

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

	<b>1 - 3</b>	<b>4 - 6</b>	<b>7 - 8</b>	<b>9 - 10</b>
<b>Scales</b>	Performance severely deficient in one or more note accuracy; finger/bow control; tempo; erratic rhythm; faulty intonation; unrefined articulations	Performance deficient in one of the following areas: note accuracy; inconsistent rhythm; faulty intonation; unrefined articulations	Scales performed well, but slightly lacking refinement in one of the following issues: tempo; intonation; articulations	Scales performed flawlessly at an appropriate tempo with outstanding intervallic intonation and clear articulations
<b>Tone Quality</b>	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).
<b>Intonation</b>	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.
<b>Note &amp; Rhythmic Accuracy</b>	Note/rhythm errors interfere with the musical flow. Performer has to restart due to errors.	Note/rhythm errors evident, but the overall performance remains effective. Pulse and rhythm are not always steady.	Minor note/rhythm errors during the most difficult passages. Pulse and rhythm are under control most of the time.	Notes and rhythms performed nearly flawlessly. Superb control of pulse and rhythm.
<b>Articulation</b>	Fundamental errors in articulation/bowing are evident.	Articulation/bowings are inconsistently performed. Attacks and releases unrefined.	Articulations/bowings performed accurately, but with minor flaws.	Articulation/bowings are stylistically accurate and tastefully performed.
<b>Technical Facility</b>	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.
<b>Interpretation Tempo</b>	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.
<b>Dynamics Expression</b>	The performance is not expressive. Lack of dynamic contrasts.	The performance is somewhat expressive, but within a narrow dynamic range.	The performance is expressive, but sometimes sound is harsh/distorted during passages with dynamic/range extremes.	The performance is highly expressive. Dynamics performed extremely well at all volumes and in all registers.
<b>Phrasing</b>	Performer's sense of phrasing needs further development. Phrasing lacks cohesiveness.	Phrasing evident, but lacks definition, nuance and/or fluidity.	Expressive shaping and contouring of phrases with minor flaws.	Performer demonstrates a mature sense of phrasing and musicianship.
<b>Other Factors Appearance Poise Policies</b>	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 is well prepared but with minor flaws. All jury policies adhered to (dress, music, copies, accompanist).	Presentation is polished and professional. All jury policies adhered to (dress, music, copies, accompanist).

**SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY 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)