

### Marking criteria

All assessed work submitted by students in the Media Arts Department is evaluated on a percentage scale. The relations to class band are shown in the tables on the next pages, these articulate marking criteria for:

- Critical Theory coursework
- Creative Audiovisual coursework
- Oral Presentations
- Creative Production Papers
- Creative Production Portfolios
- Creative Written coursework
- Documentary Production Papers

For each percentage band, a set of general assessment criteria has been articulated. These criteria should be read in conjunction with the specific instructions and advice on individual assessments cover sheets.

A mark in the class range may be awarded where the assessed work meets the majority of the criteria for that range. It is possible for strength in one criteria (e.g. originality and critical reasoning OR Creativity) to compensate for some weaknesses in other criteria (e.g. Presentation and communication OR Audience Engagement). Feedback sheets provide explicit feedback on the extent to which specific criteria have been met. However, students should note that the markers' use of the evaluative categories in the assessment matrix is indicative: feedback in the commentary section explains the final mark and points for development.

All coursework (theory and practice) and exam scripts are marked 'blind'. The standard of marking is then moderated or second marked in final year practice (again, blind). The Visiting Examiners, who are independent of Royal Holloway, may also see your work. Visiting and External Examiners can suggest changes, where appropriate, to marks awarded by markers and moderators in order to maintain and enhance the general standards of marking.

**Critical Theory Coursework** is marked across 4 criteria: 1. Research, Study and Understanding; 2. Originality and Critical Reasoning; 3. Argument and Analysis; 4. Presentation and communication. These criteria should be read in conjunction with the specific instructions and advice on individual assessments cover sheets.

Degree Class (Marking scale)	Theory Coursework marking criteria
<b>Upper 1<sup>st</sup></b> (85+)	Work should demonstrate a deep understanding and near comprehensive knowledge of the subject. It should show significant originality in interpretation and analysis. The essay or dissertation should have a coherent structure, demonstrate exceptional synthesis of primary and secondary research, and show overwhelming evidence of in-depth reading with clear indications of substantial research beyond the reading lists. Its presentation should be as near perfect as possible, with a written style that is incisive and fluent. In general, an upper first class should be of a quality that is considered worthy of publication or retention for future reference, either for research or teaching.
<b>1<sup>st</sup></b> (70-84)	Work should be excellent in most respects and may contribute some creative or original thought. It should demonstrate a mature, accurate grasp of the issues raised by the question or brief, as well as an exemplary knowledge of appropriate texts, techniques and relevant theoretical perspectives. It should conduct a sustained coherent argument in a fluent academic style and should demonstrate good skills in marshalling appropriate evidence.
<b>2(i)</b> (60-69)	Work in this class will typically be thoughtful, knowledgeable and well presented. It will exhibit a detailed understanding of the material studied on the course and the issues raised by the question or brief, and will demonstrate the ability, sustained through long stretches of the essay, to marshal the relevant evidence and develop ideas. It should contain little or no irrelevant material and should generally be well constructed. Creativity and originality or breadth and depth of response could compensate for some weakness or incoherence in style, argument, presentation or execution. At the lower end (60-62), this grade might also be awarded where a detailed answer, with considerable insights, is marred by a lack of fluency, poor organisation of material, persistent grammatical irregularities or failure to observe conventions of presentation.
<b>2(ii)</b> (50-59)	Work gives some evidence that the main thrust of the question or brief is recognised and shows that some of the course material has been absorbed; however, recognition of issues is incomplete. The material presented is restricted and may be unbalanced or of dubious relevance. There is a failure to interrogate received ideas. A comprehensive understanding has not been achieved and will result in weakness in application of ideas in practice. This class is appropriate where much of the content seems worthy of a higher grade but where poor organisation, syntax or presentation obscures meaning.
<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b> (40-49)	Work attempts to answer the question or fulfil the brief, but without understanding its implications. It may be characterised by insufficient use of materials studied or application of ideas explored in the course. Such attempts as there are will only endorse or repeat ideas rather than supporting or extending them. The work may also be descriptive and brief or repetitive, lacking focus and precision. Clumsy expression, ineffective paragraphs and poorly written sentences will often appear in third-class work. Improper use of scholarly referencing conventions will also frequently feature in work of this standard.
<b>Marginal Fail</b> (30-39)	Written work will suggest that expressive abilities are severely limited. There will be a serious lack of relevance to the question or brief, and work will show little or no evidence of the candidate having studied the work set for the course. Research, organisation and presentation will be inadequate.
<b>Clear Fail</b> (10-29)	Work in this category will be incompetent or inadequate in all areas. It may demonstrate no understanding of the subject or it may contain substantial errors in the writing. Or it may have an incomplete or chaotic structure.
<b>Clear Fail</b> (0-9)	For written work where only a few lines have been submitted and the candidate is not deemed to have made any attempt at the paper.

*Additional notes:* 1. Details of how to provide appropriate referencing are available in the [Media Arts Style Guide](#).

2. Any figures (such as screen grabs) included in coursework will be assessed on the basis of the extent to which they enhance the reader's understanding, are clearly explained and integrated with the arguments being developed in the text and are clearly labelled and captioned.

**Creative Audiovisual** work is marked across 6 criteria<sup>1</sup>: 1. Quality of work 2. Creativity 3. Professional development 4. Audience engagement 5. Critical awareness 6. Conceptual/Narrative progression. These criteria should be read in conjunction with the specific instructions and advice on individual assessments cover sheets.

Degree Class	Creative Audio-visual coursework marking criteria
<b>Upper 1<sup>st</sup> (85+)</b>	Quality of work is fully coherent and of an outstanding standard in concept, delivery, research and planning, with highly sophisticated use of appropriate technologies. Significant and appropriate creative risk/innovation has been successfully achieved to produce a work nearly fit for professional exhibition. Work is highly original and engages the audience at a complex, challenging and sophisticated level. Conceptual/narrative progression is outstanding with sophisticated editing, rhythm and composition. It evidences a deep critical awareness of relevant history and theory where appropriate.
<b>1<sup>st</sup> (70-84)</b>	Quality of work is fully coherent and of an excellent standard in concept, delivery, research and planning, with sophisticated use of appropriate technologies. Significant and appropriate creative risk/innovation has been successfully achieved to produce a work nearly fit for professional exhibition with little further development. Work is original and mostly engages the audience at a complex, challenging and sophisticated level. Conceptual/narrative progression is excellent with strong editing, rhythm and composition. It evidences a very high critical awareness of relevant history and theory where appropriate.
<b>2(i) (60-69)</b>	Quality of work is formally coherent and of a very good standard in concept, delivery, research and planning, and use of appropriate technologies. Some significant and appropriate creative risk/innovation has largely been successfully achieved, although work does not yet meet professional development standards for exhibition. The originality and demonstrates an ability to engage the audience at a complex, challenging and sophisticated level. Conceptual/narrative progression is very good with strong editing, rhythm and composition. It evidences a significant critical awareness of relevant history and theory where appropriate.
<b>2(ii) (50-59)</b>	Quality of work is generally coherent and of a good standard in concept, delivery, research, planning and use of appropriate technologies, but these may be under-developed or inconsistent. There is evidence of attempts at creativity but these are either largely conventional or may only be achieved unevenly. It would need substantial further development for professional exhibition. Work engages the audience with some effectiveness but may lack originality, tending towards the derivative. Conceptual/narrative progression is acceptable, demonstrating a fundamental grasp of editing, rhythm and composition. It demonstrates some critical awareness of relevant history and theory where appropriate.
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> (40-49)</b>	Quality of work may lack coherence and is generally of a satisfactory standard in concept, delivery, research, planning and use of appropriate technologies, but with significant weaknesses in many of these areas. There is little evidence of attempts at creativity and these are either largely conventional or are not successfully achieved. The work is largely unsuitable for further development for professional exhibition. The work struggles to engage the audience effectively and is unlikely to be original, tending to be pedestrian, routine and derivative. Conceptual/narrative progression is unclear or inconsistent with only a rudimentary grasp of editing, rhythm and composition demonstrated. It demonstrates little critical awareness of relevant history and theory.
<b>Marginal Fail (30-39)</b>	Quality of work is largely incoherent. It fails to reach a satisfactory standard in concept, delivery, research, planning and use of appropriate technologies. Creative ideas contain significant flaws and it is unfit for professional development. The work does not engage the audience effectively and is largely derivative. Conceptual/narrative progression is almost entirely absent with significant flaws in editing, rhythm and composition. It demonstrates no critical awareness of relevant history and theory.
<b>Clear Fail (10-29)</b>	The work contains all the features described in the 'marginal fail' category, but will either be significantly under length and/or exhibit these deficiencies to a much greater extent.
<b>Clear Fail (0-9)</b>	Work is so short that the candidate is not deemed to have made any attempt at the work.

<sup>1</sup> Additional notes: 1. Marks may be deducted for failure to deliver AV work in the required format, as detailed [here](#).

**Oral Presentations** are marked across 4 criteria: 1. Focus and creative engagement; 2. Critical Understanding; 3. Knowledge and research; 4. Presentation and communication. These criteria should be read in conjunction with the specific instructions and advice on individual assessments cover sheets.

Degree Class (Marking scale)	Oral Presentation Marking Criteria
<b>Upper 1<sup>st</sup></b> (85+)	<b>Focus and creative engagement:</b> Original, imaginative and incisive engagement with topic/brief. <b>Critical understanding:</b> Clear and original structure; ideas linked coherently and confidently; explicit, well-structured and relevant analysis. <b>Knowledge and research:</b> Evidence of comprehensive research and original thought; deep awareness of key debates and/or context. <b>Presentation and communication:</b> Clearly audible presentation; audio-visual aids used to a very high standard; well-paced and to time; excellent relationship with audience. Answered questions with authority and/or originality; able to generate discussion/engage others at a very high level.
<b>1<sup>st</sup></b> (70-84)	<b>Focus and creative engagement:</b> Explicitly addressed the topic/brief, identifying subtleties in assignment details. <b>Critical understanding:</b> Evidence of original thought with respect to structure of content or conclusions; ideas linked coherently; well-structured and relevant analysis. <b>Knowledge and research:</b> Clear awareness of key debates and/or context; consultation and evaluation of a broad range of relevant sources. <b>Presentation and communication:</b> Clearly audible presentation; excellent use of audio-visual aids; well-paced and to time; very good relationship built with audience; answered questions with knowledge and understanding; able to generate discussion/engage others at a high level.
<b>2(i)</b> (60-69)	<b>Focus and creative engagement:</b> Explicitly addressed topic/brief; structure evident, but could be more focused. Commenced and concluded appropriately. <b>Critical understanding:</b> Evidence of coherent links between ideas and relevant analysis. <b>Knowledge and research:</b> Evidence of a wide range of relevant sources, with some evaluation; awareness of some key debates and/or context. <b>Presentation and communication:</b> Clearly audible; mostly well-paced and on time; audio-visual aids used to increase effectiveness; relationship built with audience; able to generate discussion/engage others; answers to audience questions demonstrate knowledge and understanding.
<b>2(ii)</b> (50-59)	<b>Focus and creative engagement:</b> Addressed set topic/brief; structure evident, though unclear. <b>Critical understanding:</b> Evidence of understanding but largely descriptive with lack of critical insight. <b>Knowledge and research:</b> Limited awareness of wider debates and/or context. Evidence of some engagement with, and evaluation of, relevant sources. <b>Presentation and communication:</b> Audible throughout; pace not always appropriate and ran over/under time. Some attempt is made to build relationship with audience and generate discussion or engage others; answers to audience questions demonstrates basic understanding.
<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b> (40-49)	<b>Focus and creative engagement:</b> Partially addressed the set topic/brief; some evidence of an appropriate structure, but presentation partially rambling or unfocused. <b>Critical understanding:</b> Included little or no analysis. <b>Knowledge and research:</b> Few relevant sources consulted; sources not evaluated. <b>Presentation and communication:</b> Slightly inaudible; audio-visual aids not very effective; ran over/under time; paced too fast or too slow; weaknesses in basic understanding indicated in answers to audience questions; little attempt to generate discussion or engage others.
<b>Marginal Fail</b> (30-39)	<b>Focus and creative engagement:</b> Largely failed to address set topic/ brief; rambling, unfocused. <b>Critical understanding:</b> Included little or no analysis. <b>Knowledge and research:</b> Few relevant resources consulted, and little valuation made of them. <b>Presentation and communication:</b> Fully or partially inaudible; equipment used ineffectively; ran severely over/under time; no relationship built with audience; no attempt to generate discussion or engage others; answers to audience questions largely erroneous or irrelevant.
<b>Clear Fail</b> (10-29)	<b>Focus and creative engagement:</b> Failed to address topic/brief; very rambling and unfocused. <b>Critical understanding:</b> Included no analysis. <b>Knowledge and research:</b> No resources consulted. <b>Presentation and communication:</b> Fully or partially inaudible; presentation severely over/under time; pace too fast or too slow; no attempt to generate discussion or engage others.
<b>Clear Fail</b> (0-9)	Completely fails to address the topic. Or did not present.

**Creative Production Paper** work is marked across 5 criteria: 1. Production organisation; 2. Argument and Analysis; 3. Critical context; 4. Critique; 5. Presentation and communication. These criteria should be read in conjunction with the specific instructions and advice on individual assessments cover sheets.

Degree Class	Creative Production Paper coursework marking criteria
<b>Upper 1<sup>st</sup> (85+)</b>	An outstanding evaluation of production organisation, revealing extensive research, planning, key decisions and outcomes (whether positive or negative) and how these were handled. A coherent and incisive argument, demonstrating an insightful analysis of the creative work's conceptual evolution. Outstanding critical contextual awareness of the creative work's relationship to history and theory in the relevant form. Critique offers an in-depth and cogent evaluation of the creative work's form and aesthetic style in terms of quality, creative aims and achievements, audience engagement and narrative/conceptual progression. Presentation and communication are to a professional standard, with fluent communication, grammar, punctuation, spelling and referencing/bibliography.
<b>1<sup>st</sup> (70-84)</b>	An excellent evaluation of production organization, revealing significant research, planning, key decisions and outcomes (whether positive or negative) and how these were handled. A coherent and intelligent argument, showing an excellent analysis of the creative work's conceptual evolution. Excellent critical awareness of the creative work's relationship to history and theory in the relevant form. Critique offers a clear and cogent evaluation of the creative work's form and aesthetic style in terms of quality, creative aims and achievements, audience engagement and narrative /conceptual progression. Presentation and communication are to a very high standard, with few errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling and referencing/bibliography.
<b>2(i) (60-69)</b>	A good evaluation of production organisation, revealing some research, planning and key decisions, but does not always link these to outcomes (whether positive or negative) successfully. A clear and considered argument, with some small weaknesses, showing a good analysis of the creative work's conceptual evolution. Very good critical awareness of the creative work's relationship to history and theory in the relevant form. Critique offers a very good, but at times inconsistent, evaluation of the creative work's form and aesthetic style in terms of quality, creative aims and achievements, audience engagement and narrative /conceptual progression. Presentation and communication are to a high standard, with few errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling and referencing/bibliography.
<b>2(ii) (50-59)</b>	A clear account of production organisation, revealing little research, planning and decisions, but not necessarily how these were handled or the outcomes produced. An attempt at argument, with significant weaknesses, showing some analysis of the creative work's conceptual evolution. Some awareness of the creative work's relationship to history and theory in the relevant form but may be descriptive rather than critical. Critique offers a good, but often partial or inconsistent, evaluation of the creative work's form and aesthetic style. Presentation and communication contains errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, and referencing/bibliography.
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> (40-49)</b>	A satisfactory, but largely descriptive, of production organisation identifies problems but not how decisions affected outcomes. No clear or consistent argument or analysis as to the creative works conceptual evolution. Little awareness of the creative work's relationship to history and theory in the relevant form but may be confused or unclear. Critique is very limited but provides a satisfactory account of the creative work's form and aesthetic style. Presentation and communication are straightforward, but contain significant errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling and referencing/bibliography.
<b>Marginal Fail (30-39)</b>	An entirely descriptive, defensive or limited discussion of production organisation. Little or no argument or analysis. No or incoherent awareness of the creative work's relationship to history and theory in the relevant form. An unsatisfactory critique of the creative work's form and aesthetic style. Presentation is inadequate with major errors.
<b>Clear Fail (10-29)</b>	The work contains all the features described in the 'marginal fail' category, but will either be significantly under length and/or exhibit these deficiencies to a much greater extent.
<b>Clear Fail (0-9)</b>	Work is so short that the candidate is not deemed to have made any attempt at the work.

**Creative Production PORTFOLIO** work is marked across 4 criteria: 1. Quality of the work; 2. Production organisation; 3. Critical context; 4. Presentation and communication. These criteria should be read in conjunction with the specific instructions and advice on individual assessments cover sheets.

Degree Class	Creative Production PORTFOLIO coursework marking criteria
<b>Upper 1<sup>st</sup></b> (85+)	The Production Portfolio should be outstanding in every respect demonstrating a high level of originality, comprehensive understanding and familiarity with both the underlying creative principles and practical application of the production process. It must be an exemplary demonstration of production organisation in how to schedule, budget, script, cast, shoot, post produce and cash flow an actual or example production. Critical context will show a deep awareness and engagement in relevant history and theory in the creative work's form as well as suitability to its market. Where appropriate, industry standard software or formats will have been used to present information. Both in presentation and written style it should be near perfect and capable of being used as a benchmark.
<b>1<sup>st</sup></b> (70-84)	The Production Portfolio should be excellent in most respects. It must demonstrate originality, a full understanding of the creative and practical production process and how it operates in practice. It will need to demonstrate a full knowledge and understanding of production organization in how to schedule, budget, script, cast, shoot, post produce and cash flow an actual or example production. Critical context will show a high awareness and engagement in relevant history and theory in the creative work's form as well as suitability to its market. Where appropriate industry standard software or formats should be used when presenting information. Presentation should be of an industry acceptable standard.
<b>2(i)</b> (60-69)	The work will have many of the features of a First Class Production Portfolio. A clear demonstration that the candidate fully understands the production process with some originality. It will demonstrate a very good knowledge and understanding of production organization in how to schedule, budget, script, cast, shoot, post produce and cash flow. It's critical awareness of relevant history and theory, as well as suitability for market, will compensate for some weaknesses in presentation and use of industry standard software and formats. Alternatively a well-presented portfolio that enables effective production can compensate for some weakness of understanding of the underlying principles of the process. Presentation must be businesslike with no irrelevant, badly presented or ill thought out material.
<b>2(ii)</b> (50-59)	The Production Portfolio will not demonstrate a complete understanding of what is required to successfully produce a piece of audio visual work and display limited originality. It will demonstrate some good knowledge and understanding of production organization in how to schedule, budget, script, cast, shoot, post produce and cash flow. Some aspects of critical context will be well covered, often with some attempt at considering suitability for its market, but vital areas will be either incomplete or absent. Relevant software and formats will not always have been used. Presentation will contain errors and may include some irrelevant or ill thought out material.
<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b> (40-49)	The Production Portfolio demonstrates a weak understanding of the task or the ideas and principles explored in the course. It will demonstrate some knowledge, but often limited understanding, of production organization. There will be little critical context covered, often with only a rudimentary attempt at considering suitability for its market. Work is likely to be poorly presented and incomplete. Industry standard software and formats will not have been used making the submitted material difficult to assess.
<b>Marginal Fail</b> (30-39)	The Production Portfolio will demonstrate no real understanding of the brief or its purpose. There will also be little evidence that the course work has been understood by the candidate.
<b>Clear Fail</b> (10-29)	The work contains all the features described in the 'marginal fail' category, but will either be significantly under length and/or exhibit these deficiencies to a much greater extent.
<b>Clear Fail</b> (0-9)	Work is so short that the candidate is not deemed to have made any attempt at the work.



**Creative Written** work is marked across 6 criteria<sup>2</sup>: 1. Quality of work; 2. Creativity; 3. Professional development; 4. Audience engagement; 5. Critical awareness; 6. Presentation and communication. These criteria should be read in conjunction with the specific instructions and advice on individual assessments cover sheets.

Degree Class	Written Creative Coursework marking criteria
<b>Upper 1<sup>st</sup> (85+)</b>	Outstanding work exhibiting a writer's voice of striking originality in both form and content. Deploys formal elements such as rhythm, tone, structure, viewpoint, characterization, and dialogue, with considerable mastery, control and complexity. Contains original insights, or presents familiar insights in an arresting, fresh manner. Extremely well structured with a mature understanding of the medium. Engages its audience at a complex, demanding and sophisticated level. Evidences a very high awareness of and engagement with relevant history and theory. Ready to submit for professional consideration.
<b>1<sup>st</sup> (70-84)</b>	Excellent work. Meets all the criteria for the lower grades, but exhibits substantial levels of flair and originality. Shows a sophisticated understanding of creative writing for an audio-visual medium with good craft skills and accomplishment of dramatic purpose. Formal experimentation, if present, shows clear understanding of formal conventions and achieves its narrative purpose. Excellently structured narrative with high quality dialogue. Both form and content demonstrate a substantial engagement with reader and potential audience. Evidences a high awareness of, and engagement with, relevant history and theory. Largely meets professional standards in its given medium.
<b>2(i) (60-69)</b>	Very good work. Meets all the criteria for the lower grades, but exhibits a greater level of control and consistency. Content is of greater substance and complexity, demonstrating a noticeable level of originality and insight. Shows evidence of character development, and narrative structure. The writer's voice is clearly discernible, and there may be experiments in form and content but these may not be wholly successful. Evidences a good awareness of, and engagement with, relevant history and theory. Requires further development to meet professional standards in its given medium.
<b>2(ii) (50-59)</b>	Generally good work. Where appropriate, accepted conventions of format and layout are correctly followed. Has a clearly discernible story and/or theme, which is articulated with some fluency and consistency. The conventions of the genre/medium are understood and deployed competently with some familiarity of the genre. However, the work is likely to contain hesitancy, uncertainty or inconsistency in deployment. Characters have some sense of development but may not be fully rounded. May not be particularly original, perhaps tending towards the routine or derivative. Evidences some awareness of, and engagement with, relevant history and theory. Work would need substantial further development to meet professional standards in its given medium.
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> (40-49)</b>	Competent but often weak, partial or unbalanced understanding of the forms of the genre/medium with faults or inconsistencies in deploying them. There is some evidence of understanding of writing for the medium, but story and/or theme and character may be poorly developed, muddled or incoherent. Dialogue may be poor and the screenplay or script fails to achieve its purpose. Unsatisfactory command of the language expressing ideas with clumsiness or lack of clarity, and evidencing poor grasp of the rules of grammar, spelling and punctuation. Work shows a rudimentary awareness of, and engagement with, relevant history and theory. The work is largely unsuitable for further development to meet professional standards in its given medium.
<b>Marginal Fail (30-39)</b>	Work may be short in length, or work which displays the faults of the preceding categories in still graver form. The work does not engage the audience effectively and is largely derivative. Conceptual/narrative progression is almost entirely absent with very significant flaws in presentation, narrative structure and/or dialogue. Does not show awareness of, and engagement with, relevant history and theory. The work is unfit for consideration for professional Development.
<b>Clear Fail (10-29)</b>	The work contains all the features described in the 'marginal fail' category, but will either be significantly under length and/or exhibit these deficiencies to a much greater extent.
<b>Clear Fail (0-9)</b>	Answer is so short that the candidate is not deemed to have made any attempt at the paper.

<sup>2</sup> Additional notes: 1. Marks may be deducted for failure to deliver AV work in the required format, as detailed [here](#).

**Documentary Production Papers** are marked across 6 criteria<sup>3</sup>: 1. Critique; 2. Analysis; 3. Argument; 4. Critical Context; 5. Research and planning; 6. Quality of written English and presentation. These criteria should be read in conjunction with the specific instructions and advice on individual assessments cover sheets.

Degree Class	Documentary Production Papers marking criteria
<b>Upper 1<sup>st</sup> (85+)</b>	An outstanding evaluation and considered critique of the film from idea to screen. The candidate will engage fully with the strengths and weakness of their Production Process. Candidates will also demonstrate an impressive degree of insight into their own development as it has related to key theoretical and historical issues in Documentary. An outstanding and insightful analysis of the conceptual evolution of the film, aesthetic styles and forms with an evaluation of how these enhanced the defining ideas of the film. Candidates will demonstrate a complex and challenging understanding of the form and content within their practice. Their arguments will be intelligent, focused and cohesive. The candidate will demonstrate a sophisticated understanding and awareness of issues of methodology and evidence. An outstanding and challenging reflection of the work within a historical and critical context - making reference to documentary film and other relevant practices. Outstanding evidence of research – particularly within the context of documentary film. The candidate will demonstrate excellent written English. They will have written to length, and used the correct form of referencing and citation.
<b>1<sup>st</sup> (70-84)</b>	An excellent evaluation and considered critique of the film from idea to screen. The candidate will engage fully with the strengths and weakness of their Production Process. Candidates will also demonstrate an impressive degree of insight into their own development as it has related to key theoretical and historical issues in Documentary. An excellent and insightful analysis of the conceptual evolution of the film, aesthetic styles and forms with an evaluation of how these enhanced the defining ideas of the film. Candidates will demonstrate a complex and challenging understanding of the form and content within their practice. Their arguments will be intelligent, focused and cohesive. The candidate will demonstrate a sophisticated understanding and awareness of issues of methodology and evidence. An excellent and challenging reflection of the work within a historical and critical context - making reference to documentary film and other relevant practices. Excellent evidence of research – particularly within the context of documentary film. The candidate will demonstrate excellent written English. They will have written to length, and used the correct form of referencing and appropriate.
<b>2(i) (60-69)</b>	A strong evaluation and considered critique of the film from idea to screen. The candidate will engage well with the strengths and weakness of their Production Process. Candidates will also demonstrate a substantial degree of insight into their own practice in relation to key theoretical and historical issues in Documentary. An articulate and intelligent analysis of the conceptual evolution of the film. Also a substantial analysis of aesthetic styles and forms with an evaluation of how these enhanced the defining ideas of the film. Candidates will demonstrate a complex and challenging understanding of the form and content within their practice. Their arguments will be focused and cohesive. The candidate will demonstrate a substantial understanding and awareness of issues of methodology and evidence. Critical Context A coherent reflection of the work within a historical and critical context - making reference to documentary film and other relevant practices. Substantial evidence of research – particularly within the context of documentary film. Quality of written English language and Presentation The candidate will demonstrate good written English. They will have written to length, and used the correct form of referencing and citation.
<b>2(ii) (50-59)</b>	A satisfactory evaluation of the film from idea to screen. There may be some evidence of knowledge and engagement with key Documentary issues within the work. However, there may be a more limited understanding and insight and/or an inability to provide cohesive arguments or evidence. Analysis The candidate may provide some overview of the conceptual evolution of the film. However there may be a lack of engagement with both the style and content of the film. Candidates will have shown little understanding of form and content within their practice. They may have shown inconsistent engagement or understanding of issues of methodology and evidence. The candidate has made some observations on the strengths and weakness of their Production Process, though they may need to further develop a sense of their own practice in relation to key theoretical and historical issues in Documentary. Candidates may have provided a satisfactory historical and critical context, though it is likely this may be flawed or in need or further development. Work may also be under researched and planned. The candidate may have shown satisfactory written English, though the writing may not be to length and the referencing and citation may not be accurate.
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> (40-49)</b>	A weak evaluation of the film from idea to screen. The candidate shows very little evidence of knowledge and engagement with key Documentary issues within the work. The candidate has provided a weak critique concerning the strengths and weakness of their Production Process. The candidate demonstrates a lack of

<sup>3</sup> Additional notes: 1. Marks may be deducted for failure to deliver AV work in the required format, as detailed [here](#).



	engagement with both the style and content of the film. Candidates have shown a weak understanding of form and content within their practice. They may have shown little or inconsistent engagement or understanding of issues of methodology and evidence. There is a weak location of the candidate's practice in relation to key theoretical and historical issues in Documentary. The work may also be poorly researched and planned. The candidate may have shown weak written English. The writing may not be to length and the referencing and citation may not be accurate.
<b>Marginal Fail (30-39)</b>	An unsatisfactory evaluation of the film from idea to screen with little coherent knowledge of key documentary issues. There is poor or non-existent critique of strengths and weaknesses of their production process. The candidate demonstrates a lack of engagement with both the style and content of the film. Candidates have shown a poor or non-existent understanding of form and content within their practice. They may have shown little or inconsistent engagement or understanding of issues of methodology and evidence. There is a poor or non-existent location of the candidate's practice in relation to key theoretical and historical issues in Documentary. The work may also be poorly researched and planned. The candidate may have shown poor written English. The writing may not be to length and the referencing and citation may not be accurate.
<b>Clear Fail (10-29)</b>	The work contains all the features described in the 'marginal fail' category, but will either be significantly under length and/or exhibit these deficiencies to a much greater extent.
<b>Clear Fail (0-9)</b>	Work is so short that the candidate is not deemed to have made any attempt at the work.