



PART 1 - ACCOUNTABILITY TO THE PROCESS

1.1 ACCOUNTABILITY TO VALUES

- A. Active judges must be familiar with the Judges' Affiliation Manual and DDCA Performance Rules of competition.
- B. All judges must share a consistent, collective understanding and application of the DDCA Judges' Affiliation philosophy. Judges must adhere strictly to the criteria reference Linear Scale.
- C. Accountability in judging requires judges be prepared to explain in detail reasons for the score they assign. Judges must be able to verbally justify scores on recordings and in person. Critiques and post-event gatherings are often offered during the season to meet with coaches to discuss and explain recorded critiques.
- D. In-depth understanding of the criteria of a caption and its relationship to the other captions is imperative. Staying within the caption and not being influenced by the other elements in the performance should be a major concern for all judges.
- E. Judges must be without prejudice and/or personal agenda when assigning scores. Judges must be aware that trends in scores can convey bias, preference or manipulation of ranking. A lack of integrity in assigning scores will not be tolerated.
- F. Judges should search for and identify their own personal biases. Recognizing preferences or biases is part of the judges' self-evaluation process. It may be anything from a particular technique, a style of dance, a manner of presentation, or a size of team. It is very human to have these preferences. Unfortunately, they can color the most accurate use of the scoring process. In some cases, these preferences can be a "strength" within the recognition skills of a judge.
- G. Judges and Judge Directors do not determine or enforce a moral code of conduct for the performers and coaches of DDCA. Personal moral values regarding the appropriateness of music, choreography, costuming, plagiarism, thematics, etc., are not to influence the judging process or scoring. Judges are to only evaluate performances based on the score sheet criteria and Linear Scale, not personal standards.
 - 1. Any judge that demonstrates and accounts for an opinion of morality by lowering scores, dismissing the Linear Scale, refusing to judge, or influencing other judges, will be dismissed.
 - 2. Any issues that a judge may recognize regarding the suitability of a performance for the high school level, should be directed only to the Judges' Director.
- H. Judges should not penalize teams for errors beyond the control of the team such as problems with the sound system or crew.
- I. Judges must have the ability to understand the intent of a show and address what is being done. It is important to invest an open and unbiased interest in every program and examine the 'identity' and process within a performance, interpret that understanding with analysis, provide verbal critique, and assign a numerical value accordingly.



- J. Judges can only judge what is presented within that day of competition; they cannot judge what is not presented. Speculation or expectation of what the judge thinks should or will be in the show is inappropriate.
- K. Judges are responsible to use the same standards of achievement throughout the season, maintaining the same criteria used at the beginning of the season as at the final State Competition.

1.2 ACCOUNTABILITY TO SCORES

- A. **The first priority** for judges should be to analyze each performance and score accordingly. Judges must feel confident to make hard, but accurate calls which sometimes might not be popular. When a score is correctly given based on the criteria, the judge should feel confident that the decision can be supported by comments based on the Linear Scale.
- B. The numbers that a judge bestows to a performance become very informative statistics for interpretation. They are compared, correlated, and 'crunched' with other numbers to reveal many things about the team, the event, AND the judge!
- C. The numerical information that a judge provides should correctly represent the level of achievement of the program, how the program ranks within its division/event and the entire event, plus show realistic growth from event to event. To do this with any consistency, a judge must spend as much time considering the value of the many scores assigned as they do considering the criteria of their score sheet.
- D. Rate and Rank
 - 1. The concept of Rate and Rank is about using the tools of rating to help determine the ranking, the ultimate responsibility. Judges should not place teams in an overall ranking and then attempt to score each caption to justify that ranking.
 - 2. Judges are responsible to rank teams within divisions, as well as for the entire event. By the end of the season, each judge should have an overall ranking for each team they evaluated.
- E. Errors
 - 1. If a judge finds they have incorrectly scored a performance, it is important to acknowledge the error to the team and Judges' Director. (Second round scores are an opportunity to correct the mistake and score more appropriately, with the understanding that final ranking or placement may be unchangeable at this point. Do not attempt to boost/drop scores on *other* teams to compensate for your errors.)
 - a. **Once score sheets have been released by the judge for tabulation, changing or correction of scores will not be allowed. Judges should make sure scores have been added correctly and placements coincide before releasing for tabulation.**
 - 2. Changes in scores and rankings between rounds should be recognized. A large increase/decrease of points (i.e. more than 5 points per each sub-caption) should represent great changes in the team's achievement in Execution or Projection, OR a change in the judge's perception of the performance. Both are possible. (The Content Caption is the least likely to have great fluctuations in points due a lack of change between rounds.)



ACCOUNTABILITY

3. Make the correct decision in the first round, but do not be afraid to admit you made an error and correct it second round. Please give teams your most honest perceptions but make sure that reasons for major changes in ranking/scores are explained in detail to the team *and* judge's director.

F. Points

1. Judges should assign scores in full points. Judges may not use tenth of a point gradations when assigning scores.
2. An important tool to have for any judging event is the "TOTE SHEET." A tote sheet is used to see all scores for all teams at once, help in the comparative process between teams and sub-captions, and finally assist you in managing your numbers to rank teams accordingly. Please create a sheet format that works for you and will assist you during the entire season.
3. Scores placed near the cusp of a Linear Scale box can restrict future teams' scores. Don't push a team into an inappropriate box because there aren't numbers available.
4. Scores placed so close to each other (i.e. 65-66-67) don't offer much of a comparison. Try making bigger decisions, when appropriate.

G. Ties

1. Judges should avoid ties in both sub-captions and total scores. If a tie occurs, the judge may be asked to break their tie before final placements are announced.
2. Don't allow 'tied total points' after 2nd round performance. Use first round 'ties' as an opportunity to make comparative decisions during the 2nd round.

H. Ranking

1. The judge's ultimate responsibility is to rank teams. Use the Rating process (Sub-Captions and Caption scores) to help determine the Ranking. Don't just score and see how the placement comes out.
2. Use the thought process that you are to rank teams not only per division but for the entire event. The same Linear Scale is used for ALL teams in ALL divisions at ALL events. Eventually at the State Championship event, all Oregon teams are ranked together.
3. Before you let go of your score sheets for tabulation, make sure all your scores are added/ranked, and you agree with the outcome.

I. Sub-captions

1. Make decisions. The ranking of a team's three subcaption scores should immediately tell them of their strengths.
2. Make more decisions. Use the Tote sheet to compare subcaption scores between teams and determine overall rankings per subcaption.
3. First and last place teams are much easier to recognize than the 'many in the middle'. Give those similar teams an extra moment of consideration.

1.3 ACCOUNTABILITY TO CONSISTENCY

A. Personal Integrity



ACCOUNTABILITY

1. Integrity in scoring means knowing your previous scores and maintaining a constant interpretation of the score sheet/linear scale from round to round, event to event. Be aware of your emotional and physical variables between events.
2. Know your score sheet and linear scale standards before you see the first team.
3. Be able to back up your comments with reasoning. Explaining how you interpreted a show helps communication between judge and coach in the critique and tape formats. Work to eliminate subjectivity from your evaluations.
4. Judges seeing the same teams throughout the season, may make comments regarding a team's progression, acknowledging growth, offering support and/or criticism while scoring appropriately. Judges are responsible for tracking their scores throughout the season to provide consistent interpretation of the linear scale.
5. Integrity in judging means using your own conscience, voice, and training to determine scores.
6. Integrity in judging means not surrendering to coach/team reputation, or unspoken pressures or expectations.
7. Integrity in judging means maintaining a constant interpretation of the score sheet / linear scale from round to round, event to event.
8. Integrity in judging means always being prepared to give your best.