

TirRigh Bardic Championship

Judging Form - Spoken Word Performance

| | |
|--------------|--------------------------|
| Artist Name: | |
| Entry: | Total Score: /100 |
| Branch: | Date: |
| Judge: | Judge's Email: |

Instructions for judges:

- For each question, use a highlighter to mark any terms that apply to the artist.
- Then, circle the box in each row that indicates the point value you wish to assign for that question.
- Please do not use half points. They will be rounded down.

| Historical Accuracy/Authenticity: Describes the period appropriateness of the performance. | | | | | | | Bonus |
|--|-----------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1. Material: Did the piece provably exist in period, or are the themes, structures, and content consistent with a specific time and place in period? | No attempt made | The piece may contain period references but is well out of period in its theme, structures, and content | Some aspects of the piece were historically appropriate but the overall effect was modern | A roughly equal blend of modern and historical elements. Moving towards fully authentic | The piece may have had slightly modern characteristics but is largely historical content and style | The piece was demonstrably accurate by any reasonable measure | The piece would be perfectly at home in a historical context |
| 2. Delivery Format: To what extent were the broad choices of improvisation vs. memorization, use of movement, natural vs. stylized, and the role of audience historically accurate? | No attempt made | Some aspects of a historically accurate delivery format were attempted | Some of the aspects of the delivery format were historical | Many of the aspects of the delivery format were historical | Most of the aspects of the delivery format were historical | All of the aspects of the delivery format were historical | All of the aspects of the delivery format would be perfectly at home in their historical context |

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--|-----------------|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 3. Techniques and Interpretation: To what extent were the nuances of language, word choice, movement, characterization, performance persona, speaking style, and audience interactions historically accurate? | No attempt made | A few of the techniques and interpretation in the performance were historical (correct for the stated time and place) | Some of the techniques and interpretation used to in the performance were historical | Many of the techniques and interpretation used in the performance were historical | Most of the techniques and interpretation used in the performance were historical | All of the techniques and interpretation in the performance were historical | All of the techniques and interpretation in the performance would be indistinguishable from a period performance |
| Comments on Historical Accuracy / Authenticity: | | | | | | | |

| Documentation: Documentation tells how we know what is historically authentic, when and where it was performed, and establishes the context of all aspects of the performance. | | | | | | | Bonus |
|---|-----------------|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4. Organization: Overall, is the documentation coherent, well-organized, and easy to follow? (Include how well citations and references are incorporated into the text.) | No attempt made | Documentation lacks organization or is difficult to follow, includes minimal in-text citations and/or references | Documentation is somewhat organized and includes some in-text citations and a reference list that follows a standard format | Documentation is sufficiently organized, easy to follow, and includes in-text citations and a reference list that follows a standard format | Documentation is well organized, easy to follow, and includes in-text citations and a reference list that follows a standard format | Documentation is exceptionally well organized, easy to follow, and includes numerous in-text citations and a reference list that follows a standard format | Documentation is of a publishable level |

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--|-----------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>5. Research: Based on the evidence in the documentation, how thoroughly did the Performer research this performance? Include breadth and depth of research, quality of sources used (including primary, secondary, scholarly, etc.) and evidence of the Performer's interpretive process of sources / supporting material.</p> | No attempt made | <p>Documentation suggests only a cursory level of research, little depth or breadth. Few or no primary or scholarly sources consulted</p> <p>Little evidence of interpretation of sources.</p> | <p>Documentation shows some evidence of either breadth or depth of research. Majority of sources cited are secondary or non-scholarly</p> <p>Little or some evidence of interpretation of sources.</p> | <p>Documentation shows the Performer is working toward depth and breadth of research. At least some primary or reputable scholarly resources cited</p> <p>Some interpretation of sources is evident.</p> | <p>Documentation shows research with some depth and breadth. Sources used are generally high-quality, including primary and scholarly sources.</p> <p>Some interpretation of sources is evident.</p> | <p>Documentation shows very thorough research with both depth and breadth. Sources used are consistently high-quality, with an abundance of primary sources</p> <p>The Performer did extensive interpretation of sources.</p> | <p>Documentation presents new research conducted that extends upon what is known in the field or draws upon sources that were previously not generally known of or available</p> |
| <p>6. Connection (between documentation and performance): How well does this documentation support the performance? Is the performance itself clearly supported by the documentation given? Is the link between the research and the performance clear?</p> | No attempt made | <p>Documentation makes only oblique reference to the performance and might have wandered between topics without focus</p> | <p>Documentation addresses the performance in only a superficial fashion</p> <p>The Performer makes a vague connection between their research and their performance</p> | <p>Documentation is adequate to support the performance</p> <p>The Performer makes a basic connection between their research and their performance</p> | <p>Documentation is effectively used to support the performance</p> <p>The Performer demonstrated a significant connection between their research and their performance</p> | <p>The performance is clearly and thoroughly supported by the documentation</p> <p>The Performer's process was clearly informed by their research at every step, which is evident in reading documentation</p> | <p>Documentation is of a publishable level</p> |

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|-----------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| <p>7. Explanation (of performance): To what degree does the documentation describe the process used to create the performance?</p> | No attempt made | Performance is only loosely, or inconsistently described. It would be difficult for a reader to interpret the Performer's process for creating their performance. Very few of the recreation choices are explained and/or justified. | Performance is somewhat described. A reader can interpret some of the Performer's process for creating their performance. Some of the recreation choices are explained and justified. | Performance is satisfactorily described. A reader can interpret the Performer's process for creating their performance. Many of the recreation choices are explained and justified. | Performance is clearly described. A reader can interpret the Performer's process for creating their performance. Most of the recreation choices are explained and justified. | Performance is clearly and completely described. A reader can easily interpret the Performer's process for creating their performance, & could recreate it themselves. All recreation choices are clearly explained and thoroughly justified. | Documentation is of a publishable level |

Comments on Documentation:

| Technical Ability: The level of mastery of the period appropriate skill set necessary to perform the piece. | | | | | | | Bonus |
|--|-----------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8. Accuracy: How correctly does the Performer perform the piece in terms of memorization and pronunciation, and meet the requirements of the format, style, setting, and genre? | | The Performer made multiple significant errors in memorization, pronunciation, or style that detracted heavily from the performance | The Performer made some errors but mostly held the piece together | The Performer made few enough errors, and recovered from them well enough, to successfully deliver the piece | The Performer gave a noticeably clean performance, with little to no detectable errors | The performance was clean and accurate, including the finer details that most performers gloss over | The performance was so clean as to expose a level of detail and nuance that would otherwise be missed |
| 9. Delivery: How well does the Performer use techniques of speech and movement, such as diction, projection, intention, pacing, tone variation, and body language? | No attempt made | The Performer showed awareness of some delivery techniques | The Performer gave a partially successful delivery of the piece | The Performer gave a competent delivery of the piece | The Performer gave a solid and skilled delivery of the piece | The Performer gave a masterful delivery of the piece | The Performer went beyond mastery of the delivery of the performance in some significant way |
| 10. Interpretation: How well does the Performer use dramatic elements such as pauses and emphasis to convey the piece? | No attempt made | The Performer attempted to add dramatic elements | The Performer made some choices that contributed to the sense of the piece | The Performer generally made choices consistent with the sense of the piece | The Performer made interpretive choices that significantly enhanced the sense of the piece | The Performer made expert use of the available interpretive tools to greatly enhance the sense of the piece | The Performer went beyond the usual interpretive tools to greatly extend the sense of the piece in a new way |

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|-----------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| 11. Understanding: How well does the Performance demonstrate an understanding of the original work and its context and convey that understanding to the audience? | No attempt made | The Performer demonstrated and conveyed understanding of a few aspects of the original work and its context | The Performer demonstrated and conveyed understanding of some aspects of the original work and its context | The Performer demonstrated and conveyed understanding of many aspects of the original work and its context | The Performer demonstrated and conveyed understanding of most aspects of the original work and its context | The Performer demonstrated and conveyed understanding of all aspects of the original work and its context | The Performer went beyond and conveyed understanding of the original work and its context in some new and significant way |
| Comments on Technical Ability: | | | | | | | |

| Difficulty/Complexity: Complexity is the difficulty, challenge and level of ambition (apprentice, journeyman, master) represented by the performance. The complexity of a piece should be considered within the context of the genre of the piece rather than in terms of the complexity of other performances in the competition. | | | | | | | Bonus |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12. Difficulty of Acquisition: How hard was the piece to find, compile, and memorize? | | The piece is very easy to find and learn | The piece is moderately easy to find and learn | The piece is moderately difficult to find and learn | The piece offers significant challenges to find and learn | The piece is very challenging to find and learn on multiple levels | The piece offers exceptional challenges in acquisition |

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>13. Difficulty of Preparation: How hard is the piece to prepare in terms of extra work such as translation, transcription, interpretation from period sources, extrapolation, and making performance choices?</p> | | This piece requires no extra preparation | This piece requires some extra preparation but no specialized skills or knowledge | This piece requires some extra preparation and some specialized skills and knowledge | This piece requires significant preparation, and a variety of skills and specialized knowledge | This piece requires extensive preparation, a variety of skills, a breadth of specialized knowledge | This piece requires an exceptional level of preparation and multiple areas of deep specialized knowledge |
| <p>14. Difficulty of Performance: Are there aspects of this performance (difficult blocking, requisite physical skills, foreign languages, or obstacles to reaching the audience such as complex emotions or ideas, or obscure styles or genres) that make it hard to deliver?</p> | | The piece requires only basic skills to perform | The piece some extra effort or skills to perform | The piece is moderately challenging to perform | The piece is challenging to perform | The piece is very challenging to perform in multiple ways | This piece is far beyond the capabilities of most performers in the genre |
| <p>Comments on Difficulty/Complexity:</p> | | | | | | | |

| Artistic Merit | | | | | | | Bonus |
|---|-----------------|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| <p>15. Aesthetics: How well does the performer use vocal sonority and cadence, facial expressions, movement, and other tools such as costumes and props to add beauty to the performance?</p> | No attempt made | The performance detracted from the sense of the piece due to vocal issues, physical awkwardness, or other problems | The performance was aesthetically inoffensive and did not detract from the sense of the piece | The performance was aesthetically consistent with the sense of the piece in a way that was moderately pleasing | The performance was memorably beautiful in a way that fit the sense of the piece | The performance was memorably beautiful in a way that transcended the sense of the piece | The performer delivered a meaningful aesthetic experience that would stand on its own even without the context of the piece |
| <p>16. Originality: How well does the Performer present the performance in any new, more detailed, more obscure or otherwise interesting way?</p> <p>Consider any choices that go beyond what others have done, bringing new knowledge or performance choices.</p> | No attempt made | The Performer made a minimal attempt to personalize the performance | The Performer personalized the performance in some ways | The Performer personalized the performance in some ways and included at least one significant point of difference from common interpretations | The Performer presented a unique performance with multiple points of significant difference from common interpretations | The Performer presented a unique and surprising performance whose overall effect is much different from common interpretations | The Performer presented a unique performance that was surprising at multiple levels, whose overall effect transcends expectations |

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|-----------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| 17. Emotional Impact: How well does the Performer generate an emotional impact consistent with the presumed intent of the composer. | No attempt made | The Performer made an attempt to convey the emotional content of the piece | The Performer was somewhat able to convey the emotional content of the piece | The Performer was mostly able to convey the emotional content of the piece. The performance evoked the general feeling of the piece | The Performer was able to convey the emotional content of the piece | The Performer was completely able to convey the emotional content of the piece. The performance showed a nuanced understanding of the composer's presumed intent | The Performer went beyond what one would reasonably expect in conveying the emotional content of the piece |

Comments on Artistic Merit:

| Presentation: This applies to both the presentation of the performance to the audience and to the presentation of research to the judges. | | | | | | | Bonus |
|---|-----------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 18. Setting the Stage: How well does the Performer create the setting for the performance? Consider costumes, props, ambiance, in-persona introduction & interactions with the audience in persona. | No attempt made | The Performer made an attempt to create a setting for the performance (in a manner appropriate to the piece and the time period) | The Performer was able to somewhat create a setting for the performance | The Performer was able to create a setting for the performance | The Performer was able to create a nuanced setting for the performance at multiple levels | The Performer was able to fully immerse the audience in the sense and context of the performance | The Performer was able to fully immerse the audience in the sense and context of the performance to an exceptional degree |

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|-----------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| <p>19. Stage Presence and Audience Engagement: How well does the performer demonstrate poise, confidence, charisma, clarity, awareness of the space and the people in it, and engage the audience in a manner consistent with the piece?</p> | No attempt made | The performer attempted to demonstrate one or more aspects of stage presence | The performer showed some aspects of stage presence and was partially successful at connecting with the audience | The performer showed a moderate level of stage presence and audience connection | The performer showed notably good stage presence and solidly engaged the audience | The performer showed exceptional stage presence and strongly impacted the audience | The performer showed the stage presence of a true master and profoundly impacted the audience |
| <p>20. Oral Presentation and Questions: How well does the Performer provide meaningful context and educate the listeners on the piece?</p> | No attempt made | The Performer communicated their breadth OR depth of knowledge with basic details to demonstrate their knowledge | The Performer communicated their breadth OR depth of knowledge with some details of their knowledge | The Performer communicated breadth OR depth by providing details to demonstrate their knowledge | The Performer communicated breadth and depth by providing details to demonstrate their knowledge | The Performer communicated breadth and depth by providing many details to fully demonstrate their knowledge | The Performer communicated breadth and depth by thoroughly communicating their knowledge with many minor details and examples demonstrating their knowledge |
| <p>Comments on Presentation:</p> | | | | | | | |