



# Beer Judge Certification Program

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

www.bjcp.org

Graders: **Sandy Cockerham and Libin Shen**

## Report to Participant

Exam Date: **November 1, 2020**  
Exam Location: San Diego, CA

### BEER JUDGING EXAM SCORE

**81**

### INTERPRETATION OF 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 following criteria:

- **< 60%:** Displays weak judging skills, and the score sheets will generally have unacceptably low levels of completeness, descriptive information and/or feedback. This examinee will be an Apprentice judge.
- **60-69%:** At least two of the six exam beers were accurately evaluated. The score sheets demonstrate the minimum acceptable communication and judging skills expected of a Recognized judge.
- **70-79%:** At least three of the six exam beers were accurately evaluated. The score sheets have reasonably good completeness, descriptive information and feedback, appropriate to the Certified judging level.
- **80-89%:** At least four of the six exam beers are accurately evaluated with the high-quality scoresheets expected of a National judge.
- **≥90%:** At least five of the six exam beers are accurately evaluated, and the scoresheets have Master levels of completeness, descriptive information and feedback.

The following sections summarize your performance on the exam. 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 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

- BJCP Beer Style Guidelines (<http://www.bjcp.org/style/2015/beer/>)
- 2017 BJCP Study Guide (<http://dev.bjcp.org/exam-certification/program/studying/beer-exam-study-guide/>)
- Tasting and judging experience
- *How to Brew*, John Palmer (<http://howtobrew.com>)
- Tasting Beer, Randy Mosher
- *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

*Stefin Clapham*

*Michael Lentz*

February 15, 2021

**Sefin Clapham**  
Associate Director

**Mike Lentz**  
Exam Director

**Date**

**Summary:** Congratulations on passing the BJCP Judging Exam! Your score sheets indicate a very good familiarity with the judging process, with some minor gaps in your understanding of beer styles.

Beer Style	Apprentice		Recognized		Certified		National		Master	
	<55	55-60	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	>95
Int'l Pale Lager							■	■		
British Brown Ale						■	■			
American Pale Ale							■	■		
Belgian Dubbel						■	■			
Baltic Porter									■	■
Weizenbock							■	■		

The scoresheets you completed for this exam were evaluated based on how well they demonstrated the judging skills described below. You can analyze and improve your performance by reviewing your exam scoresheets and comparing the shaded levels in the following tables with the criteria outlined in the BJCP Exam Scoresheet Guide, which is located at [http://www.bjcp.org/docs/BJCP\\_Scoresheet\\_Guide.pdf](http://www.bjcp.org/docs/BJCP_Scoresheet_Guide.pdf). Good luck in your future judging endeavors!

**Perceptive Accuracy (20%):** Perceptive Accuracy 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.

Beer Style	Apprentice		Recognized		Certified		National		Master	
	<55	55-60	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	>95
Int'l Pale Lager					■	■				
British Brown Ale						■	■			
American Pale Ale						■	■			
Belgian Dubbel							■	■		
Baltic Porter							■	■		
Weizenbock							■	■		
Average						■	■			

**Descriptive Ability (20%):** Scoresheets should use descriptive language for the perceived characteristics, including the type and intensities of the ingredients, esters, phenols and fermentation characteristics.

Beer Style	Apprentice		Recognized		Certified		National		Master	
	<55	55-60	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	>95
Int'l Pale Lager							■	■		
British Brown Ale						■	■			
American Pale Ale							■	■		
Belgian Dubbel							■	■		
Baltic Porter						■	■			
Weizenbock						■	■			
Average						■	■			

**Feedback (20%):** 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.

Beer Style	Apprentice		Recognized		Certified		National		Master	
	<55	55-60	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	>95
Int'l Pale Lager							■	■		
British Brown Ale						■	■			
American Pale Ale						■	■			
Belgian Dubbel										
Baltic Porter							■	■		
Weizenbock						■	■			
Average						■	■			

**Completeness (20%):** A complete scoresheet provides a detailed sensory evaluation 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.

Beer Style	Apprentice		Recognized		Certified		National		Master	
	<55	55-60	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	>95
Int'l Pale Lager								■	■	
British Brown Ale									■	■
American Pale Ale							■	■		
Belgian Dubbel							■	■		
Baltic Porter								■	■	
Weizenbock								■	■	
Average								■	■	

**Scoring Accuracy (20%):** Scores are compared to consensus scores from the proctors, which are cross-checked with the average scores of all of the examinees and exam beer notes from the administrator to ensure fairness.

Beer Style	Apprentice		Recognized		Certified		National		Master	
	<55	55-60	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	>95
Int'l Pale Lager								■	■	
British Brown Ale	■									
American Pale Ale										■
Belgian Dubbel					■	■				
Baltic Porter										■
Weizenbock								■	■	
Average							■	■		

**Additional Feedback**

The previous section of your Report to Participant provides detailed feedback on how well your scoresheets exemplify the five judging skills. That feedback will be most useful when it is analyzed side-by-side with your exam scoresheets (which you can access through your record on the BJCP database). The table below provides specific examples of some of the judging errors that were noted during the evaluation of your exam. Note that these errors were not the only factors that impacted your final score, and the table should not be construed to be a comprehensive analysis of your exam. Finally, remember that the purpose of this additional feedback is to provide guidance for you to improve your judging skills, not to provoke debate based on differences of opinion between you and the exam grading staff.

Judging Errors	Int'l Pale Lager	British Brown Ale	American Pale Ale	Belgian Dubbel	Baltic Porter	Weizenbock
Perception gap or omission: a characteristic with low or higher intensity that was not identified on your scoresheet, but was noted by at least one of the proctors and at least 50% of the other examinees.	Light-Struck		Oxidation			
Perception error or sensitivity: a characteristic noted on your scoresheet that was not correlated with observations made by the proctors and by at least 25% of the other examinees.			DMS (dimethyl sulfide)		Phenols (medicinal)	
Your descriptions gave ranges for the intensity of one or more characteristics, without providing a precise level.						
Your scoresheet provided insufficient explanation for significant point deductions.	√	√			√	√
Your scoresheet provided insufficient feedback on how to improve stylistic accuracy.				√		
Your scoresheet provided insufficient feedback on how to improve technical merit.						
Assigned score was significantly ( $\geq 7$ points) higher than the consensus score.		√				
Assigned score was significantly lower ( $\geq 7$ points) than the consensus score.						