

## MUSIC – Piano Duet

Names \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_

Age Group:  JH  SH Check:  Classical Piano Duet  Sacred Piano Duet City \_\_\_\_\_

Composition Title \_\_\_\_\_ Composer \_\_\_\_\_

FACTORS EVALUATED	POOR 7-9 points	FAIR 10-13 points	GOOD 14-17 points	EXCELLENT 18-20 points	POINT TOTALS
<b>INTERPRETATION</b>	Lack of consistency in styling, mood, rhythm; lacks accuracy in proper interpretation of phrasing, tempo, and dynamics; melody not pronounced  7 8 9	Occasionally inconsistent in styling, mood, rhythm; somewhat accurate in proper interpretation of phrasing, tempo, and dynamics; somewhat pronounced melody  10 11 12 13	Mostly consistent in styling, mood, rhythm; mostly accurate in proper interpretation of phrasing, tempo, and dynamics; mostly pronounced melody  14 15 16 17	Excellent consistency in styling, mood, rhythm; accurate in proper interpretation of phrasing, tempo, and dynamics; pronounced melody  18 19 20	
<b>EXPRESSION</b>	Inaccuracy of contrast in tempo and dynamics; poor balance between instruments; phrasing not expressed properly and accurately; inaccurate execution of notes  7 8 9	Occasional good contrast in tempo and dynamics; fair balance between instruments; phrasing somewhat expressed properly and accurately; somewhat accurate execution of notes  10 11 12 13	Good contrast in tempo and dynamics; mostly good balance between instruments; phrasing mostly expressed properly and accurately; mostly accurate execution of notes  14 15 16 17	Excellent contrast in tempo and dynamics; excellent balance between instruments; phrasing expressed properly and accurately; accurate execution of notes  18 19 20	
<b>PERFORMANCE and ENSEMBLE</b>	Lacks confidence in poise and stage presence; poor overall effect; difficulty level and selection not appropriate for event; did not work well as an ensemble performance; entries and endings not precise  7 8 9	Somewhat confident in poise and stage presence; fair overall effect; difficulty level and selection somewhat appropriate for event; somewhat worked well as an ensemble performance; entries and endings somewhat precise  10 11 12 13	Mostly confident in poise and stage presence; good overall effect; difficulty level and selection mostly appropriate for event; mostly worked well as an ensemble performance; entries and endings mostly precise  14 15 16 17	Confident in poise and stage presence; excellent overall effect; difficulty level and selection appropriate for event; worked well as an ensemble performance; entrance and endings mostly precise  18 19 20	
<b>TECHNIQUE</b>	Lacked consistent coordination, hand position, proper execution of fingering (facility), sensitivity of touch, proper posture, and pedaling; poor tone quality and production  7 8 9	Occasionally inconsistent coordination, hand position, proper execution of fingering (facility), sensitivity of touch, proper posture, and pedaling; fair tone quality and production  10 11 12 13	Mostly consistent coordination, hand position, proper execution of fingering (facility), sensitivity of touch, proper posture, and pedaling; good tone quality and production  14 15 16 17	Excellent, consistent coordination, hand position, proper execution of fingering (facility), sensitivity of touch, proper posture, and pedaling; excellent tone quality and production  18 19 20	
<b>COMMENTS</b>					Total Points 80 Possible

Point Scale: 65-80 (1<sup>st</sup> place rating), 55-80 (2<sup>nd</sup> place rating), 45-80 (3<sup>rd</sup> place rating); contestant cannot ribbon if “poor” is marked in any one category.

Original Copy  Measures Numbered (Failure to fulfill will result in penalties.)

Please note that a 5-point penalty is deducted from the total score if the performance violates the 8-minute time limit. Time (judges use only): \_\_\_\_\_

Judge’s Signature: \_\_\_\_\_