



Beer Judge Certification Program

5115 Excelsior Blvd, #326
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

www.bjcp.org

Graders: [REDACTED]

Report to Participant

Date of Exam: **January 10, 2015**

Location of Exam: **Charlotte, North Carolina**

BEER JUDGING EXAM SCORE

87

INTERPRETING YOUR SCORE AND FEEDBACK

Your exam has been graded by two National or Master judges and their scoring and comments reviewed by both an Associate Exam Director and the Exam Director. This three step process ensures that the assigned scores are consistent with the criteria outlined in the BJCP ScoreSheet Guide, which is located at http://www.bjcp.org/docs/BJCP_ScoreSheet_Guide.pdf. In general, your exam score indicates that your judging skills fall into one of the following categories:

- **60:** Displayed weak tasting skills, and the score sheets generally had unacceptably low levels of completeness, descriptive information and/or feedback. You can earn experience points as a BJCP Apprentice judge as you address gaps in your knowledge of beer styles and brewing.
- **65:** At least two of the six exam beers were accurately evaluated. The score sheets demonstrated the minimum acceptable communication and judging skills expected of a BJCP Recognized judge.
- **70:** At least three of the six exam beers were accurately evaluated. The score sheets had reasonably good completeness, descriptive information and feedback, appropriate to the BJCP Certified judging level.
- **80:** At least four of the six exam beers were accurately evaluated with the high quality score sheets expected of a BJCP National judge.
- **90:** At least five of the six exam beers were accurately evaluated, and the score sheets had BJCP Master levels of completeness, descriptive information and feedback. Fewer than 5% of judges have historically earned this distinction.

The following tables summarize your performance on the exam and provide feedback on your judging of the individual exam beers. When reviewing this information, keep in mind that your final score was assigned only after an assessment of the entire exam. Since our understanding of brewing science and beer styles is constantly evolving, it may be possible to argue a few technical and stylistic details; however, your final score is not likely to change since your exam has already undergone several hours of evaluation by the most experienced judges and graders in the BJCP. Questions or appeals should be directed to the Exam Director assigned to this set.

RECOMMENDED STUDY

- *How to Brew*, John Palmer (<http://bratsofbeer.com>)
- *Dave Miller's Homebrewing Guide or The Complete Handbook of Home Brewing*, Dave Miller
- *Designing Great Beers*, Ray Daniels
- *New Brewing Lager Beer*, Greg Noonan
- *Principles of Brewing Science*, George Fix
- *Brewing Better Beer: Master Lessons for Advanced Homebrewers*, Gordon Strong
- *Beer Companion*, Michael Jackson
- BJCP Study Guide
- Tasting/Judging Experience
- BJCP Style Guidelines

Andy Hejl

Tom Cannon May 26, 2015

Andy Hejl
BJCP Associate Director

Tom Cannon
BJCP Exam Director

Date

Overall Performance Summary

Judging Skill	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Perceptive Accuracy (20%)					
Descriptive Ability (20%)					
Feedback (20%)					
Completeness (20%)					
Scoring accuracy (20%)					



Beer Judge Certification Program

5115 Excelsior Blvd, #326
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

www.bjcp.org

Individual Beer Judging

Beer 1 Style: Munich Helles

Judging Skill	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Perceptive Accuracy (20%)					
Descriptive Ability (20%)					
Feedback (20%)					
Completeness (20%)					
Scoring accuracy (20%)					

Beer 2 Style: Belgian Witbier

Judging Skill	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Perceptive Accuracy (20%)					
Descriptive Ability (20%)					
Feedback (20%)					
Completeness (20%)					
Scoring accuracy (20%)					

Beer 3 Style: Brown Porter

Judging Skill	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Perceptive Accuracy (20%)					
Descriptive Ability (20%)					
Feedback (20%)					
Completeness (20%)					
Scoring accuracy (20%)					

Beer 4 Style: American IPA

Judging Skill	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Perceptive Accuracy (20%)					
Descriptive Ability (20%)					
Feedback (20%)					
Completeness (20%)					
Scoring accuracy (20%)					



Beer Judge Certification Program

5115 Excelsior Blvd, #326
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

www.bjcp.org

Beer 5 Style:

Munich Dunkel

Judging Skill	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Perceptive Accuracy (20%)					
Descriptive Ability (20%)					
Feedback (20%)					
Completeness (20%)					
Scoring accuracy (20%)					

Beer 6 Style:

Weizenbock

Judging Skill	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Perceptive Accuracy (20%)					
Descriptive Ability (20%)					
Feedback (20%)					
Completeness (20%)					
Scoring accuracy (20%)					

Additional Feedback

Overall: Congratulations on achieving an excellent score on the BJCP judging exam. Your score sheets indicate strong familiarity with the judging process and an exemplary understanding of beer styles, but also some minor gaps. Good luck in your future judging endeavors!

The checkboxes below indicate that some of your scoresheets included common errors or omissions; they should not be interpreted as the only issues present on your scoresheets. A more comprehensive analysis of your performance can be done by comparing the shaded levels in the tables with the criteria outlined in the BJCP Exam Scoresheet Guide, which is located at http://www.bjcp.org/docs/BJCP_Scoresheet_Guide.pdf.

Perceptions: Perception is evaluated based on the descriptions provided by the proctors and the other examinees as well as the background information on the beers provided by the exam administrator. A few dedicated training sessions with experienced judges will enable you to calibrate your palate and may improve your ability to detect secondary or more subtle characteristics.

- You showed potential sensitivity to _____.
- You were possibly not as sensitive to (or familiar with) phenols and esters.
- Perceptions differed significantly from proctors and other tasters in character.
- Perceptions differed significantly from proctors and other tasters in intensity.

Descriptive Ability: Beer scoresheets should use descriptive language for the perceived beer characteristics, including the type and intensities of the malt, hops, esters, phenols and fermentation characteristics.

- Comments used ranges rather than distinct values for intensity.
- Comments did not provide intensity values.
- Comments used generic descriptors (good, nice, some, Belgian) rather than fully describing the character.



Beer Judge Certification Program

5115 Excelsior Blvd, #326
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

www.bjcp.org

Feedback: Feedback includes comparing perceptions to the style guidelines, pointing out deviations and/or technical flaws, and suggesting specific ways to improve the recipe and/or brewing process.

- Feedback was generic and not detailed.
- Feedback assumed specific techniques or ingredients.
- Feedback was not provided on major style or technical issues.
- Technical feedback was not accurate.
- Style feedback was not accurate.

Completeness: A complete scoresheet provides a complete sensory evaluation of the beer rather than just hitting the highlights. It is sometimes helpful to use the list of items under each section title as an informal checklist of attributes that need to be addressed on the scoresheet, and comments should specifically note anything that was out of place or missing for the presented style.

- Scoresheets did not address all of the relevant aspects listed for each section of the scoresheet.
- Scoresheets addressed sensory aspects in incorrect locations.
- Handwriting was difficult to read.
- Descriptor Definition or Stylistic/Technical/Intangible boxes were not used.
- Scoresheet had numerous misspelled words (not a point deduction, just an observation).

Scoring Accuracy: Scores are compared to consensus scores from the proctors, which are cross-checked with the average scores from all of the examinees to ensure consistency. You scored the Brown Porter 12 points higher than the proctors consensus score.

- There were significant scoring deviations relative to the consensus scores.
- There were addition errors on one or more scoresheets.
- The assigned scores were not consistent with the comments.