



# Beer Judge Certification Program

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

www.bjcp.org

Graders: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

## Report to Participant

Date of Exam: **July 14, 2013**  
Location of Exam: **New York, NY**

### BEER JUDGING EXAM SCORE

80

### 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 following criteria:

- <60: Displays weak tasting 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.
- 60s: At least two of the six exam beers are accurately evaluated. The score sheets demonstrate the minimum acceptable communication and judging skills expected of a Recognized judge.
- 70s: At least three of the six exam beers are accurately evaluated. The score sheets have reasonably good completeness, descriptive information and feedback, appropriate to the Certified judging level.
- 80s: At least four of the six exam beers are accurately evaluated with the high quality scoresheets expected of a National judge.
- 90s: 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 and feedback on individual beers is given on the following page. 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://howtobrew.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

*Jim Wilson*

*Scott Bickham*

10-03-2013

**Jim Wilson**  
BJCP Associate Director

**Scott Bickham**  
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: German Weizen

- Primary characteristics correctly identified: Yes.
- Perception errors or omissions: The proctors thought the sample was slightly better than you did.
- Other comments: This was a very well written description of the exam beer. Your language was very descriptive and easy to understand. There were a few perceptions that were interchanged between the flavor and mouthfeel sections that made your description less organized. You perceived the carbonation to be lower than typical and documented how it hurt the beer. There were also color and head retention perceptions that you mentioned that were not addressed again. Your perceptions implied they were additional issues to be addressed by the brewer yet there was no further comment.

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

### Beer 2 Style: Scottish 80/-

- Primary characteristics correctly identified: Yes, however the intensities differed from the proctors.
- Perception errors or omissions: Esters and acetaldehyde were perceived contrary to the proctors' description.
- Other comments: Your descriptive ability continues to be very good. Your perception of fruitiness in the aroma as well as excessive hop flavor and bitterness was contrary to what the proctors described. The idea that this was a better example of English IPA was very well communicated and matched your description. The brewer however needs to have specific instructions from you on how to make the beer a better example of the target style. In this case would you suggest the brewer reduce bittering hops, flavor hops or both? Would increasing the malt character accomplish the same thing? Also the yeast character in the form of esters and acetaldehyde in the aroma was never addressed again.

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

### Beer 3 Style: Imperial IPA

- Primary characteristics correctly identified: Yes.
- Perception errors or omissions: Very complete assessment of the exam beer.
- Other comments: This was your best scoresheet. The beer was vividly described and your perceptions were easy to follow. One area that could still be a little better would be suggestions for improvement. You said the hops were "slightly one-dimensional" which agreed with your assessment and was in context. To help the brewer even more, use your experience and perception to tell them how to make that minor adjustment. Based on what you tasted would you suggest a different hop strain, a blend of hops, another late addition or maybe a certain dry hop? Perhaps the beer suggested to you that it was either past its prime or prematurely aged making it less than it once was. At that point it is just an educated guess on your part however brewers always want to hear how their beer tastes in a contest environment.

Judging Skill	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice



# Beer Judge Certification Program

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

www.bjcp.org

Perceptive Accuracy (20%)					
Descriptive Ability (20%)					
Feedback (20%)					
Completeness (20%)					
Scoring accuracy (20%)					

**Beer 4 Style: Saison**

- Primary characteristics correctly identified: Yes.
- Perception errors or omissions: The proctors thought this sample had several flaws that hurt it.
- Other comments: Your writing continues to be descriptive however your perceptions differed from the proctors in several areas. They thought the beer was sweeter than typical, had strong alcohol, low bitterness and lacked the dryness of a classic Saison. Your suggestion for improvement was essentially a mirror of your perception that the beer "may be a touch sweet". Again, as the judge, tell the brewer how to reduce the sweetness based on everything you perceived with this beer. It could be a mash temperature issue, under attenuation, lack of bitterness or lower than typical carbonation. It is your opinion, but the brewer will appreciate it if you tell him or her what you think.

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

**Beer 5 Style: Doppelbock**

- Primary characteristics correctly identified: Yes, including oxidation the proctors mentioned.
- Perception errors or omissions: Light esters that the proctors detected as a flaw were not mentioned.
- Other comments: The description of the beer was again very vivid. There was no mention of fermentation character for the flavor indicating you didn't detect any flaws. The proctors thought the beer was a little sweeter than you did and had light oxidation as well as light fruitiness. You told the brewer to correct the minor flaws you detected but weren't specific on how they should accomplish it.

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

**Beer 6 Style: Berliner Weiss**

- Primary characteristics correctly identified: Yes.
- Perception errors or omissions: There was minor disagreement with the proctors on the flaws for this exam beer.
- Other comments: This was a very detailed description of a flawed beer. There were distinct off flavors as well as stylistic issues. The proctors thought the phenolics you detected were more metallic and chemical than plastic however your descriptions were very good. As with previous scoresheets you mentioned "removing the off flavors" which is always good advice. More specific information about how to remove it would be beneficial. In this case the proctors thought the flaws were chlorine based therefore a suggestion to filter brewing water and avoid chlorine sanitizers or rinse thoroughly would be an example of a logical, specific suggestion.



# Beer Judge Certification Program

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

www.bjcp.org

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

## Additional Feedback

Congratulations on passing the BJCP tasting exam. You consistently wrote very detailed scoresheets that would give a brewer valuable feedback had this been an actual contest. Your comments are logical and easy to understand. There are still a few areas that could be slightly better and will improve with a few additions to your feedback. Be sure to treat every beer as a learning experience and spend time with other judges who will be a continual source of valuable information.

**Perception and Feedback:** It was very clear what you perceived on each scoresheet. Descriptive language is not a weak point for you. There were even instances of you documenting what was diminished or absent that was expected for the target style. The one consistent area that was not at the same high level was your suggestions for improvement. An experienced brewer would not have trouble figuring out what they would need to do however everyone is not at that level of brewing. The step after telling them what is wrong is making a specific and logical suggestion for improvement based on all the things you perceived. Telling them a beer is too sweet is good however telling them the best way in your opinion to fix it is much better.

**Descriptive Ability and Completeness:** Your descriptive ability is excellent. There were times however in detailing the dominant characteristics of a beer there were required items missing. Use the list of items under each section title as an informal checklist of attributes that need to be addressed in that section. Aftertaste for example was often omitted and there were no comments in the aroma section to indicate if the aroma changed as the sample warmed. Continue to compare your perceptions to the style guidelines, point out deviations and suggest specific ways to improve the recipe or brewing process even for the highest scoring beers.

**Overall:** Congratulations again on achieving a high score on the BJCP exam. Your score sheets indicate a high degree of familiarity with the judging process and a good understanding of some beer styles. You write logically, your comments are clear and your feedback is very good. There are still a few ways to improve your scoresheets although they are already top notch. Good luck in your future judging endeavors!