

Florida Bandmasters Association

ADJUDICATOR TRAINING SEMINAR:
DISTRICT SOLO & ENSEMBLE M.P.A. ADJUDICATION

Brian Sullivan, Winter Park, Florida
Brian.Sullivan7509@gmail.com 321/624-5432

INTRODUCTION -- PRELIMINARY MATTERS

- Who are we?
- FBA MPAs -- "A Philosophy for Music Performance Assessment Adjudication"
- Who/what are we evaluating? Whose advocate are we?
- Goals for today

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

- Your room set-up
 - Where will you be? Good for you? The performers? The audience?
- Your events
 - Before the performance
 - What should you confirm? What else would you like to know?
 - During the performance
 - Anything can and will happen!
 - After the performance
 - THIS IS WHEN YOU EARN YOUR BIG BUCKS!
- The sheet
- Your schedule
- Rules infractions
- Other concerns

ARTISTIC/EDUCATIONAL MATTERS

- The "Three C's":
 - C _____
 - C _____
 - C _____
- Ratings
- Listening examples, discuss anticipated scenarios`

A Philosophy for Music Performance Assessment Adjudication

We, the membership of the Florida Bandmasters Association (FBA), believe that Music Performance Assessments are valuable opportunities for musical growth for both students and directors. We believe that the primary purpose of a Music Performance Assessment is to provide constructive feedback to participants in an effort to help them improve music skills, knowledge, performance abilities, and understanding. Musical performances are evaluated by adjudicators who use their musical knowledge and experiences to analyze, diagnose, and prescribe. Performers do not compete against one another; bands do not compete against other bands. Instead, performances are evaluated on the basis of how they compare to musical standards as determined by the adjudicators.

We recognize that each adjudicator brings a wealth of musical knowledge and experience to the adjudication process. We also recognize that, while there is a common core of musical knowledge which all trained musicians share, each adjudicator brings a different level of knowledge and experience to the process. It is the diversity and wealth of individual experiences of our adjudicators that provide comprehensive evaluations for our students and directors. We value the fact that musical performance is an interpretive art. As such, attempts to quantify or standardize it should be avoided. The evaluation of a musical performance is also an interpretive process. Each adjudicator will interpret a musical performance based on his or her own unique background of experiences. Attempts to quantify or standardize the interpretive nature of the adjudication process would contradict the very purpose of our Music Performance Assessments.

The primary tasks of Music Performance Assessment adjudicators are to help the participants understand how well they are performing compared to the musical standards which are appropriate for their level of maturity and experience, and to suggest ways in which improvement can be achieved. Adjudication sheets are tools which can assist adjudicators and participants in understanding the criteria which are to be included in the overall evaluation process. These sheets can also help the adjudicator address criteria in a consistent manner. But it is the adjudicator's perception and interpretation of the performance that ultimately determines how those criteria are applied.

We believe that the selection of persons to become adjudicators is an important process which has been carefully designed and diligently followed by our Association. We also believe that the continuing education of our adjudicators is imperative. To that end, we offer internships, workshops, and certification training seminars. We recognize that the most effective way to improve the adjudication of our performances is to provide adjudicators with opportunities to gain additional musical and interpretive experiences. It is incumbent upon directors to evaluate adjudicators after each Music Performance Assessment so that feedback is available for the adjudicators. It is also incumbent upon all members of the Association to report violations of adjudication standards, or poor performance on the part of individual adjudicators, to the Adjudication Committee.

Florida Bandmasters Association

Adjudicator's Comment Sheet

WIND INSTRUMENT SOLO & ENSEMBLE

Performer's Name _____ School _____

Performance Time: _____ Judge: _____ Date: _____

Selection: _____

PERFORMANCE FUNDAMENTALS	TECHNICAL ACCURACY	MUSICAL EFFECT
<input type="checkbox"/> Tone Quality <input type="checkbox"/> Intonation <input type="checkbox"/> Balance <input type="checkbox"/> Blend <input type="checkbox"/> Ensemble Sonority <input type="checkbox"/> Physical Articulation	<input type="checkbox"/> Note accuracy <input type="checkbox"/> Rhythmic Accuracy <input type="checkbox"/> Precision <input type="checkbox"/> Entrances <input type="checkbox"/> Release <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretive Articulation <input type="checkbox"/> Clarity of Articulation <input type="checkbox"/> Technique <input type="checkbox"/> Stability of Pulse <input type="checkbox"/> Dynamics Observed <input type="checkbox"/> Transitions	<input type="checkbox"/> Expression <input type="checkbox"/> Shaping of Line <input type="checkbox"/> Style <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretation <input type="checkbox"/> Phrasing <input type="checkbox"/> Tempo <input type="checkbox"/> Dynamic Expression
(circle one) A B C D E	(circle one) A B C D E	(circle one) A B C D E

Officials will include a + or - by the subdivisions, which mean they are noticeably good or noticeably needing improvement as related to the letter grade assigned. The absence of any marks indicates a performance consistent with the letter assigned. After completing the previous, circle an A, B, C, D, or E to indicate the level of performance in each category.

COMMENTS

(INCLUDING STAGE PRESENCE, DISCIPLINE, POSTURE, STRONG POINTS, WEAK POINTS)

Recommended For: _____
(Superior, Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor)
Write out Final Rating

Adjudicator's Signature

Standards for Ratings

We as Adjudicators, should make an effort to employ ALL the rating categories available when appropriate. Ratings should be literally interpreted by the titles, i.e., SUPERIOR, EXCELLENT, GOOD, FAIR and POOR. We should remember that success is not only by a SUPERIOR rating; the other ratings have credibility and should be used in a positive and constructive way.

“SUPERIOR”

The rating is comparable to the grade of “A”. This rating reflects the finest conceivable performance for the event and class of participants being evaluated – worthy of the distinction of being recognized as among the very best. While the adjudicator may find some minor points to criticize and make helpful suggestions for improvement, his/her comments sheet would show a majority of “A’s” for each category, and his/her remarks would be generally complimentary for outstanding work.

“EXCELLENT”

The rating is comparable to a grade of “B”. This rating reflects an unusually high level of performance in many respects, but one not worthy of the highest rating due to minor defects. Yet it is a performance of distinctive quality. The band receiving this rating usually shows the results of sound fundamental training, but the performance lacks the polish and finesse to qualify for a Superior rating. The squares on the Comment Sheet should contain a majority of “B’s”, with the possibility of one “A” or one “C”, but with an overall “B” average. It is usually very easy for an adjudicator to comment on such a performance since the weaknesses stand out clearly in a generally first-rate performance, and suggestions can be focused on something specific and helpful.

“GOOD”

The rating would be comparable to a grade of “C”. This rating is awarded for a good performance, but one that is not outstanding. It shows accomplishment and marked promise and potential, but is lacking in one or more essential qualities. This rating indicates much room for improvement in many of the fundamental areas listed on the Comment Sheet, and the Sheet would show a majority of “C’s”. There probably would not be enough time or space to record each specific error as it occurred, but the group would exhibit some basically fine qualities. The adjudicator should find ample opportunities to make suggestions for improvement in those fundamental factors which were revealed as weakness during the performance.

“FAIR”

This rating is comparable to a grade of “D”, and describes a performance that shows obvious weaknesses. These MAY reflect handicaps in the way of instrumentation or lack of rehearsal time, but generally represents a performance that is weak or uncertain – containing numerous errors, and revealing basic flaws in most of the fundamental factors listed on the Comment Sheet. The Sheet would show a majority of “D’s”. Probably not much space or time will be spent pointing out specific errors in the selections performed, but will focus on overall fundamental deficiencies. Comments, however, should be encouraging and contain many suggestions for improvement – possibly in the areas of rehearsal time and use, emphasis on individual practice and sectional rehearsals, careful screening of players, recommendations for ensemble and the individual players and the band as a whole.

“POOR”

This rating indicates a performance that reveals much room for improvement. The director of such a group should reevaluate his/her methods of teachings and compare them to those of directors who have achieved the higher ratings with their bands. This rating is rarely used by even the most critical adjudicators. It indicates that there is 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 their present capabilities. In others it may be due to an accumulation of careless and poor playing habits which only tend to become accentuated and more noticeable as the players grow older and are faced with more demanding literature. The Comment Sheet would be filled with a majority of “E’s”, but comments should be very tactful and encouraging. Any commendable features of the performance should be singled out and emphasized – such as any outstanding players who could serve as models for the group. Sometimes only stage deportment and appearance are favorable, but positive comments on these may offer some comfort. The adjudicator should be honest and forthright, but should not resort to sarcasm or unduly harsh criticism. Above all, urge the participants and director to strive for improvement and for the realization of their potential, remembering our purpose is to promote and encourage exceptional musical performance.

FINAL RATING – CHARACTERIZATIONS

SUPERIOR

- Finest conceivable performance
- Worthy of distinction
- Recognized as among the very best

EXCELLENT

- Reflects an unusually high level of performance
- It is a performance of distinctive quality
- Band shows the result of sound fundamental training
- Lacks the polish and finesse to qualify for a Superior rating

GOOD

- A good performance, but one that is not outstanding
- Shows accomplishment, marked promise and potential
- Indicates much room for improvement in fundamentals
- Group would exhibit some basically fine qualities

FAIR

- Performance that shows obvious weaknesses
- Weak or uncertain – containing numerous errors
- Reveals basic flaws in most of the fundamental factors from the ACS
- Requires suggestions for improvement

POOR

- Rarely used
- Lack of preparedness and understanding
- Exhibiting poor playing habits
- Requires suggestions for improvement