**66th NOAA Juror’s Report: Lucia O’Connor**  
  
This year’s show was filled with a wide selection of pieces. The calibre of the work was generally very high. Many artists showed great technical skill in their pieces. It is inspiring to see all the art that comes from Northern Ontario. I appreciated all the mediums that were entered and happy to see non-traditional and mixed media pieces submitted by artists.  The top ten and the honourable mentions are absolutely stunning works. It was definitely a tight finish to be included in the top 38 and many pieces in other circumstances would have made it to the selected exhibit, however the quality was so high among the group!  
  
The jurying process was very rewarding for me and I enjoyed going through all the submissions. I made a point of trying to write a positive aspect, an improvement aspect and a constructive critique on an aspect that maybe did not work well with the piece. I would also add that any artist in the show is welcome to have my email contact information to discuss what was written about their piece. Most of my critiques focus on depth, technical skill with medium, perspective and light source. Those areas are where I found the most need for improvement among the group.  
  
The process for marking and scoring:  
  
We broke down the pieces into -  
1. Top ten  
2. Honourable mentions  
3. Selected (but no award or HM)  
4. Non- selected.  
  
Each category was given a scoring range within 50:  
  
1. Top ten. 47-50  
2. Honourable mentions. 44-46  
3. Selected (but no award or HM). 39-43  
4. Non- selected. 38 and below.  
  
Whatever category the piece fell into had to have a score within that range. This way, no artist could be scored similarly to someone that was in a different category. For example, if someone was in the non-selected range and scored a 40 - the artist could question why someone with a 39 was selected when they have a lower score. This will help for artists that compare their number score with other artists in the show.  
  
Places of potential improvement:  
The category of presentation was a hard one to judge. The criteria were not necessarily clear as to how to score that area. For me that category became a place to arbitrarily remove or add marks to help the piece achieve the desired score within a range.  
  
I also did not use the marking aids. I found them difficult to apply to the actual scoring and critiquing. I would recommend coming up with new guidelines for jurors in the future.  
  
Miigwetch/thank you!

Lucia O’Connor

Email: luce.nirvana@gmail.com