

ROOM:

TIME:

District Wyoming Music Festival
Official Adjudication Form
BRASS/WOODWIND ENSEMBLE








WMEA FORM B-2

Information Must Be Typed


NAME OF GROUP:**SCHOOL:****ENSEMBLE TYPE:****ACCOMPANIST:****HIGH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT:****CITY:****NO. OF STUDENTS IN GROUP:****GRADE 12:****GRADE 11:****GRADE 10:****GRADE 9:****SCHOOL INSTRUCTOR:****SELECTION:****COMPOSER:**

Adjudicator,

- Place the number in the circle for each area that most closely matches the descriptors in the corresponding box.
- Total the scores and affix a division rating based upon the scale at the bottom of the form.
- Please add your comments and suggestions in the large space provided (use back, if necessary) and sign the form.

	5	4	3	2 - 1
TONE 	Excellent sonority Open, rich, focused, full resonant tone on all parts Consistent color and quality in all ranges and registers	Characteristic tone most of the time on all parts Tone color and/or quality is affected by range and volume changes	Tone color and quality is inconsistent between sections Inconsistent color and quality in various ranges and volume levels	Basic ensemble sound not developed Changing volume and registers create tone quality problems
INTONATION 	Excellent listening skills evident Adjustments made instantly within melodic and harmonic contexts	Listening skills well-developed Problems in certain ranges and/or volume, or in difficult passages Problems usually corrected quickly	Listening skills developing, but numerous intonation problems evident Few problems corrected	Listening skills undeveloped Individual/ensemble problems go uncorrected
RHYTHM 	Nearly all rhythms/note values performed correctly Tempos are accurate to printed score	Occasional rhythmic errors Most errors are quickly corrected Tempos vary from printed score, especially in difficult passages	Rhythmic accuracy is inconsistent Errors are often repeated and few are corrected Tempos inconsistent	Inaccurate rhythms detract from performance Tempos inconsistent of balance and blend
INTERPRETATION 	Very musical, sensitive, artistic performance Excellent style in all sections Excellent phrasing and use of dynamics and nuance	Meaningful interpretation most of the time Style appropriate Good phrasing and dynamics, but lacks nuance	Lacks meaningful interpretation much of the time, with problems in difficult sections Use of some dynamics and phrasing, but not always musical	Notes are performed with very little meaningful interpretation Style inconsistent or not obvious Little attention to phrasing and dynamics
BALANCE, BLEND 	Excellent melodic and harmonic balance All sections demonstrate excellent blend to ensemble sonority	Good balance/blend most of the time Balance/blend problems occur in difficult passages Problems are quickly corrected	Frequent balance and blend problems occur Musical lines often unclear Few problems are corrected	Little evidence of concept of balance and blend
TECHNIQUE 	Polished performance Articulation is accurately performed Flexibility and excellent musicianship exhibited by all	Strong performance with lapses of uniformity in difficult sections Very good articulations Flexibility and musicianship are generally good	Technique is inconsistent, performance lacks polish Articulation not consistent with printed score	Technique is underdeveloped for level of difficulty Minimal uniformity in articulation
OTHER FACTORS 	Outstanding literature for age and training Professional approach Ensemble is appropriately attired Scores provided with numbered measures for the adjudicator	Above average literature for age and training Inconsistencies in attire and/or formal approach Scores provided with numbered measure for the adjudicator	Average literature for age and training Approach lacks polish and professionalism Common etiquette often overlooked Scores not properly prepared for adjudicator	Below average or unacceptable literature Ensemble does not demonstrate appropriate approach to formal performance setting Individuals detract from performance
Adjudicator Comments and Suggestions for Improvement				

Total Points

**RATING COMPUTATION TABLE**

35 – 31 = DIVISION I (SUPERIOR)
30 – 24 = DIVISION II (EXCELLENT)
23 – 17 = DIVISION III (GOOD)
16 – 11 = DIVISION IV (FAIR)
10 – 0 = DIVISION V (POOR)

Signature of Adjudicator

Signature of Festival Chairman

DIVISIONAL RATING _____