|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | FAIL | PASS | 3H | 2H2 | 2H1 | 1H |
| 0–25 | 25–39 | 40–44 | 45–49 | 50–59 | 60–69 | 70–79 | 80–100 |
| Originality and creativity  | No evidence of creativity; confused, derivative, entirely conventional work  | Insufficient evidence of independent approach and creativity | Very limited evidence of creativity and originality | Occasional evidence of originality and creativity | Some but inconsistent evidence of originality and creativity | Some evidence of originality and innovation; some creativity in style and approach and in adopted solutions | Ample evidence of sophistication, originality, and innovation; work characterised by a distinctive style | Outstanding inventiveness and innovation; a unique, original creative style and approach |
| Character work  | Little to no sense of character or narrative, no evidence of understanding of or engagement with task | Insufficient understanding of character development; very poor quality of dialogue, action, detail, character world  | Very limited evidence of understanding and control of character development; poor quality of dialogue, action, detail, character world  | Evidence of restricted understanding and control of character development; some serious lapses in quality of dialogue, action, detail, character world  | Some evidence of understanding and control of character development and interaction with story/plot; fair quality of dialogue, action, detail, character world but with lapses | Evidence of good understanding and control of character development and interaction with story/plot; some sophistication in quality of dialogue, action, detail, character world | Excellent character development and interaction with story/plot; excellent quality of dialogue, action, detail, character world | Outstanding standards of character development and interaction with story and plot; outstanding to industry-level quality of dialogue, action, detail, character world  |
| Structure | Entirely incoherent or lacking in structure | Poor structure; inconsistent story; very little to no sense of narrative and story | Some basic understanding of the structural requirements of the task; serious lapses in story consistency | Restricted understanding of the structural requirements; some serious lapses in consistency of story | Some consistency of story but with lapses; some elements of strength of story | Evidence of good thinking about structure; good consistency and strength of story  | Strong, consistent, coherent story; evidence of how structure is not merely a secure foundation for the story but is part of the film’s meaning | Outstanding strong, consistent and coherent story; exceptional level of skills; outstanding structure as part of the film’s meaning |
| Presentation and organisation | Extremely poor; entirely irrelevant to the task | Poor work; largely irrelevant to the task; very limited evidence of planning; substandard style and presentation; frequent errors, not consistently intelligible  | Some basic understanding of the task; serious lapses in organisation and presentation; stylistically poor or inappropriate, with frequent errors | Some serious lapses in planning effectiveness; evidence of some awareness of style and tone; inconsistent formatting and presentation; some grammar errors | Fair understanding of task; maintains focus but there may be some lapses; some weaknesses of organisation, form, language and/or formatting | Good understanding of task; sound organisation and planning; use of form and language appropriate to context; good presentation and formatting, very few errors | Highly coherent, effective response to task; excellent organisation and planning; use of form and language entirely appropriate to context; excellent presentation and formatting | Outstandingly coherent and effective response to task; outstanding planning; use of form and language entirely appropriate to context, function and intention; industry-standard presentation and formatting  |