



Course Report 2009

Subject	Music
Levels	Standard Grade Intermediate 1 Intermediate 2 Higher Advanced Higher

Contents

Introduction	1
Summary of Findings	2
Entries and Awards	3
Comments on Verification: Units which make up Courses	8
Course Assessment: Standard Grade	10
Course Assessment: Intermediate 1 & Intermediate 2	12
Course Assessment: Higher	14
Course Assessment: Advanced Higher	16

Introduction

The purpose of this Course report is to give centres:

- ◆ all information on internal and external assessment for the subject in the one place
- ◆ an easier way of making a comparison across levels and years
- ◆ support in achieving consistency in national standards across levels for both internal and external assessment

We will provide a link on the SQA website from the contents page of the Course report to individual sections of the report to allow for easier navigation, in addition to having access to the complete report.

We encourage you to provide feedback about the usefulness of the Course report. Please contact Mary McDonald Qualifications Manager for NQ Music, with your comments – mary.mcdonald@sqa.org.uk

Summary of Findings

General

2009 is the third year of the new Arrangements for National Qualifications Music and there is a notable improvement in candidate performance in the external Question Paper this year.

SQA's Visiting Examiners for Music reported that the practical performing components of the external examination continue to be areas of strength for many candidates both at NQ and Standard Grade levels. Generally, centres were very well organised for the Visiting Examining event and this high degree of preparation and planning ensures that candidates are able to perform to their true potential in this live examination situation. See individual External Assessment Reports for advice on future preparation of candidates; this advice does point up some issues and how these can be dealt with in preparation for the Visiting Examination.

Centres are commended for their on-going commitment to working with SQA on the Approval of Repertoire programme which operates from May – October each year. This system was set up to safeguard and support candidates, teachers and instrumental staff, centres and SQA's Visiting Examiners. Centres send music to SQA to have the level of the pieces/songs verified for Music examination performance programmes and this process has resulted in centres being confident that the levels of pieces presented are correct and appropriate. Consequently, Visiting Examiners no longer have to refer to the Principal Assessor when issues arise. This system has advantaged all involved and many centres now have comprehensive lists of pieces approved for their centre.

In 2009 there was an overall increase in candidate entries for the Music with Technology Course (X233) model. The overall performance of candidates entered for this has continued to improve since 2007 in both the externally marked Music Technology folio and the Question Paper, which is very encouraging. The External Assessment Reports at each NQ level provide very useful advice to centres about good practice and the actual submission of the Performing with Technology folios.

External Verification continues for the Group Performing and Inventing elements of Standard Grade and a sample of NQ Units. In 2009 there was a high level of both visiting and central verification of the Unit *Music: Composing* (DV45) and the Advanced Higher Unit *Music: Listening* (DV41 13) – the Listening Commentary. It is planned that this level of verification and support for internal assessment will continue in 2010.

Entries and Awards

Entries and Awards — Standard Grade Music

Year	Entries
2009	8,878
2008	10,265
2007	10,601

Grade boundaries for each externally assessed element

Grade Boundaries 2009

Assessable Element	Credit Max Mark	Grade Boundaries		General Max Mark	Grade Boundaries		Foundation Max Mark	Grade Boundaries	
		1	2		3	4		5	6
Listening	60	44	33	50	32	26	45	28	21

Grade Boundaries 2008

Assessable Element	Credit Max Mark	Grade Boundaries		General Max Mark	Grade Boundaries		Foundation Max Mark	Grade Boundaries	
		1	2		3	4		5	6
Listening	60	45	34	50	32	26	45	28	21

Grade Boundaries 2007

Assessable Element	Credit Max Mark	Grade Boundaries		General Max Mark	Grade Boundaries		Foundation Max Mark	Grade Boundaries	
		1	2		3	4		5	6
Listening	60	45	34	50	32	26	45	28	21

Distribution of awards

	Entries	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	No Award
2009	8,878	36.4%	34.0%	16.4%	7.4%	2.9%	0.6%	0.0%	2.3%
2008	10,265	35.0%	32.8%	17.6%	8.4%	3.4%	0.8%	0.0%	1.9%
2007	10,601	33.8%	33.1%	18.3%	8.2%	3.5%	0.6%	0.0%	2.4%

Entries and Awards — Intermediate 1 Music

Year	Entries
2009	795
2008	887
2007	798

Grade Boundaries

Year	Max Mark	A	B	C	D
2009	100	70	60	50	45
2008	100	70	60	50	45
2007	100	70	60	50	45

Distribution of awards

	Entries	A	B	C	Pass	D	No Award
2009	795	17.2%	27.3%	28.4%	73.0%	7.8%	19.2%
2008	887	22.9%	27.4%	23.4%	73.7%	7.1%	19.2%
2007	798	12.8%	23.4%	26.9%	63.2%	10.7%	26.2%

Entries and Awards — Intermediate 2 Music

Year	Entries
2009	3,554
2008	3,374
2007	3,095

Grade Boundaries

Year	Max Mark	A	B	C	D
2009	100	70	60	50	45
2008	100	70	60	50	45
2007	100	70	60	50	45

Distribution of awards

	Entries	A	B	C	Pass	D	No Award
2009	3,554	54.5%	26.3%	11.5%	92.4%	2.6%	5.0%
2008	3,374	44.0%	27.3%	17.5%	88.7%	4.1%	7.2%
2007	3,095	30.4%	29.6%	21.8%	81.8%	5.9%	12.3%

Entries and Awards — Higher Music

Year	Entries
2009	4,513
2008	4,451
2007	4,278

Grade Boundaries

Year	Max Mark	A	B	C	D
2009	100	70	60	50	45
2008	100	70	60	50	45
2007	100	68	58	48	43

Distribution of awards

	Entries	A	B	C	Pass	D	No Award
2009	4,513	35.9%	33.8%	19.7%	89.4%	3.9%	6.6%
2008	4,451	37.1%	32.3%	19.6%	89.0%	3.6%	7.4%
2007	4,278	28.4%	32.0%	23.4%	83.7%	5.3%	11.0%

Entries and Awards — Advanced Higher Music

Year	Entries
2009	1,118
2008	1,055
2007	1,235

Grade Boundaries

Year	Max Mark	A	B	C	D
2009	100	70	60	50	45
2008	100	70	60	50	45
2007	100	68	58	48	43

Distribution of awards

	Entries	A	B	C	Pass	D	No Award
2009	1,118	63.3%	25.5%	7.6%	96.4%	0.6%	3.0%
2008	1,055	44.4%	31.8%	16.2%	92.4%	2.9%	4.6%
2007	1,235	42.8%	30.6%	16.9%	90.3%	3.6%	6.2%

Comments on Verification: Units which make up Courses

Titles/Levels of National Units Verified

Music: Composing	DV45 10	Intermediate 1
	DV45 11	Intermediate 2
	DV45 12	Higher
	DV45 13	Advanced Higher
Music: Listening	DV41 13	Advanced Higher

Feedback to Centres

General comments

A number of centres were again unable to meet the submission date of March 2009. After consultation with SQA, these centres were granted an extension where there were exceptional circumstances.

In 2009, 57 centres were subject to verification at the central verification event where the greater majority of centres verified were in line with national standards. Of the centres not accepted, all were accepted following resubmission.

This was the second year of verification of the Unit DV41 13 Music: Listening (Advanced Higher), the evidence requirement for which is the Advanced Higher Listening Commentary. A sample of 17 centres was selected for the verification of this Unit.

Music: Composing Unit DV45

There was a wide range of composing folios across all levels.

Folios were generally well organised with centres providing evidence that staff were comfortable with their role as internal assessors.

A wide range of musical styles and concepts were encountered, particularly in contemporary and popular genres.

Instruments of assessment, such as detailed programme notes and/or audio materials, were not always available from some centres; this led to the return of the folio sample to the centre without verification taking place. These centres were then required to re-submit complete candidate folios for verification.

The quality of the detailed programme notes and audio materials was not always acceptable for all candidates.

The Assessor's Pro Forma and Assessor's Process Observation Checklist did not always provide sufficient information to assist the verification process.

Misunderstanding and inappropriate application of composing levels was in evidence; this resulted in some candidates having been presented at the incorrect level.

Candidates should show convincing control of all five areas of melody, harmony, rhythm, structure and timbre in at least one composition.

There is still a tendency on the part of some centres to continue to be over-generous in assessment decisions when awarding a Pass in candidates' composing folio work.

Music: Listening (Advanced Higher) Unit DV41 13

Of the 17 centres verified, candidates' work from five centres initially did not meet the requirements for this Unit.

To help centres apply national standards in assessment there is exemplification of Listening Commentaries with marked up proforma which is published on SQA secure website (SQA Co-ordinators have access to this). Centres are advised to study carefully this range of examples.

It is essential that the candidate analyses at least two movements/works. Commentaries that merely refer to band line-ups, history of musical instruments etc, should be avoided.

Each concept must be illustrated with a musical quotation which should be embedded in the text and accompanied by an audio example. Complete scores and entire recordings of performances are not acceptable.

Advice on good practice and areas for further development:

Generally, centres are to be commended for the time and care which was taken in the submission of folios. The verification process is both aided and informed by the following:

- ◆ Programme notes which are informative and clarify the stimulus, composition and decision-making process, concepts deployed and actual contribution of the candidate.
- ◆ Assessor's supplementary comments in the Assessor's Pro Forma which bring focus and insight to the centre's rationale for assessment decisions.
- ◆ Scores or performance plans which are complete and accurate.
- ◆ Audio tapes or CDs (not mini disc) which are clearly recorded and labelled.
- ◆ Computer-generated scores, which are quantised and reflect the timbres chosen.
- ◆ Completed Assessor's Pro Forma and Assessor's Process Observation Checklist with comments which inform the Verifier.
- ◆ Folio time requirements which are correct for each level.
- ◆ Candidate compositions which show convincing control of all five areas of melody, harmony, rhythm, structure and timbre in at least one composition within the folio.
- ◆ Centres which make full use of exemplification materials provided by SQA in order to assist and inform themselves of the content and standard required for each of the levels of Intermediate 1 and 2, Higher and Advanced Higher.
- ◆ Listening Commentaries which follow the methodology found in the exemplification examples on the SQA secure website.

Course Assessment: Standard Grade

In Standard Grade Music, the Course assessment consists of four elements: Solo Performing, Listening, Group Performing and Inventing.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

The overall performance of candidates in the 2009 Standard Grade Music examination was consistent with the previous year.

Candidates continue to perform particularly well in the Performing elements of Standard Grade Music and there is clear evidence that centres continue to prepare their candidates well for the Visiting Examination of Solo Performing.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Candidates performed well in both Solo Performing and Group Performing/2nd Solo Instrument.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Solo Performing Examination

Centres are again reminded that four minutes is the minimum time requirement for Solo Performing programmes at all levels. Programmes which do not meet the minimum duration of four minutes incur a penalty, disadvantaging candidates.

Centres are reminded of the following change for drumkit which was implemented for the first time for the 2008 examination and continues for subsequent years:

In the past if all drumkit styles couldn't be accommodated in the 4-6 minute programme it was possible for the centre to profess that a candidate had covered the remaining style. From the 2008 examination and for following years, the Visiting Examiner requires to hear **all** professed styles, eg four contrasting styles at Credit level. Judicious cuts or fades can be made in the music to allow this.

For full information about this and other important reminders about Standard Grade Music requirements, please refer to the Standard Grade Music Update Letter issued to centres in August 2007. Please see www.sqa.org.uk NQ (National Qualifications) Music Update Letters.

Group Performing/2nd Solo Instrument and Inventing

These elements are internally assessed and subject to Visiting Verification by SQA. Visiting Verification continues in Standard Grade Music and these visits to centres take place in April/May each year. In 2009, in the centres which were selected for Visiting Verification, assessment decisions and standards which had been applied internally were found to be in line with national standards.

Feedback from these centres indicated that they welcomed the endorsement of the assessment standards they were applying and found the visits useful, supportive and informative.

When assessing Group Performing/2nd Solo Instrument and Inventing, centres must refer to and apply the GRC (Grade Related Criteria) which are found in the Standard Grade Music Arrangements Document.

Keyboards in Group Performing/2nd Solo Instrument

Candidates playing keyboards as 2nd Solo Instrument are required to play with two hands, performing both the melody line and chords (as in Solo Performing).

Candidates playing keyboards in Group Performing may play one hand melody only. However, please be aware that this may impact on the task level of a piece.

Listening

Centres should refer to the detailed Marking Instructions for Music Listening Papers which SQA publishes in the autumn of each year. These Marking Instructions are found on www.sqa.org.uk NQ Music Marking Instructions

Standard Grade Music Credit Listening Paper

In the extended writing question (Question 4 in 2009) candidates are asked to listen to a piece of descriptive music and to comment on how the composer uses musical means (concepts) in order to suggest the various images / effects stated. In their answers **candidates must link each chosen concept to one of these effects** in order to gain any marks.

In Question 6 candidates must comment on instruments / voices **and how they are used** in both versions of the music in order to gain the full range of marks available.

Appeals

When compiling and submitting Appeals evidence to SQA, centres should ensure that there is a breadth of coverage of Course content and that there is evidence that all types of questions have been sampled in a prelim-type Listening question paper.

Course Assessment: Intermediate 1 & Intermediate 2

In Intermediate 1 Music, the Course assessment consists of a Question Paper and for *Music with Performing* a Performing component and for *Music with Technology* a Folio component.

In Intermediate 2 Music, the Course assessment consists of a Question Paper and for *Music with Performing* a Performing component and for *Music with Technology* a Folio component.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

The majority of candidates at Intermediate 1 and 2 levels continue to be presented for the Music with Performing Course model – the combination of the external Question Paper and the external examination of Performing on two instruments / voice.

The Performing component broadly remained a secure area for candidates at Intermediate 2 level. However, at Intermediate 1 level there were concerns regarding candidates receiving very low marks in some cases.

Responses to the Question Paper at Intermediate 1 level were similar to last year, with certain questions again proving a challenge and serving to differentiate candidates.

Performance in the Question Paper at Intermediate 2 level was better than last year with an increase of approximately three marks on average. This improvement was also borne out in the Music with Technology candidates' responses.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Candidates at both Intermediate 1 and 2 levels demonstrated greater confidence in the Question Papers. There is an increasing number of past papers which centres can access and, given the consistent nature of these papers, it would be expected that performance would steadily improve. (See Specimen Question Paper, 2007, 2008 and 2009 Question Papers and the associated Marking Instructions which are available on the SQA website). This was particularly noticeable at Intermediate 2 level this year. This was reflected in the number of candidates gaining A or upper A at Intermediate 2. Please see page 4 of this report for statistical information.

Practical Performance on two instruments / voice remains a very secure area for the vast majority of centres across the country.

The sampling model used in the Performing component of the external exam now appears to be well established, with centres now fully prepared for the sampling procedure carried out by Visiting Examiners.

Areas which candidates found demanding

In the Question Papers, candidates at both Intermediate 1 and 2 levels found questions 5 and 6 demanding. These are the 'open-ended' questions where candidates have to use and apply their conceptual knowledge.

The final question at both levels was not particularly well done. These questions test standard notation and were more demanding for candidates who did not learn or perform using this medium.

At Intermediate 1 level a number of candidates were unable to perform to any acceptable standard on a second instrument. It is a cause of concern that a number of candidates at this level were gaining very low marks for their second instrument which had a detrimental effect on their final award.

There are a few centres in which there is, apparently, confusion regarding the requirements for presentation on drumkit and chordal guitar. Some candidates were not prepared in line with the requirements. Centres should refer to the detailed guidance available in the *National Qualifications Music: Performing* document (published November 2005).

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

- ◆ At Intermediate 1 level, as described above, a number of candidates could not perform even satisfactorily on a second instrument / voice. Whilst the Associated Board comparative level for Intermediate 1 is Grade 2, the method of assessment for all National Qualifications Music levels is the same ie, Advanced Higher candidates are assessed using the same criteria as those presented for Intermediate levels. It is the level of the performing material which differentiates candidates, not the quality of the performance. Centres must consider whether Intermediate 1 is the appropriate level of presentation for their candidates.
- ◆ Virtually all the referrals from Visiting Examiners highlighted programmes which were short of prepared time ie, candidates had not fulfilled the minimum four minute requirement for both instruments. The sampling approach adopted by Visiting Examiners will, by definition, ensure that candidates perform for less than four minutes but centres must ensure that candidates have prepared the required time.
- ◆ The regulations for drumkit and chordal guitar have not changed since the inception of the Intermediate Music levels of examination. Centres must prepare candidates accordingly.
- ◆ It would be advisable for some centres to give candidates more practice in standard notation. The last question in both Question Papers resulted in some candidates gaining few marks or no marks at all. The number of marks available for these questions is too high to be ignored.

Course Assessment: Higher

In Higher Music, the Course assessment consists of a Question Paper and for *Music with Performing* a Performing component and for *Music with Technology* a Folio component.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

The number of 2009 candidate entries is very stable with a slight increase on 2008 entries. The preparation for and the improvement in performance in the external components of the exam identified last year have been maintained. Generally, candidates and centres have adopted the advice offered over the last few years since the inception of the reviewed Courses in Music. The slight decrease in attainment in the Question Paper has been balanced by an equivalent increase in attainment in the Performing examination, and Markers and Visiting Examiners reported favourably on the overall standard of preparedness and results in these external components of the exam.

Most candidates presented for the Higher Music Performing component of the exam were presented at the correct NQ level. There were less referrals to Principal Assessor on the standard of pieces presented and, again, centres are commended on their partnership with SQA in exam preparation through the Approval of Repertoire project.

Areas in which candidates performed well

The strength of Performing remains a skill exhibited by most candidates. Centres and candidates have adapted well to the changes brought about by the introduction of sampling for the 2007 exam and subsequent years and centres have supported the changes well in their preparation for the administration of this part of the exam.

In 2009 there is again an increase in candidate entries for the Music with Technology Course and, in general, there is clear evidence of improved candidate performance. Although some aspects of the Technology Folios still require a more focused approach from candidates and centres, the overall performance of candidates in this part of the exam has continued to improve since 2007. Markers again commented on the increased understanding of standards, the improved preparation of folios and increased centre expertise in both the MIDI Sequencing and Sound Engineering and Production options.

Areas which candidates found demanding

In the Question Paper, the literacy question and the comparison question still appear to require a more focused support for a number of candidates. A number of candidates don't seem to be able to use their knowledge of concepts from the earlier concepts at Access, Intermediate 1 and Intermediate 2 levels when this is called for in some of the Higher exam questions. In the Music with Technology Course, Markers again reported that a number of candidates' responses to literacy questions require more preparation and focus and clearer understanding of concepts.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Centres are commended for the effectiveness of their response to the issues raised in the 2008 exam. 2009 is the third examination year of the reviewed Arrangements in Music and most of the earlier issues have now been addressed and the resulting improvement in performance across both Course models over the last three examination years is worthy of note.

However, some Visiting Examiners reported that there were still some centres not fully prepared for their visit. Centres should note that:

- ◆ Candidate Mark Sheets were often incorrectly completed or not completed at all. Details of the instruments or instrument and voice being professed, the pieces to be performed and all prepared times of pieces must be clearly shown.
- ◆ Candidate Mark Sheets must be completed in pen (not pencil) by centre staff. This Mark Sheet is the formal record of the assessment event and it is very important that it is completed accurately.
- ◆ In several cases, prepared performing programmes were short of the minimum time required.

Among issues raised by Markers on the Music with Technology folios were:

- ◆ Some misunderstanding of assessment criteria
- ◆ Some files not meeting the time requirements
- ◆ Some centres using 'screen shots' and 'screen dumps' as an alternative to a 'log', resulting in less information being available
- ◆ Better understanding of standards
- ◆ Improved work in centres linked to better equipment and expertise
- ◆ Candidates better prepared, material saved properly and 'log books' much improved

Course Assessment: Advanced Higher

In Advanced Higher Music, the Course assessment consists of a Question Paper and for *Music with Performing* a Performing component and for *Music with Technology* a Folio component.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

This is the third year in which the structure of the reviewed Courses in Music at Advanced Higher level has operated. Answers in this year's Question Paper appeared to reflect an improvement in the awareness of what was required with very few candidates failing to provide answers in the requested format. The majority of candidates had been well prepared by centres. Although the average mark for the Question Paper was slightly higher than in previous years, very few candidates scored more than 30 out of 40 marks or less than 18 out of 40.

Centres and candidates were generally well prepared for the sampling process in the Performing external exam.

In the Music with Technology Course much wider use was made of up-to-date computer software in the Sound Engineering and Production option with most encouraging results.

Areas in which candidates performed well

There was an obvious improvement in many responses to the Question Paper. The average mark for Question 4, containing questions on musical literacy, was encouragingly higher than in previous years.

The standard of Performing generally continued to be high with several candidates being awarded full marks. Many of the Visiting Examiners made favourable comments about candidates (and staff) who were well-prepared for the Performing examinations. Individual candidates, however, often displayed a clear difference of musical ability between their two instruments or instrument and voice in the Music with Performing Course.

In the Music with Technology Course there were several examples of outstanding folios in MIDI Sequencing and in Sound Engineering and Production where candidates' folios reached near-professional standards.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Markers reported that Question 2 of the Question Paper, the accurate identification of a musical style, and Question 6, the comparison of two excerpts, caused problems for a substantial number of candidates.

A few MIDI Sequencing candidates produced a product that failed to display musical imagination with limited or inappropriate use of the varied sequencer functions with which they should have been familiar.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

In the Question Paper, centres should continue to remind candidates that, in questions 7 and 8, they are required to provide ‘a written description. . . not simply a list of concepts’. Marking of test or prelim-type papers within centres should be based on the four sets of Marking Instructions now available (Specimen paper, 2007, 2008 and 2009) and the Advanced Higher Exemplification of Responses to Questions 7 and 8 (available on the SQA secure website) will also be helpful. Candidates should be directed to focus on the appropriate range of concepts that will attract marks; they should avoid too much concentration on any narrow area of the music such as lists of instruments or voices.

Also in the Question Paper, candidates need to be more familiar with the headings used for groups of concepts such as ‘Styles’ and ‘Structural’. This should help them when they are questioned on the identification of specific features in musical excerpts.

Visiting Examiners reported that there were still some centres not fully prepared for their visit. Centres should note that:

- ◆ Candidate Mark Sheets were often incorrectly completed or not completed at all. Details of the instruments or instrument and voice being professed, the pieces to be performed and all prepared times of pieces must be clearly shown.
- ◆ Candidate Mark Sheets must be completed in pen (not pencil) by centre staff. This Mark Sheet is the formal record of the assessment event and it is very important that it is completed accurately.
- ◆ In several cases, prepared performing programmes were short of the minimum time required.

Problems relating to the Listening Commentary, which is the internally assessed evidence requirement for Advanced Higher Music: Listening Unit (DV41 13), are detailed in the 2008 Music Senior Verifier’s *Internal Assessment Report* which can be found on SQA’s NQ Music homepage. This provides feedback on the verification of the assessment of National Qualifications Units. There still seems to be a lack of awareness in certain centres of the exact requirements for the award of a Pass in the Listening Commentary. Centres should ensure that candidates follow the methodology found in the NAB for this Unit and the exemplification materials on the SQA secure website and that staff thoroughly assess each requirement for the Listening Commentary before a Pass can be awarded. Where a centre’s assessment decisions of candidates’ work are found to be not in line with the national standard, extra administrative work is created for all involved.

Several centres failed to supply adequate evidence when making an Appeal for their candidates. There were several examples of Question Papers that were invalid owing to the use of questions from only one past paper or even the complete Specimen Paper; this is unacceptable as answers are readily available on the SQA website. A few centres had used papers that did not sample a broad enough range of concepts or had used a simpler range of question styles. Attention is drawn to the first section of the *Advanced Higher Course Assessment Pack* on www.sqa.org.uk, NQ, Music, Part 1 on page 3, which outlines the exact requirements for the structure of a suitable Question Paper.

Although there were generally less problems with the folios submitted for Music with Technology, centres are reminded of the necessity to include all of the required documentation.

For either MIDI Sequencing or Sound Engineering and Production:

- ◆ recordings of pieces for the Performing element accompanied by the Candidate Mark Sheet with the titles of the pieces and the timings of each piece in the appropriate boxes plus copies of the music

and for MIDI Sequencing:

- ◆ recordings of the candidate's MIDI sequence as a MIDI/audio data file and a stereo, audio recording of the completed piece
- ◆ a session log including details of the equipment and the settings used

and for Sound Engineering and Production:

- ◆ a stereo master recording of 2 contrasting pieces (multi-tracked or using stereo recording techniques)
- ◆ a session log for each piece including details of instruments / voices used on each track and of the equipment used during the recordings
- ◆ a music score or performance plan for each piece

In MIDI sequencing submissions candidates should use an appropriate range of sequencer facilities to produce a musical product rather than a merely mechanical reproduction of the notes from a musical score. The audio track(s) should demonstrate a secure working knowledge of basic sound engineering techniques.

Centres should ensure that all CDs used for recording performing and technology submissions are playable on a standard CD player. Several submissions had not been 'finalised' or 'closed' on completion of the recordings being placed onto CD-Rs. Where possible, CD-Rs marked as suitable for audio recording should be used to avoid extra administrative procedures for centres and SQA staff.

When recordings and the appropriate paperwork have been completed for Music with Technology candidates, centres should ensure that CDs accurately correspond to the contents of envelopes being submitted for central marking. A few centres caused a significant amount of extra investigation before candidates' work could be assessed owing to mismatched folios and recordings. This included one centre where a range of different candidates' performances, in no particular order, was recorded as one continuous track rather than as a series of individual tracks for each candidate.