

## **ADJUDICATION OF MUSIC GROUPS**

The following check list could serve as a guide for adjudicators:

1. Adjudicators must acquaint themselves with standards of performance that may be expected from school groups. The entire rating plan is based on this understanding.
2. All groups earning the same rating should have attained approximately the same level of performance. Inclusion within the same division of groups of widely varying achievements is a misuse of the rating system.
3. Expected levels of achievement may vary according to the scope and location of the competition festival.
4. It is essential that the adjudicator offer criticisms which support and clarify the rating.
5. Adjudicator shall communicate comment prior to posting of the rating.

### **RATING SYSTEM**

The trend seems to be away from giving a specific number of points on various factors such as tone, intonation, technique, etc. In lieu of the point system, a letter grade of A, B, C, D, or F shall be given for each factor and used as the criterion for the rating.

### **RATING I**

This division represents the finest conceivable performance for the event and the class of participants being judged: worthy of the distinction of being recognized as among the very best.

While the judge might find some minor points to criticize and make some helpful suggestions for further improvement, his/her comment sheet would show a preponderance of A's for each of the categories. His/her remarks would generally be complimentary for outstanding work.

### **RATING II**

This rating reflects an unusual performance in many respects but not one worthy of the highest rating due to minor defects. However, it is a performance of distinctive quality.

The group in this division usually shows the results of sound fundamental training, but the performance lacks the polish and finesse necessary to qualify for Division I. In the square on the comment sheet there could be some A's, but there also would be some B's. It is relatively easy for a judge to comment on such a performance because the weaknesses stand out clearly against a generally first-rate background, and suggestions can usually be focused on something specific and helpful.

### **RATING III**

This rating is awarded for a good performance, but one that is not outstanding. The performance shows accomplishment and marked promise, but is lacking in one or more essential qualities.

This division indicates much room for improvement in many of the fundamental items listed on the adjudicator's comment sheet. Such a comment sheet might show a few A's, and B's, but would show quite a few C's. There probably would not be time or space to record each error as it occurred, but the group would have some basically fine qualities and there should be ample opportunities for the judge to make suggestions for general improvement in those fundamental factors in which the performance revealed weaknesses.

### **RATING IV**

This rating describes a performance that shows some obvious weaknesses. These may reflect handicaps in the way of instrumentation or lack of rehearsal time.

This classification represents a performance that is generally weak and uncertain. There are numerous errors and the performance reveals basic weaknesses in most of the fundamental factors listed on the score sheet. The judge's comment sheet will show many D's. He/She probably will not devote much space to pointing out specific errors in the works performed. His/Her comments, however, will likely be encouraging and contain helpful suggestions for improvement. He/She might suggest such things as a more favorable schedule to allow more regular rehearsal, more individual practice, or sectional rehearsals, or more careful screening of players. The judge might even make specific recommendations for ensemble or individual studies, and exercises that would contribute to the development of a player or the group.

### **RATING V**

This rating indicates a performance that reveals much room for improvement. The director should check his methods, instrumentation, etc., with those of more mature organizations.

This division is rarely used even by the most critical judges. It indicates a performance in which the players reveal almost a complete lack of preparedness and understanding. In some cases this may be due to immature students attempting music which is far too advanced for them. In others, it may be due to an accumulation of careless and bad playing habits, which only tend to become accentuated and more noticeable as the player becomes older. The judge's comment sheet will, of course, be filled with D's and F's. He/She must use a great deal of tact in his comments to soloists or groups in these lower divisions. If there are any commendable features in the performance, they may be singled out. Perhaps there is one outstandingly good player in the group. He/She could be held up as a model. Sometimes only the stage deportment and appearance can be commented on favorably, but even this may be some comfort.

### **COMMENTS ONLY (N/A)**

This rating provides appropriate written and verbal feedback for the betterment of the performance and the program in general. Place no letter or number ratings on the Adjudication Form.