**Department of Music**

**Coursework Coversheet & Feedback Form (PGT: Essay-based work)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **In submitting this form with your assignment I make the following declaration:**  I declare that the coursework submitted is my own work and has not (either in whole or in part) been submitted towards the award of any other qualification either at Royal Holloway or elsewhere. I have attributed/referenced all sources of information used during the completion of my assignment, including all direct quotes with quotation marks. I am aware that failure to do so constitutes an assessment offence. I have not submitted this work as part of any other coursework and I have submitted my essay to Turnitin ([www.submit.ac.uk](http://www.submit.ac.uk)) and included the paper ID reference on this coversheet. I understand that plagiarism is a serious academic offence that may result in disciplinary action.  If you are registered with the Disability and Dyslexia Services (DDS) and have a green sticker please make sure it is attached to this coversheet.  I understand that where work is submitted late, without acceptable extenuating cause, or where the work exceeds any set upper limit, penalties in the form of mark deductions will be applied in line with the College’s [Academic Regulations](https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/students/study/our-college-regulations/attendance-and-academic-regulations.aspx).  I understand that any marks provided herein are provisional, and may be subject to change as part of the moderation process. | | | | |
| **Course Code** |  | **Student ID** |  | |
| **Module Title** |  | **Candidate Number** |  | |
| **Turnitin Number** |  | **Submission Date** |  | |
| **Coursework Tutor** |  | **Word Count** |  | |
| **Coursework Title** |  | | | |
| **Referencing System** |  | | | |
| **Bibliography included? (*Highlight as relevant*)** | | **Yes** | | **No** |

**Overall performance and feedback**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark** |  | **Marker** |  | This mark is subject to revision during the examinations process |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **(A) Distinction (70-79)** | **(B) Merit**  **(60-69)** | **(C) Pass**  **(50-59)** | **(D) Fail**  **(40-49)** |  |
| **Demonstration of reading, research, and critical (historical, analytical, ethnographic etc.) context** | **Distinction** (80-100) – See Handbook for guidance | Demonstration of **thorough knowledge** of secondary literature, showing awareness of and accounting for divergences in scholarly literature. Displays a good understanding of broader critical and/or theoretical context. | **Good** **account** of the basic state of scholarly knowledge and differing interpretations. Shows a reasonable degree of broader critical and/or theoretical context. | Shows **awareness of scholarly literature** but tends to use it uncritically for ‘information’ rather than evaluating. Key facts/ideas generally present. Appropriate primary and secondary sources are covered and evaluated with some confidence. Limited awareness of broader context. | A workable design permitting demonstration of some technical and/or creative ability and holding some interest.  There is inadequate understanding of primary and/or secondary sources, and/or too much reliance on paraphrase, or on simple descriptions. | **Low Fail** (1-39) – See Handbook for guidance |
| **Engagement with musical material and practices** | Material is treated with technical command and **developed with authority,** revealing creative flexibility of approach, high intellectual standards and signs of **distinct originality**. | The adduced evidence reflects intelligent research and has been subjected to **critical analysis.** Creativity and originality or breadth and depth of response could compensate for some weakness in style or some incoherence of argument. Alternatively, a well-written, thoughtful answer could compensate for a narrowness in the range of issues addressed. There is little or no irrelevant material. Good command of detail**.** | A **sound design** permitting demonstration of a good range of intellectual, technical and/or creative abilities. Poor performance in one part of the submission may mar an otherwise consistent outcome. The main issues are understood, but the evaluation may appear conventional, and the overall outcome a little shallow. A basic knowledge of material and practices is shown. | Treatment of material may be weak and/or unbalanced; there may be some glaring technical or similar errors. |
| **Structure and content of argument** | Submission shows professional potential. Arguments are articulated with **rigour, accuracy, and clarity.** Awareness of alternatives and a broader theoretical context are present. In the case of analytical work, a maturely sustained argument shows originality of approach, design and execution, combined with precision in presentation. | Issues are understood and handled **imaginatively and consistently**. At the lower end of the band some shallowness may be apparent; at the upper end, a sense of assurance will be predominant, with a focussed, elegant technical command and sense of detail. | The **issues are understood**, even if they are not developed fully. Work may be inconsistently structured, e.g. leading to rigidity in the treatment of complex issues or containing some passages of irrelevance. There may be some misunderstandings, errors, and/or omissions. | Incomplete understanding of the issues is shown; treatment may rely on convention rather than demonstrating critical perception. The main thrust of the task will have been recognised, although arguments may be limited or unbalanced, and/or the evidence may be of dubious relevance. |
| **Organisation and structure** | Material is structured in a consistently logical manner, and presented with **clarity and authority**. Introduction and conclusion do more than repeat. | A **well-developed and well-structured** design permitting the demonstration of a good range of intellectual, technical and/or creative abilities, and sustaining interest throughout. | The **content and** **substance** **of an argument** are present but connecting steps are not always clear. There is, however, a general clarity of meaning. | Fragmented and difficult to follow. Meaning may sometimes be difficult to discern. |
| **Writing:** **style, grammar, and spelling. Presentation, referencing** | **Unmistakable stylistic maturity.** Well referenced and presented. No significant errors. | A **good** standard of writing, reference, and presentation, with few errors or inconsistencies. | **Straightforward** and clear. There will be some errors and/or inconsistencies in writing, presentation, and referencing | Several significant errorsand/or inconsistencies in these categories. |