

| L3 Diploma in Music Performance & Production | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| Unit 8 Collaborative Performance Project - Assessment and Grading Record Sheet | | | | | | | | |
| The learner can provide evidence of: | | | | R | P | M | D | |
| Context | Comment | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 Analyse the requirements and parameters of a collaborative music performance project | Good understanding and knowledge of subject context used to make sound judgments, articulate ambitions and clarify purpose. | | | | | | X | |
| Research | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Review a range of research sources to support the production of a performance project | Thorough and sustained research and investigation of relevant sources, interpretation and synthesis of information used to inform, support and develop ideas. | | | | | | X | |
| 2.2 Interpret research to develop ideas and effectively communicate to an audience | | | | | | | X | |
| Practical skills | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Demonstrate the ability to contribute to the planning, organisation and development of a collaborative performance | Consistent and appropriate processes, skills and knowledge applied to extend enquiry and develop creative solutions. | | | | | | X | |
| 3.2 Apply practical skills, knowledge and understanding to complete a collaborative performance project within an agreed timeframe | | | | | | | X | |
| Evaluation and reflection | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 Critically evaluate a collaborative performance project against the agreed requirements and parameters | Effective communication of analysis and interpretation, independent synthesis of information and application of reasoned decision making to inform development of ideas. | | | | | | X | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| Candidate ID: Lukass Zalaikalns | | Grade | |
| Pathway: MPP | | MERIT | |
| Centre: Bradford College | Assessor: Lewis Blofeld Second Marker: Nicolas Sykes | Dates Initial Marking: 05/06/24 Second Marking: 11/06/24 | |

Commentary as appropriate:

Well done, Lukass, you have completed this project to a Merit standard. The work submitted meets all the assessment criteria and is of a Merit standard.

Context – It is clear you understand the context the genres you are working in and the technical requirements of the recording process, it would be good to explore the requirements of the professional and the expectations, especially in recording and mixing. Understanding the quality requirements and how they are obtained will help you work towards them more effectively.

Research – You have provided a range of research into the different elements of your project this is good and demonstrates your ability to explore other ideas other than your own. You have provided some good research, but more depth and detail would be useful to move towards the higher grades.

Practical Skills – The “Kids in America” recording is good overall but lacks finer balance and effect processing. The drums sound heavily compressed and lack attack. The main vocals and guitar is a little low in the mix, the drums bass and backing vocals often dominate the mix. The overall recording sound is not too bad but there are some major mistakes with guitars dropping out of time. The main vocals also sound a little thin and lacking depth. “My Girlfriend is Beautiful” is a good riff but there is not much more than that here, drums, bass and most importantly vocals would have helped to frame this as a song rather than just guitar chords. You could have collaborated with a vocalist to write the lyrics and sing if this is something you are not confident with. Groove Galaxy is similar albeit with bass, again this feels unfinished and more like a demo than a finished recording. Your final performances are very good and if you spent a lot of time preparing for this. If you had focused on this as your project you would have been able to achieve a higher grade.

Evaluation and Reflection – You have provided evaluations for each of your end products, this works well but could be more detailed in terms of the success and weaknesses rather than what you did. There is a lot of description of what you did rather than an evaluation of it. It is not clear why you did not evaluate throughout the project, this would have provided more opportunities to document your process and reflect on the successes and weaknesses.

Summary – You have completed a project to a good standard, your research is good with a range of sources, this could be more extensive and analysed with more depth but explain your knowledge of context and research of the area of study well. You should work more on practicing recording and mixing techniques and using collaboration to create finished full tracks rather than guitar chords. Even providing a lead line would have helped. The evaluation as audio recordings is good for a final evaluation but you need to work on reducing the amount of descriptive process (what you did) and focus more on evaluation (why you did it, strength, weaknesses), this would enable you to achieve a higher grade.

Second Marker Comments:

Lukass has completed his project to a Merit standard, demonstrating a solid understanding of the genres and technical requirements. While his research was good, more depth and detail would enhance the overall quality. Practical skills in recording were shown, but there were issues with balance and effect processing, and the work often felt unfinished. His evaluations were descriptive but lacked detailed analysis of strengths and weaknesses, and more ongoing reflection throughout the project would have been beneficial. To achieve higher grades, Lukass should focus on deeper research, refining recording techniques, and providing more evaluative content in his reflections. Lukass spent a large amount of time on performances that were not the focus of his project and this hindered the practical grade, although the final performances were very enjoyable.

Exemplification for UAL Awarding Body Grade Criteria – Level 3

This guide is to be used in conjunction with the assessment and grading criteria for UAL Awarding Body qualifications at Level 3.

| | Fail Work submitted fails to meet one or more of the assessment criteria and is of a poor standard | Pass Work submitted meets all of the assessment criteria and is of a satisfactory standard | Merit Work submitted meets all assessment criteria and is of a high standard | Distinction Work submitted meets all assessment criteria and is of a very high standard |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Context | Limited understanding of subject context, lacking clarity in aims and purpose. | Understanding of subject context used appropriately to make judgments, describe aims and clarify purpose. | Good understanding and knowledge of subject context used to make sound judgments, articulate ambitions and clarify purpose. | Comprehensive understanding and knowledge of subject context used to communicate complex concepts, articulate ambitions and clarify purpose. |
| Research | Little or no evidence presented or information does not relate sufficiently to task. | Sufficient relevant information has been gathered, documented and used in the development of ideas. | Thorough and sustained research and investigation of relevant sources, interpretation and synthesis of information used to inform, support and develop ideas. | Independently identified, thorough and sustained research and investigation of a range of relevant sources, insightful interpretation and synthesis of information used to inform, support and develop ideas. |
| Practical skills | Limited range of processes demonstrated, judgement and execution of techniques is poor. | Adequate range of processes, skills and knowledge demonstrated. Competent execution and application of techniques used to develop ideas. | Consistent and appropriate processes, skills and knowledge applied to extend enquiry and develop creative solutions. | In depth understanding and aesthetic awareness, imaginative and flexible processes, skills and knowledge applied in extensive enquiry to develop creative solutions. |
| Evaluation and reflection | Insufficient evidence of ongoing evaluation, lack of or only basic analysis and little or no justification for ideas. | Clearly communicated evidence of valid evaluation and realistic analysis independently used to inform and develop ideas. | Effective communication of analysis and interpretation, independent synthesis of information and application of reasoned decision making to inform development of ideas. | Accomplished and professional communication of perceptive analysis and interpretation, demonstrating clarity and sophistication in thinking and maturity in decision making to progress ideas. |