10: Student managed a diverse range of props (hand props, set dressing, food/consumables, specialty items, breakaways) and handled design, fabrication, organization, and tracking.

7–8: Student worked across several prop types and responsibilities with competence.

5–6: Student focused on a limited set of props or a single responsibility (e.g., sourcing only).

3–4: Student handled very few props with minimal variety in type or responsibility.

1–2: Student's involvement was limited to a single prop or task.

DIFFICULTY (1–10)

How technically demanding were the props to design, fabricate, source, or manage?

9–10: Props required advanced fabrication skills, complex mechanical elements, period-accurate research, breakaway construction, or sophisticated organizational systems for a large inventory.

7–8: Props involved significant craftsmanship, detailed research, or complex coordination and tracking.

5–6: Props required moderate skill in sourcing, basic construction, or standard organizational methods.

3–4: Props were simple to acquire or assemble with minimal skill required.

1–2: Props required virtually no effort, skill, or planning.

REMEMBER

Evaluate the student's contribution, not the school's budget or access to prop shops. Expensive or rare props alone are not evidence of outstanding achievement. Score each area independently.

If required documents are missing, the highest score a category can receive is a 5.

LIGHTING

EVALUATION GUIDE

WHAT IS THIS CATEGORY?

Recognizes the student(s) responsible for designing, programming, operating, and implementing the lighting elements of a production. This may include: Lighting Design, Programming, Operation, Cue Development, Focus/Instrument Placement, Color Selection, Special Effects, and System Configuration. Evaluate the student's planning, design, programming, operation, and execution—not simply the quality of equipment.

POST-SHOW QUESTIONS

- What specific lighting responsibilities did the student have?
- Did the student design, program, operate, or implement the lighting system?
- Did the student actively program or operate the console during performances?
- What planning, drafting, or design documents did the student create?
- What evidence of the student's process can be provided?

EVIDENCE DISCLOSURE

Any lighting design, programming, drafting, or system configuration completed primarily by adults, professional designers, consultants, or non-student contributors must be disclosed. Examples: adult-created designs, professional light plots, consultant-generated paperwork, adult-programmed consoles, professional system configuration. Failure to disclose may impact evaluation.

WHAT TO LOOK FOR

- Did lighting support storytelling, mood, and atmosphere?
- Were lighting choices intentional and appropriate?
- Did lighting help focus audience attention?
- Did the student demonstrate planning and technical skill?
- Was there evidence of design, drafting, programming, or cue development?
- Were transitions smooth and effective?
- Did lighting enhance rather than distract from the performance?

IMPORTANT

More equipment does not equal better student achievement. Evaluate the student's contribution, not the school's budget or facility. Students who actively design and program should be evaluated more favorably than those limited to hanging, focusing, or basic setup. Students seeking the highest scores should demonstrate both exceptional execution and evidence of a professional lighting process.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

Lighting Plot (hand-drawn or digital lighting plot) • Cue Sheet (cue list, magic sheet)

OPTIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Magic Sheets • Channel Hookups • Instrument Schedules • Color Schedules • Focus Charts • Lighting Paperwork • Programming Documentation • Visual Renderings

LIGHTING

SCORING GUIDE

PRESENTATION (1–10)

How polished, consistent, and professionally executed is the lighting throughout the production?

9–10: Lighting is flawlessly executed with precise timing, seamless transitions, consistent focus, and professional-level reliability throughout every cue.

7–8: Lighting is well-executed with strong consistency and only minor timing or focus issues.

5–6: Lighting is functional but has noticeable timing errors, missed cues, or inconsistent focus areas.

3–4: Lighting is unreliable with frequent missed cues, poor timing, or distracting inconsistencies.

1–2: Lighting actively hinders the production with constant errors or failures.

ORIGINALITY (1–10)

How creative and inventive is the lighting design in supporting mood, focus, and storytelling?

9–10: Design demonstrates exceptional artistic vision with inventive color choices, creative use of angle and texture, and innovative approaches that elevate the narrative beyond conventional stage lighting.

7–8: Design shows strong creative choices with thoughtful use of color, angle, and intensity to support storytelling.

5–6: Design is appropriate but relies on standard washes and expected looks without creative interpretation.

3–4: Design shows little creative thought; generic or flat lighting throughout.

1–2: No evidence of intentional design; lighting appears arbitrary or unconsidered.

RANGE (1–10)

How varied are the lighting looks, techniques, and responsibilities the student managed?

9–10: Student created diverse looks across scenes (warm/cool, specials, gobos, color mixing, practicals) and handled design, programming, paperwork, and operation.

7–8: Student demonstrated several distinct looks and managed multiple responsibilities in the lighting process.

5–6: Student created limited variety in looks or focused on a single responsibility (e.g., operation only).

3–4: Student produced minimal variation with repetitive looks or a single narrow task.

1–2: No variety; same look throughout or involvement limited to one simple action.

DIFFICULTY (1–10)

How technically demanding was the lighting to design, program, draft, or operate?

9–10: Work required advanced programming, complex cue sequences, multi-zone control, moving light programming, or sophisticated system design well beyond standard student work.

7–8: Work involved significant technical skill including detailed cue writing, multi-channel programming, or complex paperwork.

5–6: Work required moderate technical knowledge and standard console operation.

3–4: Work was simple operation with minimal programming or design input.

1–2: Work required virtually no technical skill or knowledge.

REMEMBER

Evaluate the student's contribution, not the school's equipment inventory. Expensive fixtures, moving lights, or LEDs alone are not evidence of outstanding achievement. Score each area independently.

If required documents are missing, the highest score a category can receive is a 5.

COSTUMES

EVALUATION GUIDE

WHAT IS THIS CATEGORY?

Recognizes the student(s) responsible for designing, researching, creating, selecting, coordinating, fitting, constructing, altering, and managing costumes. This may include: Costume Design, Construction, Coordination, Alterations, Crafts, Wardrobe Management, Character Research, and Tracking/Organization. Evaluate the student's design, planning, research, construction, coordination, and execution—not simply the appearance, quantity, or expense of garments.

POST-SHOW QUESTIONS

- What specific costume responsibilities did the student have?
- Did the student design, construct, alter, coordinate, fit, track, or manage costumes?
- What design, research, planning, or organizational documents did the student create?
- What evidence of the student's process can be provided?

EVIDENCE DISCLOSURE

Any costume design, construction, alterations, fittings, crafts, or wardrobe management completed primarily by adults, professional designers, parents, volunteers, or non-student contributors must be disclosed. Examples: adult-created designs, professionally constructed garments, parent-sewn pieces, professional tailoring, adult-managed wardrobe operations. Failure to disclose may impact evaluation.

WHAT TO LOOK FOR

- Did costumes support character development and storytelling?
- Were choices appropriate to the production's style, period, and concept?
- Did costumes help define character, status, relationships, or setting?
- Did the student demonstrate research and design thinking?
- Was there evidence of planning, organization, fittings, or construction?
- Were costumes consistent and well maintained throughout?
- Did costumes enhance rather than distract from the performance?

IMPORTANT

A large budget or renting costumes is not automatically evidence of outstanding achievement. Evaluate the student's contribution, not the school's resources or costume inventory. Students who design, construct, alter, coordinate, or manage costumes should be evaluated more favorably than those limited to distributing costumes or organizing racks. Students seeking the highest scores should demonstrate both exceptional execution and evidence of a professional costume process.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

Costume Plot (character costume tracking chart) • Costume Renderings (costume sketches, costume collage)

OPTIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Research Boards • Design Packets • Measurement Records • Fitting Notes • Construction Documentation • Alteration Records • Wardrobe Run Sheets

COSTUMES

SCORING GUIDE

PRESENTATION (1–10)

How polished, cohesive, and professionally executed are the costumes in the production?

9–10: Costumes are flawlessly constructed or sourced with exceptional fit, finish, and visual cohesion across the entire cast. Every detail supports the world of the play.

7–8: Costumes are well-executed with strong consistency, good fit, and only minor issues in finish or cohesion.

5–6: Costumes are functional and generally appropriate but lack refinement, have inconsistent quality, or show visible shortcuts in construction or fit.

3–4: Costumes are poorly fitted, inconsistent in style, or visibly unfinished.

1–2: Costumes are distracting, inappropriate, or undermine the production.

ORIGINALITY (1–10)

How creative and distinctive are the design choices in supporting character, period, and story?

9–10: Designs show exceptional artistic vision with inventive silhouettes, color palettes, or fabric choices that elevate character storytelling beyond conventional approaches.

7–8: Designs demonstrate strong creative thinking with thoughtful, character-specific choices that clearly support the narrative.

5–6: Designs are appropriate but rely on expected or standard approaches for the genre/period without creative interpretation.

3–4: Designs show little creative thought; costumes are generic or interchangeable between characters.

1–2: No evidence of intentional design; costumes appear arbitrary or pulled without consideration.

RANGE (1–10)

How varied are the techniques, styles, and responsibilities the student managed?

9–10: Student demonstrated mastery across multiple areas (design, construction, alteration, fitting, sourcing, quick-change coordination) with distinct looks for diverse characters.

7–8: Student worked across several responsibilities and created clear differentiation between characters and scenes.

5–6: Student focused on a limited set of responsibilities (e.g., pulling only) with some variation between characters.

3–4: Student handled very few costumes or a single narrow task with minimal variety.

1–2: No variety; all characters look essentially the same or involvement was limited to one simple task.

DIFFICULTY (1–10)

How technically demanding were the costumes to design, construct, source, or manage?

9–10: Work required advanced skills such as pattern drafting, period construction, complex alterations, specialty fabrics, quick-change engineering, or managing a large cast with multiple changes.

7–8: Work involved significant craftsmanship, detailed research, complex coordination, or challenging construction techniques.

5–6: Work required moderate skill in sourcing, basic alterations, or standard organizational methods.

3–4: Work was simple pulling or purchasing with minimal skill required.

1–2: Work required virtually no effort, skill, or planning.

REMEMBER

Evaluate the student's contribution, not the school's budget or costume inventory. Expensive rentals, professional designers, or parent volunteers alone are not evidence of outstanding student achievement. Score each area independently.

If required documents are missing, the highest score a category can receive is a 5.

CHOREOGRAPHY

EVALUATION GUIDE

WHAT IS THIS CATEGORY?

Recognizes the student(s) responsible for creating, teaching, organizing, rehearsing, and refining movement for a production. This may include: Dance Choreography, Musical Staging, Movement Composition, Dance Captain Responsibilities, Physical Storytelling, Formation Design, Traffic Patterns, and Movement Coaching.

Evaluate the student's artistic vision, movement composition, storytelling, teaching, leadership, and execution—not simply the performance ability of the cast.

POST-SHOW QUESTIONS

- What specific choreography responsibilities did the student have?
- Did the student create original choreography or movement?
- Did the student teach and rehearse performers?
- What planning or rehearsal documents did the student create?
- What evidence of the student's process can be provided?

EVIDENCE DISCLOSURE

Any choreography, movement design, dance instruction, or staging completed primarily by adults, professional choreographers, dance teachers, or non-student contributors must be disclosed and credited. Failure to disclose significant non-student contributions may impact evaluation.

WHAT TO LOOK FOR

- Did the choreography support storytelling and character development?
- Was movement appropriate to the style and demands of the production?
- Did the choreography effectively use the performance space?
- Were formations, transitions, and traffic patterns clear and intentional?
- Did the movement demonstrate creativity and originality?
- Did performers execute the choreography confidently and consistently?
- Did the student's work enhance the overall production?

IMPORTANT

Strong performers do not automatically indicate strong choreography. Difficult choreography does not automatically indicate effective choreography. Evaluate the student's contribution, not the talent level of the cast. Students who create, teach, stage, and rehearse choreography should be evaluated more favorably than those limited to demonstrating steps. Students seeking top scores must show both exceptional choreography and evidence of a professional process.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

Formation Charts (formation maps, staging diagrams) • Choreography Notes (rehearsal notes and teaching notes)

OPTIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Traffic Pattern Maps • Rehearsal Plans • Blocking Documentation • Movement Research • Video Rehearsal Documentation • Dance Captain Materials • Teaching Materials

CHOREOGRAPHY

SCORING GUIDE

PRESENTATION (1–10)

How polished, clean, and professionally executed is the choreography as performed in the production?

9–10: Choreography is performed with exceptional precision, clean formations, seamless transitions, and consistent execution across all numbers and performances.

7–8: Choreography is well-executed with strong formations and transitions; only minor synchronization or spacing issues.

5–6: Choreography is functional but has noticeable spacing, timing, or transition issues that affect the overall polish.

3–4: Choreography is poorly executed with frequent spacing errors, sloppy transitions, or inconsistent performance.

1–2: Choreography is chaotic, disorganized, or actively distracts from the production.

ORIGINALITY (1–10)

How creative and inventive is the choreography in supporting character, story, and emotional tone?

9–10: Choreography demonstrates exceptional artistic vision with inventive movement vocabulary, creative storytelling through dance, and innovative approaches that go beyond replicating existing choreography.

7–8: Choreography shows strong creative choices with thoughtful movement that clearly supports character and narrative.

5–6: Choreography is appropriate but relies on familiar steps, standard combinations, or recreations of existing choreography without creative interpretation.

3–4: Choreography shows little creative thought; generic movement with no connection to story or character.

1–2: No evidence of intentional choreographic design; movement appears random or unconsidered.

RANGE (1–10)

How varied are the styles, responsibilities, and choreographic demands the student managed?

9–10: Student created choreography across multiple styles and numbers, handled teaching, staging, formation design, and rehearsal leadership, demonstrating breadth across the full choreographic process.

7–8: Student worked across several numbers or styles and managed multiple responsibilities (creating, teaching, staging).

5–6: Student focused on one or two numbers or a single responsibility (e.g., demonstrating steps only) with limited variety.

3–4: Student's involvement was narrow with minimal variation in style or responsibility.

1–2: Student contributed to a single moment or task with no variety.

DIFFICULTY (1–10)

How technically demanding was the choreography to create, teach, stage, and coordinate?

9–10: Work required advanced skills such as creating complex formations, managing large ensemble staging, teaching intricate combinations, coordinating quick transitions, or integrating movement with technical elements.

7–8: Work involved significant choreographic skill including multi-part staging, detailed formation work, or challenging teaching responsibilities.

5–6: Work required moderate skill in creating or teaching basic combinations and formations.

3–4: Work was simple movement direction with minimal choreographic demand.

1–2: Work required virtually no choreographic skill or planning.

REMEMBER

Evaluate the student's choreographic contribution, not the cast's dance ability. Talented dancers, physically demanding movement, or professional choreographers alone are not evidence of outstanding student achievement. Score each area independently.

If required documents are missing, the highest score a category can receive is a 5.

STAGE MANAGEMENT

EVALUATION GUIDE

WHAT IS THIS CATEGORY?

Recognizes the student(s) responsible for organizing, coordinating, and executing the performance. Evaluate leadership, communication, organization, cue calling, and backstage operations—not the quality of lighting, sound, scenery, costumes, props, or projections.

POST-SHOW QUESTION

"Who called the show, and what were the stage manager's responsibilities during performances?"

WHAT TO LOOK FOR

- Did the student call the show?
- Were technical cues and transitions executed smoothly?
- Was the performance well-organized and consistent?
- Were backstage operations efficient and coordinated?
- Did the student demonstrate leadership and problem-solving?
- Were scene changes handled smoothly?

IMPORTANT

A stage manager who calls the show demonstrates a higher level of responsibility than one who only manages paperwork, attendance, or backstage supervision. Calling the show is significant evidence of high achievement.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

Cue Documentation (calling script pages, cue script pages) • Production Report (rehearsal report or performance report)

OPTIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Rehearsal Schedules • Contact Sheets • Blocking Notation • Preset Lists • Run Sheets • Scene Change Documentation • Crew Assignments

STAGE MANAGEMENT

SCORING GUIDE

PRESENTATION (1–10)

How polished, smooth, and professionally coordinated is the production from a stage management perspective?

9–10: Production runs flawlessly with precise cue calling, seamless scene changes, consistent pacing, and no visible backstage disruptions across all performances.

7–8: Production runs smoothly with strong coordination and only minor timing or transition issues.

5–6: Production is functional but has noticeable pacing issues, awkward transitions, or inconsistent cue execution.

3–4: Production has frequent coordination problems, missed cues, or disruptive scene changes.

1–2: Production is chaotic with constant delays, missed cues, or visible backstage failures.

ORIGINALITY (1–10)

How creative and resourceful is the student's approach to solving production challenges and organizing the process?

9–10: Student developed innovative organizational systems, creative solutions to complex logistical challenges, or original approaches to communication and coordination that elevated the production process.

7–8: Student showed strong problem-solving skills and thoughtful approaches to scheduling, communication, or backstage coordination.

5–6: Student used standard organizational methods without significant creative adaptation.

3–4: Student showed little initiative in solving problems or improving processes.

1–2: No evidence of creative thinking in organization or coordination.

RANGE (1–10)

How broad and varied are the stage management responsibilities the student fulfilled?

9–10: Student called the show AND managed multiple areas (scheduling, crew supervision, rehearsal reports, scene change coordination, communication between departments, conflict resolution).

7–8: Student called the show and handled several additional responsibilities with competence.

5–6: Student fulfilled basic SM duties but did not call the show, or called the show with limited additional responsibilities.

3–4: Student's involvement was limited to one or two narrow tasks (e.g., attendance only).

1–2: Student's role was minimal with virtually no variety in responsibility.

DIFFICULTY (1–10)

How technically demanding and complex was the production to stage manage?

9–10: Production required calling complex cue sequences, coordinating multiple departments simultaneously, managing large crews, handling rapid scene changes, or navigating significant logistical challenges.

7–8: Production involved significant coordination demands including multi-department communication, detailed cue calling, or complex scheduling.

5–6: Production required moderate organizational skill and standard coordination.

3–4: Production was simple to coordinate with minimal cues or crew to manage.

1–2: Production required virtually no stage management skill or coordination.

REMEMBER

Evaluate the student's leadership and coordination, not the quality of lighting, sound, costumes, or scenery. A stage manager who calls the show demonstrates a higher level of responsibility. Score each area independently.

If required documents are missing, the highest score a category can receive is a 5.

SETS

EVALUATION GUIDE

WHAT IS THIS CATEGORY?

Recognizes the student(s) responsible for the design, planning, construction, painting, installation, and execution of the physical environment. Evaluate both the quality of the finished set and the student's contribution. The category rewards artistic vision, technical execution, and craftsmanship.

POST-SHOW QUESTIONS

- What specific responsibilities did the student have?
- Did the student design, draft, build, paint, supervise, or lead?
- What planning or design documents did the student create?

WHAT TO LOOK FOR

- Did the set support the story, setting, and themes?
- Was the set functional and safe for performers?
- Strong craftsmanship and attention to detail?
- Evidence of leadership, planning, and problem-solving?
- Evidence of intentional design and preparation?
- Did the set enhance audience understanding and enjoyment?

IMPORTANT

A large or expensive set is not automatically excellent. Evaluate the student's work, not the resources available. Students seeking top scores must demonstrate both an outstanding final product and evidence of a professional planning process.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

Ground Plan (hand-drawn or digital ground plan) • Rendering or Model Documentation (rendering, model photos)

OPTIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Elevations • Construction Drawings • Paint Elevations • CAD/Vectorworks Drawings • Scale Models • Build Schedules

SETS

SCORING GUIDE

PRESENTATION (1–10)

How polished, well-crafted, and professionally finished is the set?

9–10: Set is flawlessly constructed with exceptional craftsmanship, clean finishing, professional-quality painting, and meticulous attention to detail throughout.

7–8: Set is well-built with strong craftsmanship and only minor finishing or detail issues.

5–6: Set is functional and generally well-constructed but has noticeable finishing issues, inconsistent quality, or visible shortcuts.

3–4: Set is poorly constructed with weak craftsmanship, unfinished elements, or visible structural problems.

1–2: Set is unsafe, falling apart, or so poorly finished it distracts from the production.

ORIGINALITY (1–10)

How creative and inventive is the set design in supporting story, world, and concept?

9–10: Design demonstrates exceptional artistic vision with inventive spatial solutions, creative use of materials, or innovative approaches to storytelling through environment that go beyond conventional staging.

7–8: Design shows strong creative thinking with thoughtful choices that clearly support the world of the play.

5–6: Design is appropriate but relies on expected or standard approaches without creative interpretation.

3–4: Design shows little creative thought; generic or uninspired environment.

1–2: No evidence of intentional design; set appears arbitrary or unconsidered.

RANGE (1–10)

How varied are the techniques, skills, and responsibilities the student managed?

9–10: Student demonstrated mastery across multiple areas (design, drafting, construction, painting, rigging, scene changes) and created distinct environments or looks across scenes.

7–8: Student worked across several responsibilities and techniques with competence and clear variety in output.

5–6: Student focused on a limited set of responsibilities (e.g., painting only) with some variation.

3–4: Student handled a single narrow task with minimal variety in technique or responsibility.

1–2: Student's involvement was limited to one simple, repetitive task.

DIFFICULTY (1–10)

How technically demanding was the set to design, build, paint, or install?

9–10: Work required advanced skills such as complex structural engineering, multi-level construction, mechanized scene changes, advanced painting techniques, or sophisticated drafting and planning.

7–8: Work involved significant construction skill, detailed planning, complex coordination, or challenging techniques.

5–6: Work required moderate skill in standard construction, basic painting, or simple planning.

3–4: Work was simple assembly or decoration with minimal technical demand.

1–2: Work required virtually no construction skill or planning.

REMEMBER

Evaluate the student's contribution, not the school's budget, shop facilities, or adult labor. A large or expensive set is not automatically excellent. Score each area independently based on the student's work.

If required documents are missing, the highest score a category can receive is a 5.

PORTFOLIO COVER SHEET



SHOW TITLE

SCHOOL

CATEGORY

STUDENT NAME(S)

ROLE / RESPONSIBILITIES

REFLECTION (150-250 WORDS)

REQUIRED ROLE EVIDENCE CHECKLIST

Check the box for each required document included in your portfolio.
Both documents must be submitted for full eligibility.



MARKETING & PUBLICITY

- ☐ Marketing Plan
 - ☐ Marketing Materials
-

SPECIAL EFFECTS & TECHNOLOGY

- ☐ Effect/System Plan
 - ☐ Effect Cue Documentation
-

HAIR & MAKEUP

- ☐ Hair & Makeup Design Template
 - ☐ Look Book
-

SOUND

- ☐ Sound Cue List
 - ☐ Microphone Plot or Sound System Documentation
-

PROPS

- ☐ Master Props List
 - ☐ Build/Buy/Borrow List
-

LIGHTING

- ☐ Lighting Plot
 - ☐ Cue Sheet
-

COSTUMES

- ☐ Costume Plot
 - ☐ Costume Renderings
-

CHOREOGRAPHY

- ☐ Formation Charts
 - ☐ Choreography Notes
-

STAGE MANAGEMENT

- ☐ Cue Documentation
 - ☐ Production Report
-

SETS

- ☐ Ground Plan
 - ☐ Rendering or Model Documentation
-

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

List any additional supporting materials included in your portfolio:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____