

Hello everyone,

As we go into Week Four, please continue your diligence digging into the programs, focusing on class standards, and identifying clearly what differentiates teams from each other. From listening to files, we are interpreting the class standards very well and using them to determine scoring neighborhoods. Across all classes, the adjudication system consistently reinforces this equation:

**Reward = Appropriately scaled challenge + clarity of intent + quality of achievement**

Challenge or ambition that is:

- Unclear,
- Beyond the performers' training, or
- Incompatible with class expectations

is *at risk* because it undermines achievement (compatibility), design, communication, and effect.

What changes by class is **where the “sweet spot” lies** between *challenge* and *achievement*, and how much the sheets *expect* or *encourage* designers to push the envelope.

- **Reward is always conditional on training and achievement**
- **Compatibility between design, performers, and class intent is the decisive factor**

To receive full credit, challenge and depth are evaluated relative to performer training, compatibility, and class intent. As ensembles advance, we are expected to raise our standards not simply for the amount of challenge presented but for how consistently, compatibly, and meaningfully that challenge functions within the overall design and effect.

Thanks for all that you do and please let us know anything you need.

Sam & William