



Juror Handbook

2019-2020

FACTOR's juror team plays an integral role in funding applicants to our Juried Sound Recording (JSR) and Artist Development (AD) programs. Without artists and industry professionals volunteering their time and expertise, the successful adjudication of applications to these programs would not be possible.

Contact

If you have questions or concerns at any point, email juror@factor.ca. FACTOR's staff will follow up as soon as possible.

It's our privilege to work with you to fund vibrant artists across Canada's diverse music community.

Thank you for being a member of FACTOR's juror team.

Table of Contents	Page
<u>Overview</u>	2
<u>The Juror Team</u>	2
<u>Juried Programs</u>	2
<u>Juried Sound Recording</u>	2
<u>Artist Development</u>	3
<u>The Jury Process</u>	3
<u>Assessing Applications</u>	3
<u>Juried Sound Recording</u>	4
<u>Artist Development</u>	6
<u>Leaving Feedback</u>	7
<u>Conflict of Interest</u>	8
<u>Confidentiality</u>	8
<u>FAQ</u>	9
<u>Appendix: Detailed Scoring Rubric</u>	10

Overview

FACTOR has two deadlines each year for the JSR and AD programs. In 2019, the deadlines are:

- Thursday, May 16
- Thursday, October 17

Applicants can apply to either program once each year but must wait one deadline (12 months) before they can apply again. An exception is offered to the 20 top-scoring applicants that did not receive an offer of funding in each program; they can apply at the next deadline.

Each deadline, FACTOR receives more applications with strong merit than can be funded within the limits of our budget. We rely on a team of jurors to assess these applications and determine which projects are most competitive.

Jurors assess applications **online** via FACTOR's juror portal and review one or two assessment tracks, a biography, goals, a marketing or development plan, and more. Jurors score each application using scoring criteria provided by FACTOR.

FACTOR's staff review the top-scoring applications for eligibility and recommend a list of projects to our Board of Directors for funding. Applicants are notified of the results of their application within 16 weeks of each deadline.

The Juror Team

Jurors are volunteer professionals working in music, radio broadcasting and related industries. Our juror team consists of artists, promoters, managers, publicists, booking agents, publishers, music supervisors, sync agents, radio programmers, and more.

Each juror:

- must be a Canadian citizen or Permanent Resident;
- have a minimum of 5 years' experience in the music industry or a related industry; and
- have been active in the music industry within the past 2 years.

There are over 1,700 professionals on FACTOR's juror team from across the country (and abroad) working in diverse genres, communities, and locations. Jurors do not need to live in Canada.

A juror with fewer than 5 years' experience may be considered if they are working in an underrepresented genre or community and can demonstrate significant experience that can be substantiated by their peers.

Once per fiscal year, FACTOR sends jurors who participate in a review a small gift as a token of our appreciation. Most jurors participate to give back, keep up on industry changes, discover artists and improve their own applications.

Juried Programs

Juried Sound Recording (JSR)

The JSR program contributes toward the cost of acquiring, producing and marketing a full-length album.

In FACTOR's system, artists with a profile rating of **General** or **Artist 2** can apply. Any artist can receive a General profile rating. Artists who demonstrate a recent history of substantial album sales, streams, tour revenue, radio charting, sync revenue, and social media followers may qualify for a profile rating of Artist 2.

Successful applicants may claim up to 75% of eligible expenses related to recording, marketing, touring, showcases, videos, and radio marketing. The funding is a grant and is not paid back to FACTOR.

Funding is available in two phases in this program. Phase 1 funding is available to all applicants. Phase 2 funding is available if an applicant's recording is particularly successful with unit sales, streams, and/or radio charting.

The maximum amount available for artists with a profile rating of

General

\$67,500 in Phase 1

\$30,000 in Phase 2

Artist 2

\$77,500 in Phase 1

\$40,000 in Phase 2

A portion of the funding is **flexible** and can be shifted between recording, marketing, touring, and showcasing at the applicant's discretion with some limits. Funding for radio marketing, videos, and international touring and showcases is available in **specific** amounts for each activity.

Artist Development (AD)

The AD program offers an artist a subsidy toward one year of artist development activities.

In FACTOR's system, artists and professional songwriters with a profile rating of **General**, **Artist 2**, or **Songwriter** can apply.

Successful applicants may claim up to 75% of eligible expenses related to recording, marketing, touring, showcases, videos, and radio marketing. The funding is a grant and is not paid back to FACTOR.

The maximum funding available is \$2,000 regardless of the artist's profile rating. The funding is **flexible** and can be shifted to recording, marketing, touring, showcases, videos, and radio marketing at the artist's discretion.

The Jury Process

After an application deadline for our juried programs has passed, FACTOR's staff review the materials submitted by each applicant and prepare them to be assessed by our juror team.

FACTOR receives more than 1,000 applications to our juried programs each deadline and maintains a standard that each application should be assessed by 7 jurors.

Prior to each application deadline, FACTOR sends an email to the juror team with the details of a week-long jury review. Jurors RSVP by clicking a link. Jurors who participate are expected to schedule 3 to 4 hours in their calendar during that one-week period.

Applications are sorted by genre and region, divided into small groups, and assigned to a **jury** with a unique jury number. Each jury has (at most)

- 3 applications to the JSR program, or
- 4 applications to the AD program.

Jurors who RSVP to participate are assigned to a maximum of 3 juries and are expected to spend

- 20 minutes assessing each JSR application, or
- 15 minutes assessing each AD application.

Once a review is complete, FACTOR schedules additional week-long reviews until all necessary assessments have been completed. Jurors receive a new RSVP email each time. Generally two or three week reviews are required each deadline. Jurors can participate as often as they like, and there is no obligation to participate if they are unavailable.

Assessing Applications

Jurors assess an applicant's materials against 4 or 5 scoring criteria as determined by FACTOR. Materials and scoring criteria vary by program. A maximum of 100 points can be awarded to each applicant.

Please note: Applicants are not expected to submit complete, mastered assessment tracks. Some tracks may be demos or works-in-progress, but jurors should be able to reasonably hear all elements.

Applicants state any changes they intend to make, and jurors are expected to do their best to understand the artist's vision. Jurors should do their best to score the merits of an application against FACTOR's criteria regardless of production quality.

A more detailed scoring rubric can be found in the [Appendix](#).

Juried Sound Recording (JSR)

Assessment Materials

- A biography of the artist and website link
- High-level goals for the project
- 2 assessment tracks from the proposed full-length album with lyrics (if applicable) - in most cases, the tracks should be recent and unreleased.
- Intended changes to the assessment tracks
- A detailed marketing plan
- A summary of the team involved in the project (included in the marketing plan)

It is **not** mandatory for applicants to include a budget in the JSR program, though some applicants choose to provide one.

Scoring

Jurors are expected to spend **20 minutes** assessing each JSR application against 5 criteria.

Applicants submit 2 assessment tracks and their intended changes and jurors award up to 60 points for the:

- Songs - 25
- Vocals & Lyrics - 20
- Musicality - 15

Jurors also review the applicant's biography, website, goals, marketing plan and the team involved and can award up to 40 points for the:

- Marketing Plan & Presentation - 25
- Team - 15

Applicants also upload optional materials to an Additional Files section, but jurors are not expected to review them unless they have time or want additional context.

Jurors can use the scoring rubrics below to ensure they are scoring consistently. Typical considerations are listed under each criterion. Each criterion is weighted, so jurors can consider the merits of the application and use the headings below to see what score corresponds to their assessment.

Rubric - JSR

Songs - 25				
Melody: Is the melody memorable, and dynamic?				
Structure: Is the song's structure organized, effective and well-paced?				
Arrangement: Is the arrangement creative, compelling and balanced? Are elements like tempo, dynamics and harmony used well?				
Originality: Is the song original with a clear perspective?				
Interpretation: For historic classical and jazz pieces, is the repertoire selection and interpretation compelling and relevant?				
No Merit	Fair	Good	Excellent	Extraordinary
0 ←	→ 6 ←	→ 13 ←	→ 19 ←	→ 25

Vocals & Lyrics - 20

Performance: Is the vocal performance captivating, powerful, and charismatic?

Lyrics: Are the lyrics evocative, relatable and refined?

Impact: Are the vocals compelling, memorable or convey a distinct message?

Technique: Are the vocalist's pitch, timing, register and breathing appropriate?

Instrumentals: For instrumental pieces, is the performance of the lead melody instrument(s) impactful and expressive?

No Merit	Fair	Good	Excellent	Extraordinary
0 ←	→ 5 ←	→ 10 ←	→ 15 ←	→ 20

Musicality - 15

Performance: Is the instrumental and rhythmic performance exciting, dynamic and complementary?

Style: Do the instruments groove, vibe, and reference relevant genres appropriately?

Technique: Is the timing, rhythm, pitch, dynamic and craft of the performance impressive?

Relevance: Do the instruments sound interesting, fitting and contemporary?

No Merit	Fair	Good	Excellent	Extraordinary
0 ←	→ 4 ←	→ 8 ←	→ 11 ←	→ 15

Marketing Plan & Presentation - 25

Expectations: Are the high-level goals realistic and achievable?

Planning: Is the plan thoughtful, thorough and likely to achieve the stated goals?

Detail: Has enough detail been provided on how the plans will be executed?

Impact: Will this plan successfully advance the artist's career?

No Merit	Fair	Good	Excellent	Extraordinary
0 ←	→ 6 ←	→ 13 ←	→ 19 ←	→ 25

Team - 15

Team: Has the team and support network been properly communicated for all plans? This can include artist members and informal relationships.

Capacity: Does the team have the resources and capacity to execute the applicant's plan?

Success: How successful will the team be in accomplishing the applicant's goals?

No Merit	Fair	Good	Excellent	Extraordinary
0 ←	→ 4 ←	→ 8 ←	→ 11 ←	→ 15

Artist Development (AD)

Assessment Materials

- A biography of the artist and website link
- 1 assessment track with lyrics (if applicable) - in most cases, the track should be recent and unreleased
- A detailed artist development plan (filled out directly in the online portal).

Scoring

Jurors are expected to spend **15 minutes** assessing each AD application against **4** criteria.

Applicants submit 1 assessment track and jurors award up to 75 points for the:

- Songs - 25
- Vocals & Lyrics - 25
- Musicality - 25

Jurors also review the applicant's biography, website, goals, and artist development plan and can award up to 25 points for the:

- Artist Development Plan & Presentation - 25

Applicants also upload optional materials to an Additional Files section, but jurors are not expected to review them unless they have time or want additional context.

Jurors can use the scoring rubrics below to ensure they are scoring consistently. Typical considerations are listed under each criterion. Each criterion is weighted, so jurors can consider the merits of the application and use the headings below to see what score corresponds to their assessment.

Rubric - AD

Songs - 25 Melody: Is the melody memorable, and dynamic? Structure: Is the song's structure organized, effective and well-paced? Arrangement: Is the arrangement creative, compelling and balanced? Are elements like tempo, dynamics and harmony used well? Originality: Is the song original with a clear perspective? Interpretation: For historic classical and jazz pieces, is the repertoire selection and interpretation compelling and relevant?				
No Merit	Fair	Good	Excellent	Extraordinary
0 ←	→ 6 ←	→ 13 ←	→ 19 ←	→ 25

Vocals & Lyrics - 25 Performance: Is the vocal performance captivating, powerful, and charismatic? Lyrics: Are the lyrics evocative, relatable and refined? Impact: Are the vocals compelling, memorable or convey a distinct message? Technique: Are the vocalist's pitch, timing, register and breathing appropriate? Instrumentals: For instrumental pieces, is the performance of the lead melody instrument(s) impactful and expressive?				
No Merit	Fair	Good	Excellent	Extraordinary
0 ←	→ 6 ←	→ 13 ←	→ 19 ←	→ 25

Musicality - 25 Performance: Is the instrumental and rhythmic performance exciting, dynamic and complementary? Style: Do the instruments groove, vibe, and reference relevant genres appropriately? Technique: Is the timing, rhythm, pitch, dynamic and craft of the performance impressive? Relevance: Do the instruments sound interesting, fitting and contemporary?				
No Merit	Fair	Good	Excellent	Extraordinary
o ←	→ 6 ←	→ 13 ←	→ 19 ←	→ 25

Artist Development Plan & Presentation - 25 Expectations: Are the high-level goals and budget estimates realistic and achievable? Planning: Is the plan thoughtful, thorough and likely to achieve the stated goals? Detail: Has enough detail been provided on how the plans will be executed? Impact: Will this plan successfully advance the artist's career?				
No Merit	Fair	Good	Excellent	Extraordinary
o ←	→ 6 ←	→ 13 ←	→ 19 ←	→ 25

Leaving Feedback

Jurors are encouraged to leave feedback for applicants on what they did well and how they may improve future applications.

FACTOR expects jurors to leave feedback that is professional and constructive. This can be challenging as jurors have little time to make their assessments and thoughtfully communicate their suggestions to the applicant.

To simplify this, when in doubt:

1. Start by telling the applicant what they did well,
2. Suggest how some elements could be improved, and
3. Edit your feedback to ensure your communication is positive and professional.

Here are a few examples to demonstrate how negative feedback can be edited to be more constructive, positive and professional:

Negative Example	Positive Edit
The songs are strong but are they strong enough to break through in a competitive pop radio market? Hard to say. The team is very bare bones... no management, no agent, no distribution, no social media team. Very tough go for just a producer and radio tracker.	The songs are strong. Continue to make this your focus as the pop radio market is very competitive. It's great to see a producer and radio tracker on your team, but they may be overwhelmed without someone handling management, booking, distribution and social media.

Negative Example	Positive Edit
Not too ambitious. The plan lacks details about social media marketing, hiring a publicist, college radio campaigns, etc. I like the song, but the business side just isn't there yet.	I like your assessment track – good work. Your development plan could be more ambitious to match the strength of your song. A social media strategy, college radio campaign, and hired publicist could help.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Production could be a lot cleaner, the cuts and edits are rough - Production sounds a bit dated - Missing low end like a bass or 808 - The song is too long, improved longer than needed - The artist's vocals work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The vocals work – well done! - The production could sound more contemporary, fresh and clean - Some low-end like a bass or 808 could really add to the track - The song could be more concise. The improvised sections could be shorter
The artist's bio is rough and while it does give me a sense of who they are, I don't necessarily understand the tone and voice. In the artist development plan, I really don't see what the artist has planned or intends to do. I see a lot of things they wish for or hope to do but I'd like more concrete ideas like people they want to work with or venues they are looking to secure.	The biography gave me a sense of who the artist is, but I would like to see more of their personality & voice. The development plan includes good goals but needs concrete plans that demonstrate how the goals will be accomplished. For example, who will you work with and which venues do you hope to secure?
Love the EPK layout and how you've used it. Weak vocals and musicality. At times the arrangement sounds messy and cluttered. Strong written presentation but consider revisiting music, lyrics, and improving vocals to match expectations from plan.	I love how you used your EPK and its layout. The vocals and musicality of your track could be stronger. Consider adding more structure to the arrangement to tighten things up. Your writing is strong – focus on developing the other elements to that level.

Conflict of Interest

Each assessment made by FACTOR's juror team influences which projects FACTOR recommends for funding. To maintain the integrity of the jury process, jurors must disclose conflicts of interest if they are applying to a juried program or a person may perceive that they might benefit (directly or indirectly) from a project's success.

If a juror applies to a juried program, they should let FACTOR know when they RSVP to participate as juror. In these cases, the juror is assigned applications from the program they didn't apply to.

Jurors should also claim a conflict of interest if someone may perceive that they could benefit directly or indirectly from an application's success. In most cases, the juror can file their conflict directly in FACTOR's online juror portal and move on. If the conflict is significant, the juror should let FACTOR know and they may be assigned applications from another program.

When in doubt, jurors should contact FACTOR at juror@factor.ca with the details of their conflict. FACTOR prefers to err on the side of caution with all conflicts and will generally have someone refrain from assessing an application or program in most cases.

All jurors must read and understand [FACTOR's Conflict of Interest & Confidentiality Agreement](#).

Confidentiality

FACTOR's jury process would not be possible without mutual confidentiality among applicants and jurors.

Applicants are not told which jurors assess their applications or provide feedback. Jurors agree that they will not disclose the details of the applications they are assigned, the materials submitted, or the artists they review. This includes to conversations in person, online, and on social media. Jurors must delete any materials they temporarily download during a jury review once they've finished their assessment.

Jurors are welcome to share that they are jurors publicly, along with any observations about the jury process overall. Jurors should not disclose any specific details about the applicants, artists or applications they assess.

Some jurors may be interested in working with an applicant they were made aware of through FACTOR's jury process. To do so appropriately and professionally, jurors should

1. Maintain confidentiality about assessing their application and the details of the application, and
2. Wait until the results of the jury review have been sent to applicants and the review is complete.

At that point the juror can reach out to the artist or applicant.

All jurors that participate in a jury review throughout FACTOR's fiscal year are named in FACTOR's annual report each year.

All jurors must read and understand [FACTOR's Conflict of Interest & Confidentiality Agreement](#).

FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions)

I've forgotten my username and password. How do I find it?

You have two options:

1. Go to portal.factor.ca and click the Forgot password? link. Follow the prompts to reset your password. Note it may take up to 10 minutes for our system to email you the new details.
2. Email juror@factor.ca and FACTOR's staff will resolve the issue as soon as possible.

I can't play an Assessment Track. What do I do?

Email juror@factor.ca and FACTOR's staff will resolve the issue as soon as possible.

I'm friends with an applicant. Is this a conflict of interest?

If you are friends with an applicant, this is not necessarily a conflict of interest. Many professionals know each other in the music industry, so this is bound to happen.

That said, FACTOR prefers to err on the side of caution if there is any doubt. If someone may perceive that you may benefit directly or indirectly from a project's success, it's best to note a conflict of interest.

I'm assessing an instrumental Assessment Track. How do I score the Vocals/Lyrics criterion?

For instrumental pieces, consider this:

Performance: Is the performance captivating, powerful, and charismatic?

Impact: Does the performance tell a story, evoke emotion or convey a distinct message?

Technique: Is the timing, rhythm, pitch, dynamic and craft of the performance compelling?

You may need to consider this within the specific context of the assessment track(s) and project.

I'm assessing a JSR applicant who works independently. They manage, book and release their own work without significant support from industry professionals. How do I score the Team criterion?

The JSR program is intended for applicants at all stages of their career. FACTOR does not intend to penalize applicants who are in early stages of their career or choose to work independently.

[Refer to the scoring rubric provided under the JSR portion of the Assessing Applications section.](#)

Even if the applicant's team is made up of artist members and informal connections, the juror should consider who will be responsible for elements of the applicant's marketing plan, their capacity to accomplish those plans, and how successful that team will be.

Should the production or technical quality of assessment tracks be taken into consideration?

No. Elements of the song should be audible with reasonable clarity but do your best to assess the track without allowing the production quality to influence you significantly. Consider the merits of the assessment track(s) in a best-case scenario.

Conversely, artists should not be penalized if they provide a high-quality assessment track. FACTOR does not penalize artists who have the resources to do so.

Are jurors expected to assess an applicant's eligibility or budget?

Jurors are not expected to assess an applicant's eligibility to receive funding in our juried programs.

If you notice a potential red flag, please complete your assessment as usual and email juror@factor.ca with your concern. FACTOR's staff will follow up as soon as possible.

A budget is **not** required in the JSR program, but some applicants choose to include it. If they do, you can include it your assessment, but it is considered optional and additional.

In the AD program, applicants provide an estimate of what they'll spend on several development activities. These figures represent all estimated costs, not just those they plan to subsidize with FACTOR funding. Assess the merits of these estimates and consider if they are reasonable and realistic.

Appendix: Detailed Scoring Rubric

Sometimes an application is challenging to score against FACTOR's scoring criteria. The following scoring rubric is more detailed and may help jurors assess an application more easily.

Juried Sound Recording (JSR)

Songs (25 of 100 points)

Rating: Extraordinary (20 – 25)

- The melody is considerably memorable and dynamic.
- The song's structure is organized, effective and well-paced.
- The arrangement is creative, balanced and very compelling. Elements like tempo, dynamics and harmony are used very effectively.
- The song is very original with a clear perspective.
- For historic classical and jazz pieces, the repertoire selection and interpretation are highly relevant and considerably compelling.

Rating: Excellent (14 – 19)

- The melody is memorable and dynamic.
- The song's structure is organized and well-paced.
- The arrangement is creative and balanced. Elements like tempo, dynamics and harmony are used effectively.
- The song is original with some perspective
- For historic classical and jazz pieces, the repertoire selection is relevant and compelling.

Rating: Good (7 – 13)

- The melody is moderately memorable with some dynamics.
- The song's structure is organized well.
- The arrangement is creative and moderately balanced. Elements like tempo, dynamics and harmony are used.
- The song is original.
- For historic classical and jazz pieces, the repertoire selection is relevant.

Rating: Fair (0 – 6)

- The melody is not particularly memorable.
- The song has some structure.
- The arrangement is not particularly creative.
- The song is moderately original.
- For historic classical and jazz pieces, the repertoire selection is moderately relevant.

Vocals & Lyrics (20 of 100 points)

Rating: Extraordinary (16 – 20)

- The vocal performance is captivating, powerful, and charismatic.
- The lyrics are highly evocative, relatable and refined.
- The vocal performance is compelling, memorable and conveys a distinct message.
- The vocalist's pitch, timing, register and breathing are very appropriate.
- For instrumental pieces, the performance of the lead melody instrument(s) is considerably impactful and expressive.

Rating: Excellent (11 – 15)

- The vocal performance is powerful and charismatic.
- The lyrics are evocative and relatable.
- The vocal performance is memorable and conveys a distinct message.
- The vocalist's pitch, timing, register and breathing are appropriate.
- For instrumental pieces, the performance of the lead melody instrument(s) is impactful and expressive.

Rating: Good (6 – 10)

- The vocal performance is strong and moderately charismatic.
- The lyrics are relatable and well-written.
- The vocal performance is strong and conveys a message.
- The vocalist's pitch, timing, register and breathing are moderately appropriate.
- For instrumental pieces, the performance of the lead melody instrument(s) is somewhat impactful and expressive.

Rating: Fair (0 – 5)

- The vocal performance is not particularly strong.
- The lyrics are somewhat relatable.
- The vocal performance is not particularly strong and doesn't convey a clear message.
- The vocalist's pitch, timing, register and breathing are not particularly appropriate.
- For instrumental pieces, the performance of the lead melody instrument(s) is not particularly impact or expressive.

Musicality (15 of 100 points)

Rating: Extraordinary (12 – 15)

- The instrumental and rhythmic performance is exciting, dynamic and complementary.
- The instruments groove, vibe, and reference relevant genres remarkably well.
- The timing, rhythm, pitch, dynamic and craft of the performance are highly impressive.
- The instruments sound particularly interesting, fitting and contemporary.

Rating: Excellent (9 – 11)

- The instrumental and rhythmic performance is dynamic and complementary.
- The instruments groove, vibe, and reference relevant genres well.
- The timing, rhythm, pitch, dynamic and craft of the performance are impressive.
- The instruments sound interesting, fitting and contemporary.

Rating: Good (5 – 8)

- The instrumental and rhythmic performance is moderately dynamic and complementary.

- The instruments groove, vibe, and reference relevant genres.
- The timing, rhythm, pitch, dynamic and craft of the performance are moderately impressive.
- The instruments sound interesting and fitting.

Rating: Fair (0 – 4)

- The instrumental and rhythmic performance is not particularly dynamic or complementary.
- The instruments do not particularly groove, vibe, or reference relevant genres.
- The timing, rhythm, pitch, dynamic and craft of the performance are not particularly impressive
- The instruments do not sound particularly interesting or fitting.

Marketing Plan & Presentation (25 of 100 points)

Rating: Extraordinary (20 – 25)

- The high-level goals are considerably realistic and achievable.
- The plan is thoughtful, thorough and very likely to achieve the stated goals.
- Substantial detail has been provided on how the plans will be executed.
- This plan will considerably advance the artist's career.

Rating: Excellent (14 – 19)

- The high-level goals are realistic and achievable.
- The plan is thoughtful, thorough and likely to achieve the stated goals.
- Enough detail has been provided on how the plans will be executed.
- This plan will advance the artist's career.

Rating: Good (7 – 13)

- The high-level goals are moderately realistic and achievable.
- The plan is moderately thoughtful, thorough and somewhat likely achieve the stated goals.
- Moderate detail has been provided on how the plans will be executed.
- This plan will moderately advance the artist's career.

Rating: Fair (0 – 6)

- The high-level goals are not particularly realistic and achievable.
- The plan is not particularly thoughtful, thorough and unlikely achieve the stated goals.
- Insufficient detail has been provided on how the plans will be executed.
- The plan is unlikely to advance the artist's career.

Team (15 of 100 points)

Rating: Extraordinary (12 – 15)

- The team and support network have been properly communicated for all plans. This can include artist members and informal relationships.
- The team has considerable resources and capacity to execute the applicant's plan.
- The team will be highly successful in accomplishing the applicant's goals.

Rating: Excellent (9 – 11)

- The team and support network have been communicated for all plans. This can include artist members and informal relationships.
- The team has resources and capacity to execute the applicant's plan.

- The team will be successful in accomplishing the applicant's goals.

Rating: Good (5 – 8)

- The team and support network have been moderately communicated for all plans. This can include artist members and informal relationships.
- The team has moderate resources and capacity to execute the applicant's plan.
- The team will be somewhat successful in accomplishing the applicant's goals.

Rating: Fair (0 – 4)

- The team and support network have not been communicated for all plans.
- The team has few resources and little capacity to execute the applicant's plan.
- The team will not be particularly successful in accomplishing the applicant's goals.

Artist Development (AD)

Songs (25 of 100 points)

Rating: Extraordinary (20 – 25)

- The melody is considerably memorable and dynamic.
- The song's structure is organized, effective and well-paced.
- The arrangement is creative, balanced and very compelling. Elements like tempo, dynamics and harmony are used very effectively.
- The song is very original with a clear perspective.
- For historic classical and jazz pieces, the repertoire selection and interpretation are highly relevant and considerably compelling.

Rating: Excellent (14 – 19)

- The melody is memorable and dynamic.
- The song's structure is organized and well-paced.
- The arrangement is creative and balanced. Elements like tempo, dynamics and harmony are used effectively.
- The song is original with some perspective
- For historic classical and jazz pieces, the repertoire selection is relevant and compelling.

Rating: Good (7 – 13)

- The melody is moderately memorable with some dynamics.
- The song's structure is organized well.
- The arrangement is creative and moderately balanced. Elements like tempo, dynamics and harmony are used.
- The song is original.
- For historic classical and jazz pieces, the repertoire selection is relevant.

Rating: Fair (0 – 6)

- The melody is not particularly memorable.
- The song has some structure.
- The arrangement is not particularly creative.
- The song is moderately original.
- For historic classical and jazz pieces, the repertoire selection is moderately relevant.

Vocals & Lyrics (25 of 100 points)

Rating: Extraordinary (20 – 25)

- The vocal performance is captivating, powerful, and charismatic.
- The lyrics are highly evocative, relatable and refined.
- The vocal performance is compelling, memorable and conveys a distinct message.
- The vocalist's pitch, timing, register and breathing are very appropriate.
- For instrumental pieces, the performance of the lead melody instrument(s) is considerably impactful and expressive.

Rating: Excellent (14 – 19)

- The vocal performance is powerful and charismatic.
- The lyrics are evocative and relatable.
- The vocal performance is memorable and conveys a distinct message.
- The vocalist's pitch, timing, register and breathing are appropriate.
- For instrumental pieces, the performance of the lead melody instrument(s) is impactful and expressive.

Rating: Good (7 – 13)

- The vocal performance is strong and moderately charismatic.
- The lyrics are relatable and well-written.
- The vocal performance is strong and conveys a message.
- The vocalist's pitch, timing, register and breathing are moderately appropriate.
- For instrumental pieces, the performance of the lead melody instrument(s) is somewhat impactful and expressive.

Rating: Fair (0 – 6)

- The vocal performance is not particularly strong.
- The lyrics are somewhat relatable.
- The vocal performance is not particularly strong and doesn't convey a clear message.
- The vocalist's pitch, timing, register and breathing are not particularly appropriate.
- For instrumental pieces, the performance of the lead melody instrument(s) is not particularly impact or expressive.

Musicality (25 of 100 points)

Rating: Extraordinary (20 – 25)

- The instrumental and rhythmic performance is exciting, dynamic and complementary.
- The instruments groove, vibe, and reference relevant genres remarkably well.
- The timing, rhythm, pitch, dynamic and craft of the performance are highly impressive.
- The instruments sound particularly interesting, fitting and contemporary.

Rating: Excellent (14 – 19)

- The instrumental and rhythmic performance is dynamic and complementary.
- The instruments groove, vibe, and reference relevant genres well.
- The timing, rhythm, pitch, dynamic and craft of the performance are impressive.
- The instruments sound interesting, fitting and contemporary.

Rating: Good (7 – 13)

- The instrumental and rhythmic performance is moderately dynamic and complementary.

- The instruments groove, vibe, and reference relevant genres.
- The timing, rhythm, pitch, dynamic and craft of the performance are moderately impressive.
- The instruments sound interesting and fitting.

Rating: Fair (0 – 6)

- The instrumental and rhythmic performance is not particularly dynamic or complementary.
- The instruments do not particularly groove, vibe, or reference relevant genres.
- The timing, rhythm, pitch, dynamic and craft of the performance are not particularly impressive
- The instruments do not sound particularly interesting or fitting.

Artist Development Plan & Presentation (25 of 100 points)

Rating: Extraordinary (20 – 25)

- The high-level goals and budget estimates are remarkably realistic and achievable.
- The plan is thoughtful, thorough and very likely to achieve the stated goals.
- Substantial detail been provided on how the plans will be executed.
- The plan will considerably advance the artist's career.

Rating: Excellent (14 – 19)

- The high-level goals and budget estimates are realistic and achievable.
- The plan is thoughtful, thorough and likely to achieve the stated goals.
- Enough detail been provided on how the plans will be executed.
- The plan will advance the artist's career.

Rating: Good (7 – 13)

- The high-level goals and budget estimates are moderately realistic and achievable.
- The plan is thoughtful, thorough and somewhat likely to achieve the stated goals.
- Moderate detail been provided on how the plans will be executed.
- The plan will moderately advance the artist's career.

Rating: Fair (0 – 6)

- The high-level goals and budget estimates are not particularly realistic and achievable.
- The plan is not particularly thoughtful, thorough and unlikely to achieve the stated goals.
- Moderate detail been provided on how the plans will be executed.
- The plan will not particularly advance the artist's career.