Graders: **Grader1** and **Grader2** ***Report to Participant***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date of Exam: **Month Day, Year**  Location of Exam: **City, State**  **INTERPRETING YOUR SCORE AND FEEDBACK**  Your exam has been graded by two National or Master judges and their scoring and comments reviewed by both an Associate Exam Director and the Exam Director. This three step process ensures that the assigned scores are consistent with the criteria outlined in the BJCP Scoresheet Guide, which is located at <http://www.bjcp.org/docs/BJCP_Scoresheet_Guide.pdf>. In general, your exam score indicates that your judging skills fall into one of the following categories:   <60: Displayed weak tasting skills, and the score sheets generally had unacceptably low levels of completeness, descriptive information and/or feedback. You can earn experience points as a BJCP Apprentice judge as you address gaps in your knowledge of beer styles and brewing.   60s: At least two of the six exam beers were accurately evaluated. The score sheets demonstrated the minimum acceptable communication and judging skills expected of a BJCP Recognized judge.   70s: At least three of the six exam beers were accurately evaluated. The score sheets had reasonably good completeness, descriptive information and feedback, appropriate to the BJCP Certified judging level.   80s: At least four of the six exam beers were accurately evaluated with the high quality scoresheets expected of a BJCP National judge.  90s: At least five of the six exam beers were accurately evaluated, and the scoresheets had BJCP Master levels of completeness, descriptive information and feedback. Fewer than 5% of judges have historically earned this distinction.  The following tables summarize your performance on the exam and provide feedback on your judging of the individual exam beers. When reviewing this information, keep in mind that your final score was assigned only after an assessment of the entire exam. Since our understanding of brewing science and beer styles is constantly evolving, it may be possible to argue a few technical and stylistic details; however, your final score is not likely to change since your exam has already undergone several hours of evaluation by the most experienced judges and graders in the BJCP. Questions or appeals should be directed to the Exam Director assigned to this set. | **MEAD JUDGING EXAM SCORE**  **\_\_\_\_** |
| **RECOMMENDED STUDY**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | *•* | BJCP Mead Study Guide | |  |  | | *•* | BJCP Special Ingredient Descriptions | |  |  | | *•* | BJCP Exam Program Description | |  |  | | *•* | *Compleat Meadmaker*, Ken Schramm | |  |  | | *•* | *The Complete Guide to Making Mead: The Ingredients, Equipment, Processes, and Recipes for Crafting Honey Wine*, Steve Piatz | |  |  | | *•* | Tasting/Judging Experience | |  |  | | *•* | BJCP Style Guidelines | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |
|  |
| **AD ED Date**  **BJCP Associate Director BJCP Exam Director** |

🡨 Grader instructions: Anything in red font should be deleted or replaced. Begin by pasting the Tables in Columns B through H in the “RTP Tables” tab in the Exam Grading Form here, replacing these lines of text 🡪

**Additional Feedback**

Grader Instructions: The Exam Directors discourage the inclusion of prose feedback on the individual exam beers, since it tends to delay the completion of the grading assignment. The tables from the RTP already contain a great deal of information on the judging performance on each of the exam beers, and that feedback does not need to be reiterated in written form. Many graders will just provide the Overall congratulatory statement below, in which case the most accurate highlighted words should be selected and the others deleted. If giving additional written comments, please do not refer to the judging rank since the final score may change due to factors such as retake status.

**Overall:** Congratulations on achieving a(n) passing/good/very good/excellent score on the BJCP Mead Judging Exam. Your score sheets indicate a basic/good/excellent familiarity with the judging process and a weak/good/very good/exemplary understanding of beer styles, but also some significant/minor gaps. Good luck in your future judging endeavors!

Some graders may wish to incorporate the comments and checkboxes below, but they are optional and should either be used in their entirely or deleted. Note that the checkbox macro can only be used efficiently in the 2010 and later versions of MS Word. If included, the checkbox section should be prefaced with the following statement:

The checkboxes below indicate that some of your scoresheets included common errors or omissions; they should not be interpreted as the only issues present on your scoresheets. A more comprehensive analysis of your performance can be done by comparing the shaded levels in the tables with the criteria outlined in the BJCP Exam Scoresheet Guide, which is located at <http://www.bjcp.org/docs/BJCP_Scoresheet_Guide.pdf>.

**Perceptions:** Perception is evaluated based on the descriptions provided by the proctors and the other examinees as well as the background information on the beers provided by the exam administrator. A few dedicated training sessions with experienced judges will enable you to calibrate your palate and may improve your ability to detect secondary or more subtle characteristics.

You showed potential sensitivity to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

You were possibly not as sensitive to (or familiar with) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Perceptions differed significantly from proctors and other tasters in character.

Perceptions differed significantly from proctors and other tasters in intensity.

**Descriptive Ability:** Beer scoresheets should use descriptive language for the perceived beer characteristics, including the type and intensities of the malt, hops, esters, phenols and fermentation characteristics.

Comments used ranges rather than distinct values for intensity.

Comments did not provide intensity values.

Comments used generic descriptors (good, nice, some, Belgian) rather than fully describing the character.

**Feedback:** Feedback includes comparing perceptions to the style guidelines, pointing out deviations and/or technical flaws, and suggesting specific ways to improve the recipe and/or brewing process.

Feedback was generic and not detailed.

Feedback assumed specific techniques or ingredients.

Feedback was not provided on major style or technical issues.

Technical feedback was not accurate.

Style feedback was not accurate.

**Completeness**: A complete scoresheet provides a complete sensory evaluation of the beer rather than just hitting the highlights. It is sometimes helpful to use the list of items under each section title as an informal checklist of attributes that need to be addressed on the scoresheet, and comments should specifically note anything that was out of place or missing for the presented style.

Scoresheets did not address all of the relevant aspects listed for each section of the scoresheet.

Scoresheets addressed sensory aspects in incorrect locations.

Handwriting was difficult to read.

Descriptor Definition or Stylistic/Technical/Intangible boxes were not used.

Scoresheet had numerous misspelled words (not a point deduction, just an observation).

**Scoring Accuracy:** Scores are compared to consensus scores from the proctors, which are cross-checked with the average scores from all of the examinees to ensure consistency.

There were significant scoring deviations relative to the consensus scores.

There were addition errors on one or more scoresheets.

The assigned scores were not consistent with the comments.