|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Commentary Feedback Sheet (Text/Film sequence)*** |  |
| Reg Nº |  | Course Code |  | Date |  |
| First Marker  |   | Mark  |  %  |

The ticked categories do not represent exact marks and are purely indicative. Remember that the internally agreed mark is provisional and subject to moderation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Indicators of poor quality* | *0-**29* | *30-**39* | *40-**49* | *50-**54* | *55-**59* | *60-**64* | *65-**69* | *70-**79* | *80-**89* | *90-100* | *Indicators of high quality* |
| Little sense of contextual location of selected passage/clip |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Literary and socio-historical context of passage/clip clearly identified  |
|  |
| Little attention paid to formal aspects of the text/clip |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Clear focus on form of text/clip |
|  |
| Fails to address stylistic, technical or expressive issues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Addresses issues of style, technique, and expression and how deployed |
|  |
| No sense in which content relates to wider socio-cultural issues. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Relates content to wider frames of reference (social & cultural presuppositions) |
|  |
| Overly descriptive with little analytical argumentation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Argument well illustrated: aware of contradictions and ambiguities |
|  |
| Muddled and poorly written  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Well presented and clear |
|  |
| **Other comments**  |