|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **(A) Distinction (70-85)** | **(B) Merit**  **(60-69)** | **(C) Pass**  **(50-58)** | **(D) Fail**  **(40-49)** |  |
| **Projection and communication** | **Distinction** (80-100) – See Handbook for guidance | The programme is **innovative** and its execution **memorable**, and moves the audience both intellectually and emotionally. Technical command is entirely assimilated into creative interpretation, and the performer's **individual voice** is clearly evident. | The programme projects a **wide range of musical and technical abilities** and sustains audience interest throughout even though there may be slight unevenness in the quality of the entire performance. The performer appears generally  **assured**.  . | The programme projects **a range** of musical and technical abilities, and sustains audience interest. The performer communicates interpretations **consistently**. | The programme demonstrates a **reasonable** range of technical and musical abilities and some sense of occasion is created. But the performance is efficient more than creative. **Plausible** platform manner, with only intermittent communicative ability. Programming is itself often weak and/or unachieved. | **Low Fail** (1-39) – See Handbook for guidance |
| **Technical control (intonation where relevant)** | **High** **level** of technical control and fluidity in all aspects of the recital. | Technical abilities are mostly **controlled** and fluid, although there may be a few lapses. | **Adequate** technical control is shown, with a reasonable sense of the instrument’s or voice’s capabilities. Technical weaknesses may be outweighed by musical qualities, but overall the performance will be strong | **Basic** technical control is shown, yet there are several important lapses. |
| **Articulation** | **Highly** **varied**, where appropriate, facility for articulation, strongly connected to interpretative and stylistic aims. | Considerableeffort and achievement in projecting a variety of articulation, which generally **convinces** in interpretative and stylistic terms. | Articulation fulfils musical and programming requirements **partially**. | Some variety of articulation is shown, yet with only **intermittent** performative relevance and success. |
| **Tone quality, expressive range** | Tone quality and expressive range are **excellent**, with a developed understanding of tone production and variation: well chosen and matched throughout. | Generally pleasing and/or varied (as appropriate) tone quality, with **considerable** expressive range according to repertoire. | **Varied** tone quality and expressive range, with some attempts made to match this to the needs of the repertoire and occasion. | **Restricted** palette on offer here, with only partial relation to specific requirements of repertoire. |
| **Stylistic and structural awareness** | **Strong,** enabling a convincing interpretation of chosen, varied repertory. | A **good** level of stylistic and structural awareness, if not entirely consistent within and/or between pieces. | Some **attempts** display such awareness, inconsistently achieved. | **Occasional** indications of such awareness, which rarely connect interpretatively. |