



A-LEVEL

Music

MUS5B

Mark scheme

2270

June 2016

Version 1.0: Final Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk.

Assessment Criteria for Unit 5 (max 60 marks)

Briefs B and C

The marks for the composition/arrangement for Unit 5 will be awarded to show achievement in a more complex task than is required by the same mark band of Unit 2 assessment criteria:

60–51 marks:

- The piece will be stimulating, inventive and imaginative.
- The candidate will demonstrate a firm grasp of, and secure handling of, structure, development, tonality, use of melody, harmony and rhythm, texture, timbre, and a clear understanding of the chosen style.
- The writing for the chosen instrument(s)/voice(s)/electronic sound source(s) will be highly idiomatic.
- The expressive features of the music will be immediately apparent to the listener.
- The score/chart/annotation will be accurate and detailed, accurately reflecting the music in the recording in relation to pitch, rhythm, form and structure, timbre, texture and performance detail.
- The review provides a detailed and accurate evaluation of the process with an extensive use of technical language.

50–41 marks:

- The piece will be musically interesting and satisfying.
- The candidate will demonstrate an understanding of structure, development, tonality, use of melody, harmony and rhythm, texture and timbre, within the context of the style of the music.
- The writing for instrument(s)/voice(s)/electronic sound source(s) will be appropriate in relation to the expressive qualities of the music.
- The score/chart/annotation will be largely accurate and detailed, bearing a close resemblance to the music in the recording in relation to pitch, rhythm, form and structure, timbre, texture and performance detail.
- The review provides an evaluation of the process which is mostly detailed and accurate with a good use of technical language.

40–31 marks:

- The piece will be effective.
- The candidate will demonstrate an understanding of some aspects of structure, development, tonality, use of melody, harmony and rhythm, texture and timbre, in relation to the selected task.
- The writing for instrument(s)/voice(s)/electronic sound source(s) will be mostly competent and there will be an attempt to convey some of the expressive features of the music.
- The score/chart/annotation will contain some detail relating to the music in the recording in relation to pitch, rhythm, form and structure, timbre, texture and performance detail.
- The review provides an evaluation of the process with some detail and accuracy, with a sound use of technical language.

30–21 marks:

- The piece will be partially effective and complete but will demonstrate limited understanding in relation to structure, development, tonality, use of melody, harmony and rhythm, texture and timbre.
- The writing for instrument(s)/voice(s)/electronic sound source(s) will be partially successful and the expressive qualities of the music will be unconvincing and tend to be contrived.
- The score/chart/annotation will contain limited detail relating to the music in the recording in relation to pitch, rhythm, form and structure, timbre, texture and performance detail.
- The review provides an evaluation of the process which lacks detail and is not always accurate with some use of technical language.

20–11 marks:

- The piece will lack effectiveness and will demonstrate a basic understanding of structure, development, tonality, use of melody, harmony and rhythm, texture and timbre leading to sections of incoherence.
- There will be some areas that are incomplete and the writing for instrument(s)/voice(s)/electronic sound source(s) will demonstrate a lack of understanding in relation to the expressive qualities of the music.
- The score/chart/annotation will contain inaccuracies and/or inconsistencies relating to the music in the recording in relation to pitch, rhythm, form and structure, timbre, texture and performance detail.
- The review provides a limited evaluation of the process which is mainly descriptive, with some use of technical language.

10–1 marks:

- The piece will demonstrate a very limited and rudimentary understanding of the compositional techniques.
- There will be significant areas that are incomplete and much of the piece will lack coherence.
- The writing for instrument(s)/voice(s)/electronic sound source(s) will demonstrate significant weaknesses that will inhibit the expressive qualities of the music.
- The score/chart/annotation will be largely inaccurate and will contain only rudimentary detail relating to the music in the recording in relation to pitch, rhythm, form and structure, timbre, texture and performance detail.
- The review is a description of the process with a limited use of technical language.