

Standards for MPA Sight-Reading Ratings

A copy of these standards should be with each judge during the adjudication.

The sight reading adjudicator should justify his/her rating through written and/or recorded comments. The adjudicator should take great care to assure that the comments on the adjudication form and on the audio recording are consistent with the overall and caption ratings for that particular band and should call attention to fundamental characteristics of the group. The presence or lack of good tone quality, intonation, rhythmic precision, blend and balance, offer a basis for making brief suggestions for improvement of the group. The sight reading adjudicator should keep in mind and take into consideration that their evaluation is on a "first reading" and may not reflect the finesse and musical expressiveness associated with a stage performance.

Superior: "I" The rating is comparable to the grade of "A". This rating reflects a high level of performance for the event and experience level of participants being evaluated. The performance demonstrates that the group is able to meet all or nearly all of the technical demands of the music and may reflect a broad awareness of the composer's intent. Bands that receive this rating perform frequently, if not consistently, with technical proficiency, but they may lack some finesse and style associated with artistic expression. The performance shows the result of sound fundamental training, but may lack some of the polish and finesse. The adjudicator may find some areas to critique, but these areas do not significantly distract from the overall quality of the performance. His/her caption ratings would consist of mostly A's while his/her remarks would be indicative of a quality performance.

Excellent: "II" The rating is comparable to the grade of "B". This rating reflects a high level of performance for the event and experience level of participants being evaluated. The performance demonstrates that the group is able to meet most of the technical demands of the music and may at times reflect a broad awareness of the composer's intent. The performance reflects few, if any, limitations in fundamental issues but may lack the polish and finesse to qualify for a rating of superior. The adjudicator may occasionally find areas to critique; these areas may distract from the overall quality of the performance. His/her caption ratings would consist of mostly B's while his/her remarks would be indicative of a quality performance. 15

Average: "III" The rating is comparable to the grade of "C". This rating reflects a mediocre level of performance for the event and experience level of participants being evaluated. The performance demonstrates that the group is able to meet some of the technical demands of the music, but reflects an absence of awareness for the composer's intent. The performance reflects consistent limitations in fundamental training and lacks the polish and finesse to qualify for a rating of excellent. The adjudicator will find consistent areas to critique and these areas will significantly distract from the overall quality of the performance. His/her comments sheet would consist of mostly C's. Below

Average: "IV" The rating is comparable to the grade of "D". This rating reflects a level of performance that is consistently weak and filled with technical errors and intonation problems. The performance very rarely reflects performance fundamentals. The adjudicator will find many areas to critique that significantly distract from the overall quality of the performance. This classification represents a performance that is generally weak and uncertain. Comments should be encouraging and contain helpful suggestions for improvement. His/her comments sheet would consist of mostly D's.

Poor: "V" The rating is comparable to the grade of "F". The performance is unacceptable both technically and musically. It demonstrates a lack of technical proficiency and musical understanding. Careless and bad playing habits are prevalent, providing significant and ongoing evidence of poor preparation and training. This rating indicates a performance that reveals much room for improvement. Remarks should be honest, but never sarcastic. They should point out the basic weaknesses and make suggestions for improvement, and above all, urge the participants and director to work toward qualifying for a higher rating next year. His/her comments sheet would consist of mostly F's.

Note: Adjudicators should make every effort to employ all the rating categories when appropriate. The ratings should be interpreted literally by the titles: Superior, Excellent, Average, Below Average, and Poor. Success is not measured only by a superior rating. The other ratings have credibility and should be used in a positive and constructive way.