

# Concert Review Guidelines

Music Appreciation students are required to attend two concerts during the course of the semester. Each concert review is worth a total of up to 50 points and should discuss thoroughly each piece on the program.

After attending a complete concert performance, review each piece on the program using good journalistic prose. The review should be 3 complete pages, double spaced and using 12 point font. Begin with a cover page including course information, your name, the professor's name, and the date. \*Do Not use headers at the top of each page. Begin the review with an introduction, followed by a thorough review of each piece on the program, incorporating as many elements and performance factors as possible, and end with a conclusion offering your final thoughts or analyses. Staple the review neatly and include the original concert program when submitted. The review and program must be submitted one week after the performance, or in the case of weekend concerts, within ten days of the concert.

**The following criteria will be used to assess reviews. \*See grading rubric on reverse side.**

**Completeness:** The student has thoroughly discussed each piece on the program.

**Personal Insight:** The review exhibits a high level of insight and critical reflection.

**Course Content Integration:** Elements and Performance Factors are integrated into the concert review.

**Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar:** The review contains no spelling, punctuation or grammatical errors.

**General Presentation:** The review is written using good journalistic prose. Fonts and spacing are observed.

## **Elements** (Choose from the Following)

**Instrumentation:** Strings, woodwinds, brass, percussion, keyboard

**Tempo:** very slow, slow, medium slow, medium fast, fast, very fast, changes in tempo

**Dynamics:** very soft, soft, medium soft, medium loud, loud, very loud, style of dynamic contrast

**Rhythm:** steadiness, simple or complex, primary focal point, secondary to other elements

**Melody:** simple or elaborate, primary focal point, secondary to other elements

**Harmony:** simple or complex, primary focal point, secondary to other elements

**Texture:** monophonic, homophonic, polyphonic

**Period:** Medieval, Renaissance, Baroque, Classical, Romantic, 20th Century, Modern

## **Performance Factors** (Choose from the Following)

**Ensemble:** Musical cohesion, balance and unification achieved in the performance

**Intonation:** The degree of accuracy with which pitches are produced

**Musicianship:** Style, Expressiveness, Artistry

**Other Performance Factors:** Choice of literature, projection, poise

# Rubric for Assessing Concert Reviews

<u>Criteria</u>		<u>Levels of Achievement</u>	
	<u>Mastered:</u> <b>(10 points)</b>	<u>Competent:</u> <b>(5 points)</b>	<u>Not Competent:</u> <b>(0 points)</b>
1. <b><u>Completeness</u></b>	The review is three pages, it contains an introduction and a conclusion, the program is included, and the review thoroughly discusses each piece on the program	The review is three full pages, the program is included, but the review is lacking in detail.	The review is not three full pages, elements of the review are missing, or severely lacking in detail.
2. <b><u>Personal Insight</u></b>	The review exhibits a high level of personal insight and critical reflection.	The review exhibits some personal insight and reflection, but needs to probe deeper into aspects of the performance.	The review shows little personal insight or reflection, and does not provide sufficient evidence of a thoughtful response to the music.
3. <b><u>Course Content Integration</u></b>	Aspects of course content are well integrated into the student's reflections.	Aspects of course content are integrated into the student's reflections, but there are a number of missed opportunities to make connections.	The review shows little or no integration of course content into the student's reflections.
4. <b><u>Spelling, Punctuation, and Grammar</u></b>	The review contains no spelling, punctuation, or grammatical errors.	The review contains no more than 1 or 2 minor errors.	The review contains far too many errors for a coherent response.
5. <b><u>General Presentation</u></b>	The review is written in good journalistic prose, and the fonts, spacing and format are standard.	The writing is generally good, but the prose is too informal, or the physical appearance is somewhat substandard.	The writing is poor, or informal or the overall format or presentation is not up to college level work.