

**SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC
CLASSICAL INSTRUMENTAL JURY RUBRIC**

	1 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 8	9 - 10
Scales	Scales severely deficient; more than 4 note errors. Student unable to competently perform one or more of the scales.	Scales deficient in the following areas: 3-4 total note errors; inconsistent rhythm; faulty intonation; unrefined articulations	Scales deficient in the following areas: 1-2 total note errors; too slow tempo; unrefined articulations	Scales performed Nearly flawlessly at an appropriate tempo with outstanding intervallic intonation and clear articulations
Tone Quality	Underdeveloped tone lacks focus and clarity. Vibrato (if appropriate) is lacking	Tone is developing. Fuzziness, lack of clarity sometimes evident, especially in range and dynamic extremes. Vibrato (if appropriate) is underdeveloped.	Tone is well developed but occasionally lacks clarity/resonance. Vibrato (if appropriate) is evident, but needs refinement.	Tone is mature and resonant, with vibrato (if appropriate).
Intonation	Intonation is poor. Poor breath support/bow control adversely affects intonation.	Intonation issues evident. Inconsistent breath/bow control affects intonation.	Overall intonation is good; minor issues occur and performer demonstrates ability to adjust pitch.	Outstanding intonation in all registers and volumes.
Note & Rhythmic Accuracy	Note/rhythm errors interfere with the musical flow. Performer may have to restart due to errors.	Some errors in note accuracy and/or rhythm are evident, but overall performance remains effective.	Notes and rhythms are performed mostly accurately— a couple of minor errors during difficult passages.	Notes and rhythms performed nearly flawlessly.
Articulation	Fundamental errors in articulation/bowing are evident.	Articulation/bowings are inconsistently performed. Attacks and releases unrefined.	Articulations/bowings performed mostly accurately, but with minor flaws.	Articulation/bowings are stylistically accurate and tastefully performed.
Technical Facility	Performance is underprepared. Technical flaws hinder performance. Performer has to restart due to errors.	Performance is somewhat prepared. Technical facility is inconsistent.	Performance shows adequate preparation. Technical facility is very good, with minor flaws during difficult passages.	Performance is extremely well prepared. Technical facility is fluid.
Interpretation Tempo	Performer lacks a fundamental understanding of the music. Tempo choices are not stylistically appropriate.	Performer's musical interpretation is developing. Tempo choices are sometimes not always appropriate.	Performer displays a good understanding of the music and a clear sense of musical interpretation. Tempo choices are generally appropriate.	Performer displays a deep understanding of the music to render an emotive musical interpretation. Tempo choices are appropriate and tasteful.
Dynamics Expression	The performance is not expressive. Lack of dynamic contrasts.	The performance is somewhat expressive. More dynamic contrasts are necessary.	The performance is expressive, but within a narrow dynamic range.	The performance is highly expressive. Dynamics performed extremely well at all volumes and in all registers.
Phrasing	Performer's sense of phrasing needs further development. Phrasing lacks cohesiveness.	Performer's sense of phrasing is developing. Phrases sometimes lack definition, dynamic shape, and/or nuance.	Expressive shaping and contouring of phrases with minor flaws.	Performer demonstrates a mature sense of phrasing and musicianship.
Other Factors Presentation Appearance Poise Policies	The performance lacks adequate preparation. Two or more jury policies not followed (dress, music, copies, accompanist).	Presentation lacks polish. One jury policy not followed (dress, music, copies, accompanist).	Presentation exhibits adequate preparation. All jury policies adhered to (dress, music, copies, accompanist).	Presentation is polished and professional. All jury policies adhered to (dress, music, copies, accompanist).

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC
CLASSICAL INSTRUMENTAL JURY EVALUATION FORM

Student Name _____

Date _____

Instrument _____

1 – 10 points each category
Refer to rubric on opposite page

SCALES

Comments: _____

QUALITY OF SOUND

TONE QUALITY

Comments: _____

INTONATION

Comments: _____

TECHNIQUE

NOTE & RHYTHM ACCURACY

Comments: _____

ARTICULATION

Comments: _____

TECHNICAL FACILITY

Comments: _____

MUSICALITY

INTERPRETATION & TEMPO

Comments: _____

DYNAMICS & EXPRESSION

Comments: _____

PHRASING

Comments: _____

OTHER FACTORS

Appearance, Poise, Policies

Comments: _____

TOTAL (100) _____

Faculty Signature _____

Jury score = 25% of Private Lesson/Applied Music grade
Passing Score for B.M. majors is 75. Passing Score for B.A. majors is 65.

_____ In consideration of your progress and jury performance, with input from your studio instructor, it is the unanimous recommendation of the panel that your degree program be changed to the BA Liberal Arts in Music. After one full semester, this decision can be re-evaluated based on progress. (check if there is letter from studio instructor and you agree)