

		(A) Lower to Good 1 <sup>st</sup> (70-85)	(B) Upper 2 <sup>nd</sup> Class (60-69)	(C) Lower 2 <sup>nd</sup> Class (50-59)	(D) Third Class (40-49)	
<b>Demonstration of reading, research, and critical (historical, analytical, ethnographic etc.) context</b>	Outstanding 1 <sup>st</sup> (86-100) – See Handbook for guidance	<b>Strong</b> in awareness of and accounting for divergences in scholarly literature. Displays a good understanding of broader critical and/or theoretical context.	<b>Good</b> 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. <b>Limited</b> awareness of broader context.	Shows some knowledge of the basic material but <b>lacks understanding</b> of key problems, questions, contexts.	Fail (1-39) – See Handbook for guidance
<b>Engagement with musical material and practices</b>		<b>Depth</b> in engagement. Draws meaningful, integrated connections and/ or analytical conclusions. Illuminating and, at the higher level, original in insights and/or approach.	Shows <b>insight</b> and awareness of varied interpretation and/or analytical issues. Good command of detail. Critical frameworks have been understood and applied.	Shows a <b>thoughtful</b> degree of historical/analytical/ethnographic/other critical understanding. A basic knowledge of material and practices is shown.	<b>Partial</b> : discussion and understanding of musical material and practices are limited.	
<b>Argument and content</b>		<b>Perceptive</b> , fluently presented argument, articulated with rigour, accuracy, and clarity. Points are well backed up. Awareness of alternatives and a broader theoretical context are present.	<b>Well argued</b> ; progress may readily be followed. There are few or no surprising omissions and no serious misunderstandings. Points tend to be well backed up, although there may be exceptions to that.	Content and substance of an argument are present but, connecting steps may not always quite convince and/or cohere. Some expected points may be missing or confusingly presented. There is, however, a <b>general clarity</b> of meaning	<b>Explores</b> the topic but the line of argument is tenuous or missing. Accuracy, relevance, and command of detail are sometimes or often lacking.	
<b>Organisation and structure</b>		<b>Convincing and coherent</b> , resting on a sustained, developed argument (see above). Introduction and conclusion do more than repeat.	Structure is broken down into clear <b>logical</b> steps. There is reasonable continuity between and within sections.	Makes an <b>orderly</b> series of points, which falls some way short of a cumulative argument developing into more than the sum of its parts. There may be some misunderstandings, errors, and/or omissions..	<b>Fragmented</b> and difficult to follow. Meaning may sometimes be difficult to discern.	
<b>Writing: style, grammar, and spelling. Presentation, referencing</b>		<b>Incisive</b> and fluent style. Well referenced and presented. No significant errors.	A <b>good</b> standard of writing, reference, and presentation, with few errors or inconsistencies.	<b>Straightforward</b> and clear. There will be some errors and/or inconsistencies in writing, presentation, and referencing	Several significant <b>errors</b> and/or inconsistencies in these categories.	