



Juror Handbook

2024-2025

Thank you for being a member of FACTOR’s juror team, which plays an integral role in funding applicants to our Juried Sound Recording: Album, Juried Sound Recording: Single/EP, and Artist Development programs. Without industry professionals lending their time and expertise, the adjudication of applications to these programs would not be possible.

It’s our privilege to work with you to fund vibrant artists across Canada’s diverse music community. If you have questions or concerns at any point, email juror@factor.ca.

Overview

There are four juried program intakes deadlines in 2024:

Juried Sound Recording: Single/EP	May 16
Artist Development	May 23
Juried Sound Recording: Album	September 12

Applicants can apply to any one juried program once in a fiscal year.

Each deadline, FACTOR receives more eligible, deserving applications than can be funded within the limits of the available 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 12 weeks of each deadline, dependent on volume of applications and availability of jurors.

The Juror Team

Jurors are professionals working in music: 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 five years’ experience in the music industry or a related industry; and
- have been active in the music industry within the past two 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 five 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.

Jurors provide their time and expertise without remuneration, most wishing to give back to their industry, remain current to trends, discover artists, inform their own applications, and so on. Participating jurors receive an annual modest honorarium in recognition of their services.

Juried Programs

Juried Sound Recording: Album

The JSR: Album 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 Canadian artist can receive a General profile rating. Artists who demonstrate a recent history of substantial market activity via album sales/streams, tour revenue, radio charting, sync revenue, and audience engagement through social media may qualify for a profile rating of Artist 2.

Successful applicants may claim up to 50% of eligible expenses related to recording, marketing, touring, showcasing, videos, and radio marketing. The funding support is not paid back to FACTOR

The maximum amount available for artists is \$67,500

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 showcasing is available in **specific** amounts for each activity.

Juried Sound Recording: Single/EP

The JSR: Single/EP program contributes toward the cost of producing and marketing a release of five or fewer songs and under 20 minutes total running time.

Artists with a profile rating of **General** or **Artist 2** can apply and successful applicants may claim up to 50% of eligible expenses related to recording, marketing, touring, showcasing, videos, and radio marketing. The funding support is not paid back to FACTOR.

This funding is designed to be **flexible** and can be shifted between recording, marketing, touring, and showcasing at the applicant's discretion with some limits. The Single/EP project must be completed by the close of FACTOR's fiscal year.

Artist Development (AD)

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

Artists with a profile rating of **General** can apply and successful applicants may claim up to 75% of eligible expenses related to recording, marketing, touring, showcasing, videos, and radio marketing. The funding support is not paid back to FACTOR.

The maximum funding available is \$5,000. The funding is **flexible** and can be shifted to recording, marketing, touring, showcasing, 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 hundreds of applications to our juried programs each deadline and maintains a standard that each application should be assessed by multiple jurors.

Prior to each application deadline, FACTOR sends an email to the juror pool 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, 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 three juries and are expected to diligently and expertly assess the merits of each 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. Commonly, two one-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 when scoring 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: Album and Juried Sound Recording: Single/EP

Assessment Materials

- A biography of the artist and website link
- High-level goals for the project (Album only)
- 2 assessment tracks (1 for Single/EP) from the proposed project with lyrics (if applicable) - in most cases, the tracks should be recent and unreleased. Please note that instrumental tracks are also allowed (see scoring rubric below)
- Intended changes to the assessment tracks (JSR: Album only)
- A detailed marketing plan
- For JSR: Album applicants, a summary of the team involved in the project (included in the marketing plan)
- For JSR: Single/EP applicants, a detailed budget

Scoring

Jurors are expected to assess each JSR application against five 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 (for JSR: Album) or Budget – 15 (for JSR: Single/EP)

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 – Juried Sound Recording Programs

Songs – 25 points

<p>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? For historic classical and jazz pieces: Is the repertoire selection and interpretation compelling and relevant?</p>			
Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1-6	7-13	14-20	21-25

Lyrics and Vocals – 20 points

<p>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? For Instrumental pieces: Is the performance of the lead melody instrument(s) impactful and expressive?</p>			
Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20

Musicality – 15 points

<p>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?</p>			
Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1-3	4-7	8-11	12-15

Marketing Plan and Presentation – 25 points

<p>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?</p>			
Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1-6	7-13	14-20	21-25

Team – 15 points (JSR: Album only)

<p>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?</p>			
Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1-3	4-7	8-11	12-15

Budget – 15 points (JSR: Single/EP only)

Budget: Evaluate the sources of income, expenses, cash flow, and risk management Capacity: Does the applicant have the resources and capacity to execute the plan financially? Success: How successful will the team be in accomplishing the applicant's goals based on current external factors?			
Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1-3	4-7	8-11	12-15

Artist Development (AD)

Assessment Materials

- A biography of the artist and web links
- One 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 assess each AD application against four criteria.

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

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

Jurors also review the biography, web links, goals, and artist development plan, awarding up to 25 points for the:

- Artist Development Plan & Presentation - 25

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 – Artist Development

Songs – 25 points

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? For historic classical and jazz pieces: is the repertoire selection and interpretation compelling and relevant?			
Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1-6	7-13	14-20	21-25

Lyrics and Vocals – 25 points

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? For instrumental pieces: is the performance of the lead melody instrument(s) impactful and expressive?			
Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1-6	7-13	14-20	21-25

Musicality – 25 points

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?			
Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1-6	7-13	14-20	21-25

Plan and Presentation – 25 points

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?			
Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1-6	7-13	14-20	21-25

Notes for FACTOR review

If you are concerned about an applicant's eligibility or other elements of the application, complete your assessment as usual and note your concern(s) in the *Notes for FACTOR Review* section. Examples of possible issues: missing documentation, MP3 missing or not working, or any other issues. If you have questions, please email juror@factor.ca.

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 typically have someone refrain from assessing an application or program.

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 submissions. Jurors agree they will not disclose the details of the applications assigned to them, the materials submitted, or the artists they review. This includes conversations in person, online, and on social media. Jurors must delete any materials downloaded during review once assessment is complete.

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 who participate in a jury review throughout FACTOR's fiscal year are named in FACTOR's annual report.

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 know or am friends with an applicant. Is this a conflict of interest?

Many professionals know one another in the music industry and this is not necessarily a conflict but FACTOR wishes to avoid any perception of potential bias or conflict and requests jurors declare conflict of interest where a relationship exists.

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?

FACTOR does not intend to penalize applicants who 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. 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.

Are jurors expected to assess an applicant's eligibility?

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 *note your concern in the Notes for FACTOR review section*. If you have any questions please email juror@factor.ca with your concern. FACTOR's staff will follow up as soon as possible.

Are jurors expected to assess an applicant's budget?

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: Excellent (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: Very Good (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 (or Instrumentals) (20 of 100 points)

Rating: Excellent (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: Very Good (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: Excellent (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: Very Good (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: Excellent (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: Very Good (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 to 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 to 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 – JSR: Album only)

Rating: Excellent (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: Very Good (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.

Budget (15 of 100 points – JSR: Single/EP only)

Rating: Excellent (12 – 15)

- The budget has been communicated in thorough detail for all plans.
- There are ample resources and capacity to execute the plan financially.
- The team will be highly successful in accomplishing the applicant's goals.

Rating: Very Good (9 – 11)

- The budget has been communicated in detail for all plans.
- There are sufficient resources and capacity to execute the plan financially.
- The team will be successful in accomplishing the applicant's goals.

Rating: Good (5 – 8)

- The budget has been communicated in brief detail for all plans.
- There are resources and capacity to execute the plan financially.
- The team will be somewhat successful in accomplishing the applicant's goals.

Rating: Fair (0 – 4)

- The budget has not been communicated for all plans.
- There are insufficient resources and capacity to execute the plan financially.
- The team will not be particularly successful in accomplishing the applicant's goals.

Artist Development (AD)

Songs (25 of 100 points)

Rating: Excellent (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: Very Good (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 (or Instrumentals) (25 of 100 points)

Rating: Excellent (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: Very Good (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: Excellent (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: Very Good (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: Excellent (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 has been provided on how the plans will be executed.
- The plan will considerably advance the artist's career.

Rating: Very Good (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 has 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 has 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 or thorough, and is unlikely to achieve the stated goals.
- Moderate detail has been provided on how the plans will be executed.
- The plan will not particularly advance the artist's career.