**Harmonization Presentation Scoring Device**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Achievement Category** | Level 1  Emerging | | Level 2  Approaches Criterion | | **Level 3**  **Meets Criterion** | Level 4  Exceeds Criterion | **Performance**  **Standards** | |
| **Perform/Present:** Share creative musical work that demonstrates craftsmanship and exhibits originality. | | | | | | | | |
| **Recognition of Notation**  *(scoring the Presentation Preparation Worksheet)* | Notation was not legible and / or did not use a consistent notation system; included no indications of  musical elements. | Notation was partially legible and / or was inconsistently notated; included no indications of musical elements. | | Notation was mostly legible and used a consistent notation system; included  some indications of musical elements. | | Notation was legible, used a consistent notation system; included many  indications of musical elements. | | **MU:Cr3.2.H.Ia** **Perform** final versions of ***improvisations****,* ***compositions*** (**forms** such as **theme and variation** or 12-bar blues) and *three-or-more*-chord accompaniments in a *variety of patterns (such as arpeggio, country and gallop strumming, finger picking patterns*), demonstrating ***technical skills*** *in applying principles of composition/improvisation and originality* in developing and organizing **musical ideas.** |
| **Feedback for Refinement**  *(scoring the Presentation Preparation Worksheet)* | Evidence indicated no feedback was used to refine the technical aspects of the harmonization. | Evidence indicated  that feedback had minimal  influence on refinement of the technical and musical aspects of the harmonization. | | Evidence indicated some feedback was used to refine the technical aspects of the harmonization. | | Evidence clearly indicated that feedback led to refinement of both the technical and the musical aspects of the harmonization in multiple instances. | |
| **Verbal Presentation**  *(scoring the recorded presentation)* | The presentation did not explain how the chords and accompaniment patterns fit the given melody | The presentation included some explanation of how the chords and accompaniment patterns fit the given melody. | | In most instances, the presentation adequately explained how the chords and accompaniment patterns fit the given melody. | | In all  instances, the presentation thoroughly explained how the chords and accompaniment patterns fit the given melody. | |
| **Technical**  **Accuracy and**  **Expressive**  **Qualities of Performance**  *(scoring the recorded presentation)* | Performance was technically inaccurate and had few, if any, expressive qualities. | Performance was sometimes technically accurate  and had some expressive  qualities. | | Performance was mostly technically accurate and had some expressive  qualities. | | Performance was technically accurate and had consistently demonstrated expressive qualities. | |
| **Melodic Interpretation**  *(scoring the self-evaluation form)* | Demonstrated no interpretive choices and did not provide for the effective use of chords or accompaniment patterns. | Demonstrated some interpretive choices that provided for the effective use of chords or accompaniment patterns. | | Demonstrated many interpretive choices that provided for the effective use of either chords or accompaniment patterns. | | Demonstrated interpretive choices that provided for the effective use of both chords and accompaniment patterns. | |